

Cambridge Pre-U Specimen Papers  
and Mark Schemes

Cambridge  
**Pre-U**

Cambridge International Level 3  
Pre-U Certificate in  
**HISTORY**

For use from 2008 onwards



UNIVERSITY of CAMBRIDGE  
International Examinations



# Specimen Materials

## History (9769)

Cambridge International Level 3  
Pre-U Certificate in History (Principal)

For use from 2008 onwards

**QAN 500/4268/3**

### Support

CIE provides comprehensive support for all its qualifications, including the Cambridge Pre-U. There are resources for teachers and candidates written by experts. CIE also endorses a range of materials from other publishers to give a choice of approach. More information on what is available for this particular syllabus can be found at [www.cie.org.uk](http://www.cie.org.uk)

### Syllabus Updates

This booklet of specimen materials is for use from 2008. It is intended for use with the version of the syllabus that will be examined in 2010, 2011 and 2012. The purpose of these materials is to provide Centres with a reasonable idea of the general shape and character of the planned question papers in advance of the first operational examination.

If there are any changes to the syllabus CIE will write to centres to inform them. The syllabus and these specimen materials will also be published annually on the CIE website ([www.cie.org.uk/cambridgepreu](http://www.cie.org.uk/cambridgepreu)). The version of the syllabus on the website should always be considered as the definitive version.

Further copies of this, or any other Cambridge Pre-U specimen booklet, can be obtained by either downloading from our website [www.cie.org.uk/cambridgepreu](http://www.cie.org.uk/cambridgepreu)

or contacting:

Customer Services, University of Cambridge International Examinations,  
1 Hills Road, Cambridge CB1 2EU  
Telephone: +44 (0)1223 553554  
Fax: +44 (0)1223 553558  
E-mail: [international@cie.org.uk](mailto:international@cie.org.uk)

CIE retains the copyright on all its publications. CIE registered Centres are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use. However, CIE cannot give permission to Centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within a Centre.

Copyright © University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate 2008



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/01A**

Paper 1a British History Outlines c. 300–1547

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN PAPER

**2 hours 15 minutes**

---

**READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST**

Answer **three** questions, which must be chosen from **at least two** sections of the paper.

All questions in this paper carry equal marks.

You are reminded of the need for analysis and critical evaluation in your answers to questions. You should also show, where appropriate, an awareness of links and comparisons between different countries and different periods.

---

This document consists of **6** printed pages.



**Section 1: c. 300–663**

- 1 How appropriately may the fourth century be described as 'a golden age' for Roman Britain?
- 2 When and why did Roman rule in Britain come to an end?
- 3 How complete a picture of early Anglo-Saxon settlement is provided by the evidence for the period c. 450–c. 600?
- 4 Why did the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms adopt Christianity?
- 5 How extensive and complete was the authority of the kings of Northumbria over the rest of Anglo-Saxon England in the period 593–670?

**Section 2: 663–978**

- 6 How important a contribution was made by Theodore of Tarsus and St. Wilfrid to the consolidation of Christianity in England?
- 7 Why were Viking expeditions against Britain in the period from 786 to 871 so successful?
- 8 Assess the importance of Offa's kingship.
- 9 Should historians be more impressed by the cultural rather than the military achievements of Alfred?
- 10 Account for the predominance of Wessex in tenth-century England.

**Section 3: 978–1135**

- 11 Why did Cnut not meet with greater opposition in England?
- 12 *(Candidates offering Paper 5a: The Norman Conquest should not answer this question.)*  
Why did Harold II both gain and lose the crown in 1066?
- 13 *(Candidates offering Paper 5a: The Norman Conquest should not answer this question.)*  
How is the consolidation of Norman rule in England in the period 1066–1087 best explained?
- 14 To what extent was the breach between William II and Anselm a matter of personality rather than principle?
- 15 Assess the significance of Henry I's governmental and legal reforms.

**Section 4: Themes c. 300–1066**

- 16 A significant number of urban settlements had grown up by 1000. How and why had this development occurred?
- 17 How far, and in what ways, did the nature of Anglo-Saxon kingship change after the conversion to Christianity?
- 18 How important were the links between England and continental Europe in the seventh and eighth centuries?
- 19 To what extent can the impact of Scandinavian incursions into Britain from c. 786 to c. 1069 be regarded as a period of integration of peoples rather than conquest?
- 20 How strong was the late Anglo-Saxon economy?
- 21 How healthy was the late Anglo-Saxon Church?

**Section 5: 1135–1272**

- 22 To what extent, and in what ways, did the kings of Scotland consolidate their authority in the period 1124–1286?
- 23 How convincing is the argument that Stephen's reign was a period of anarchy?
- 24 'Ultimately a failure.' How valid is this judgement on the reign of Henry II?
- 25 Account for the collapse of the Angevin Empire in the early-thirteenth century.
- 26 How far were the events of 1258–65 a response to Henry III's failings as King?

**Section 6: 1272–1399**

- 27 How successfully did Edward I rule England?
- 28 Why did it prove difficult for the English to assert themselves effectively in Scotland in the period 1286–1357?
- 29 'Outstandingly successful to 1360; thereafter a king beset with problems.' To what extent do you agree with this verdict on the reign of Edward III?
- 30 How serious a threat to the established order was the Peasants' Revolt?
- 31 How valid is the judgement that Richard II brought about his own downfall?

**Section 7: 1399–1461**

- 32 To what extent did the domestic problems of Henry IV's reign arise out of the circumstances of his acquisition of the crown?
- 33 How are the military successes of Henry V best explained?
- 34 What was the significance of the rising of Owain Glyndwr?
- 35 Why did the English position in France collapse in the reign of Henry VI?
- 36 How is the outbreak of civil strife in England in 1455 best explained?

**Section 8: 1461–1547**

- 37 Why did Edward IV lose the throne in 1470, yet regain it in 1471?
- 38 How effective a king was Henry VII?
- 39 ***(Candidates offering Paper 5c: The Reign of Henry VIII should not answer this question.)***  
'The King's servant.' How convincing is this view of Wolsey's position as chief minister?
- 40 How far, and in what ways, was the power and prestige of the Scottish monarchy extended by James IV and James V?
- 41 ***(Candidates offering Paper 5c: The reign of Henry VIII should not answer this question.)***  
Who was chiefly responsible for the religious changes in England in the period 1529–1547, the King or his ministers?

**Section 9: Themes c. 1066–1547**

- 42 'The relationship between peasants and their lords between c. 1066 and c. 1300 can best be described as conflict-ridden.' How accurate is this view?
- 43 How significant a contribution did the Cistercians make to the Church and society in twelfth-century Britain?
- 44 To what extent did the economic and social status of women change between c. 1100 and c. 1500?
- 45 'The severity of the impact of the Black Death has been over-stated.' How accurate is this view?
- 46 How popular was the English Church in the fifteenth century?
- 47 'A land of great economic prosperity.' Discuss this view of England in the fifteenth century.

---

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

University of Cambridge International Examinations is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/01A**

Paper 1a British History Outlines c. 300–1547

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

**2 hours 15 minutes**

---

**MAXIMUM MARK: 90**

---

This document consists of **50** printed pages.



UNIVERSITY of CAMBRIDGE  
International Examinations

**Section 1: c. 300–663****1 How appropriately may the fourth century be described as ‘a golden age’ for Roman Britain?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The focus will be on the period 300–400. Analysis and evaluation are required. A description of life in Roman Britain or a narrative of events will not achieve the required answer. An exhaustive coverage is not expected but there has to be evidence of knowledge over a reasonable chronological range. A good range of material can be covered: for example, villas (much building), towns (some controversy over strengths and decline elements), trade and industry, the evidence of coins, the effects of the mid-century troubles and the disaster of 367, the fortunes of the army, how far general defence and security upheld prosperity and stability (see below – AO2).

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Candidates need a good focus on ‘How appropriately ....’. It would be possible to argue for a ‘golden age’, prior to decline and collapse of Roman authority in Britain. Then again, threats were growing (barbarians from Ireland, Scotland, the Continent) and there is evidence of change and (limited) upheaval (e.g. Pelagianism; separatism signs; the Saxon Shore; the beginnings of Anglo-Saxon incursions).

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

## 2 When and why did Roman rule in Britain come to an end?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The focus will be on the period from c. 400 to c. 450 with a balanced assessment of ‘when and why’, delivered by analysis and evaluation, not a form of chronological survey. There is scope for debate (see AO2 below) and there has been much argument as to the end of Roman rule. ‘Britain’ needs to be considered: episodic withdrawals; downscaling of commitment and presences; a retreat. Consideration may be given to events in 407 (Constantine III and the troop withdrawals), 410 (Honorius’ letter, often seen as a key date and event), 429 (Germanus’ visit), 442 (Saxons), around 446 (the appeal to Aetius). Reasons that may be considered: declining Roman assets and resources; barbarian settlements and penetration (with 406 as important); civil wars; troops withdrawals from Britain; the breakdown of Roman rule and an ordered life (the two synonymous, perhaps); possible separatism; possible effects from Pelagianism; changing economic and social circumstances. Reference to the wider context of Roman problems and their impact on Britain – the nature of the Empire was changing, and fast – would be useful, provided Britain remains the focus.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, ‘when and why’ set up debate and argument. No specific date may be offered (but see above) but a sense of period/decade and explanation (‘why’) will be required. Again, there are debate areas here. A historiographical dimension is possible here and there is an open arena for arguments as to the reasons for the rejection and removal of Roman authority.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**3 How complete a picture of early Anglo-Saxon settlement is provided by the evidence for the period c. 450–c. 600?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The focus will be on the long period here but candidates will be aware that its longevity reflects both time-span of invasions and settlements and the very essence of the question, the availability and nature of the evidence. A narrative account of Anglo-Saxon penetration and settlement will need enough of an implicit response to score well. Analysis and evaluation are required.

Candidates need a good range of documentary and non-documentary material and need to make comment on these. A sense of the completeness (or otherwise) of the evidence and what can be pieced together therefrom should be key features.

Settlements and expansion within the terminal dates will need focus.

There needs to be awareness of prior Anglo-Saxon presence and assessment of subsequent arrivals; so, too, awareness of such issues as the displacement of the British or English overlordship of British subject villages.

Evidence needs to be adduced and range across the written (Gildas, Bede, Anglo-Saxon chronicle, possibly Nennius and Procopius), archaeological (burial sites, grave finds, village sites, etc.) and toponymic and numismatic. Stress may be placed upon the value of the archaeological, set alongside literary forms.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Candidates need a good focus on ‘How complete ...’, inviting assessment of nature, scale and scope of evidence and of gaps and weaknesses. Here, the wider the range of evidence considered, the more critical the evaluation, and the better the quality of argument in constructing a picture, the higher the likely reward will be. This is an open-ended, contentious question area. Local and regional knowledge would be welcome and worthy of reward within a well-developed answer.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

#### 4 Why did the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms adopt Christianity?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The focus will be on the period c. 597–c. 664 and the processes of conversion. A narrative-chronology of events will not respond to the demands of the question, unless explanation is embedded. Good analysis and evaluation are required, selecting and deploying relevant information as appropriate. Reasons that can be adduced: ideology, conviction, fear; political and military success and the benefits perceived to come from Christianity, spiritual and material. Individuals and features that can be cited: St Augustine, Canterbury, Kentish Kings, especially Aethelberht; Northumbrian events surrounding Edwin and Paulinus, Oswald and Aidan; Birinus and the West Saxons; the pagan activities of Penda and relapses to paganism; the pivotal Synod of Whitby; developing diocesan organisation, the spread of the authority of the Archbishop of Canterbury; the training of clergy; the development of monasteries as centres of excellence; pastoral work – all of which helped to fuel conversions and standardisations of faith, belief, practice.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Candidates will need to focus on ‘Why ...’, explaining factors and assessing issues, spread over time, and reflecting arguments over the reasons. These will embrace the appeal and power of Christianity, the role of individuals, a certain opportunism.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**5 How extensive and complete was the authority of the kings of Northumbria over the rest of Anglo-Saxon England in the period 593–670?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The focus will be on the period from the reign of Aethelfrith (d. 616) to Oswiu (d. 670). A narrative of events, including reigns, will not answer the question unless there is strong explanation. Good analysis and evaluation are required. Northumbrian hegemony effectively ended later, in 685 with the rout and death of Ecgrith. But even before then there were strains (Bernicia-Deira) and challenges (Mercia – whose kings killed seven members of the Bernician and Deiran dynasties, 616–79). Yet Northumbria (an amalgam of the latter lands) was paramount with political and military powers of some substance for much of this period. Factors to be assessed: awareness needs to be shown that Northumbrian power cannot be assessed simply in terms of relations with the other kingdoms of the ‘heptarchy’, though a strong emphasis on these is perfectly acceptable. Matters which may be assessed: the Bernicia/Deira distinction and its significance at key junctures; the related matter of the successions and disputes; expansion under Aethelfrith (d. 616); the extent and length of the hegemony over the English enjoyed by Edwin, Oswald and Oswiu; the problem of Mercia; relations with, and the extent of power over, non-English peoples (and especially the Britons of Elmet and Strathclyde, the Picts and the Irish); relative decline in the later years of Oswiu and the reigns of Ecgrith and Aldrith. Discussions on such issues as the Bretwaldaship and the nature of Northumbrian hegemony may also be offered, and are worthy of credit.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may enhance responses but are not required. In this question, a strong focus on ‘How extensive and complete ...’ is required, with the possible arguments of unevenness and superficiality of control. Once again, argument and debate over the balance of Northumbrian strengths and fortuitous circumstances in explaining control and power should be a feature. It is possible that the rulers were simply lucky and that their authority and power were bound to be transient.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

## Section 2: 663–978

**6 How important a contribution was made by Theodore of Tarsus and St. Wilfrid to the consolidation of Christianity in England?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The focus will be on the period of the consolidation of Christianity but equal coverage is not a prerequisite of a successful answer. What is required is analysis, linked to evaluation, supported by appropriately selected material, not narrative or description of each contribution. Theodore (Archbishop of Canterbury, 667–90) and St Wilfrid (bishop and abbot, d. 709) were significant characters. For St Wilfrid, the Synod of Whitby (664) was something of a high point. His subsequent career was stormy, with deprivations (664–9, 678–86, 691–706) and divisions of his see of Northumbria, disagreements with Kings Ecgfrith and Aldfrith and the Archbishops of Canterbury, Theodore and Berhtwald, visits to the Pope to appeal, imprisonment, exile and councils in 705 and 706. He also was a missionary – into Frisia and with the South and West Saxons and Mercians. He had a particular view of the Church – a view played up by Eddius Stephanus and down by Bede. He favoured large sees, huge episcopal estates, high political life (personal ascetism and public grandeur) whereas Theodore wanted the reverse. There were issues over Wilfred’s relations with York. He clashed on several major issues with his kings – not least because he was friendly with Mercian kings. He aroused much feeling, intense, bitter, powerful. Conversions (Anglo-Saxons), the foundation of monasteries and building were features. He brought from Gaul the Rule of St Benedict and was a channel for Roman influence.

Theodore’s successes after 672 were significant: he built up an episcopate, organised and united the Church under Canterbury; he stimulated monastic growth via attracting land grants; he created a Canterbury ‘school’; he presided over two important Synods and extended his authority; he took further the outcome of the Whitby Synod and so the Roman version of Christianity, organising the Church along Roman lines.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this instance, ‘How important ...’ opens up debate and argument; relative importance; assessment of the roles of others and of contextual factors (kings, bishops, holy men, monasteries). Answers may comment upon the combined effects, albeit of two disparate approaches and traditions.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

## 7 Why were Viking expeditions against Britain in the period from 786 to 871 so successful?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The focus will be on the period from the attacks on Northumbrian monasteries through to the start of major attacks on England and on Alfred's lands including areas of Wessex. Raids intensified after c. 835 (on London, Canterbury, Southampton). Causal narrative may work well enough but a clearly thematic response is likely to be better here. Factors to be assessed will embrace a mixture of Viking strengths and domestic weaknesses, perhaps varying across time and place.

Worthy of consideration would be: Viking leadership; naval and military strengths and skills; the ability to project force at distance and to raid with clinical efficiency; the ability to attack weakly-defended coastal sites and to roam inland; the changes in and after 850 (Danish army overwintered on Thanet and this marked a new pattern of more permanent presence); the 866 'great raiding army' in East Anglia and the 867 base at York; English weaknesses in a lack of unity, lack of leadership, uncertain military responses, over-dependence on old fortified (but weak) centres, belief in the Viking attacks as a divine punishment.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this instance, focus is on 'Why ...' and so explanation matters. There is scope for argument and debate. 'So successful' needs some comments, conveying as it does a sense of completeness of success.

Here, some limited reference to the reasons behind Viking attacks and then land settlements would be in order, though the bulk of the response must be an explanation of reasons for success. Argument and debate may centre on whether the Vikings formed such a dynamic force that they were unstoppable or whether internal English weaknesses facilitated their success – until Alfred's reign, that is. Certainly, the Vikings proved a disruptive force, attacking the Christian religion and its bases as much as economic centres.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

## 8 Assess the importance of Offa's kingship.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The focus will be on Offa's reign and actions via analysis and assessment, not a narrative of the reign (unless with elements of analysis). Evaluation is important. Offa's kingship had significance, not least as the apogee of Mercian supremacy. Some awareness of Aethelbald's legacy as of Offa's own would be helpful. So, also, some consideration of the problems of sources as evidence for any assessment would be useful.

Contextual awareness will help: relations with Continental rulers, above all Charlemagne; relations with other English rulers as well as consideration of Mercia's place before and after his reign (Wessex, arguably, was the ultimate beneficiary of all he did).

A wide range of matters can be adduced; relations with Kent, East Anglia, Wessex; the nature and extent of political hegemony; the significance of military leadership and power (an archetypal warrior king?); trade; relations with the Continent; coins; charters; laws; relations with the Church and Papacy (Lichfield, anointing of his son); Offa's Dyke (as a symbol of power?).

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Candidates need to assess importance, significance, impact and reputation areas. Debate and argument are possible here: for example, as to the real depth and extent of Offa's supremacy (too dependent on military force? transient?); as to the extent of the future Wessex dominance leading to mis-reading of aspects of Offa's kingship (as above at AO1); as to the importance of lucky circumstances. The question is explicit as to 'importance', hence impact and status are important to evaluation – contemporary resonance, later hindsight views.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

## 9 Should historians be more impressed by the cultural rather than the military achievements of Alfred?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is analysis and evaluation of achievements, balancing cultural (and other) and military areas. Analysis matters. A narrative of the reign will not deliver an answer unless there is some analysis present.

Equal treatment of the achievements cited is not necessary here – argument will be built around one or the other – but both aspects do need treatment.

It is likely that military achievements will figure prominently. However, cultural had significance and indeed the two can be linked, not least in Alfred's personality and leadership on a range of fronts.

On the military fronts, operations against the Vikings (871–8, 892–6); the interlude years and military and naval reforms of the 880s (burhs, navy, rotational fyrd); the value of political alliances with Mercia (London's strategic value) and with some Welsh leaders; political leadership (ealdormen, thegns, etc.) – all should feature. It can be argued that the survival of Wessex was of the greatest importance and that military successes beyond that were limited (see AO2, below).

On the cultural level, focus can be upon the 'Alfredian Renaissance' in learning and scholarship (translations, schools, scholars imparted, revived learning) and the revival (and centrality to Alfred) of religious life. It is clear that learning and spirituality were intimately linked and vital in his wars with the Vikings (seen as a scourge, a divine punishment).

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Candidates can consider how far the military achievements have been over-rated and whether cultural achievements (as above) had the greater contemporary significance. Then again, it is possible to say that military survival was essential. Argument and debate can be advanced here. For example, it is possible that the military successes were exaggerated (the nature of the written evidence is of note here); the Vikings settled into the Danelaw after c. 878–80; the raiders of 892–6 were highly mobile and never defeated completely (rather a stalemate ensued); Alfred's personal involvement was limited in the 890s. But Wessex survived, a major achievement, and there was some greater unity, even sense of 'English-ness'. Also, the cultural achievements may be over-estimated (given the nature of the clerical-led evidence); yet the strong personal role of Alfred bears favourable comment.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

## 10 Account for the predominance of Wessex in tenth-century England.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The focus will be on the period after Alfred's death to the reign of Edgar, arguably the peak of Wessex's ascendancy. The troubled reign of Aethelred II will have little relevance here. A narrative is not required; rather analysis and evaluation providing explanation.

Wessex's eventual supremacy was based on the legacy of Alfred and the intense efforts of Edward the Elder and Athelstan – possibly the under-regarded Eadred – and the demonstrable authority of Edgar.

There is plenty of material to consider, with analysis and evaluation required: for Edward, Tettenhall; the building of fortifications and the occupations of London and Oxford; victories against the Danes in the Midlands; control of Mercia on the death of Aethelflaed; further Danish submissions (918–20) but no authority north of the Humber. For Athelstan, invasion of Northumbria; the extension of overlordship outside 'England'; the campaigns of 926–7, 934 and major success at Brunanburh (937); close relations with and recognition from Continental powers; forms of national assemblies; use of Danes as councillors; the use and importance of laws and charters and coins. For Edgar, the handling of the Danelaw; firm internal government; shows of strength towards potential enemies; law-giving; re-coinage; strong support of the Church.

Common themes would be: the expansion of Wessex's military and political hegemony; the value of Mercia; the control of the Danelaw; the defeat and subjugation of enemies (British, Norse); the developments of the monarchy, government, coinage and its controls, laws; support of ealdormen; conciliar features; the eventual creation of peace and stability, founded on strong kingship.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this instance, there is scope for argument and debate. For example, it can be said that Wessex's supremacy was always likely given the dynamic created by Alfred, Edward the Elder and Athelstan. Then again, favourable circumstances (no alternatives, no rivals other than Norse settlers and invaders) may have been more significant. Military power and dynamism can be seen as crucial. Then again, Edgar's was a peaceful reign and personality plus political skills may have been as important. Consideration may be given to just how strong Wessex really was, how integrated was Northumbria, how much luck did play its part (e.g. the absence of major Danish challenges).

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**Section 3: 978–1135****11 Why did Cnut not meet with greater opposition in England?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The focus should be on the period from 1013 until 1035, and answers should not simply consist of a narrative of the campaigns of 1013 until 1016, although knowledge of these campaigns which is used to explain Cnut's victories and place them in context could be useful. Answers should, for example, display knowledge of the weaknesses of Anglo-Saxon government and defences in the period of the conquest, of support for Cnut and of his military skills. They should also discuss Cnut's government after 1016, for example his relations with the Anglo-Saxon nobility, his use of existing government and financial systems, his relations with the Church, and foreign policy only insofar as this affected his position in England, for example relations with Normandy.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, Cnut's success could be attributed to his ability to maintain continuity through winning the support of the English church and much of the English ruling class, but he could still be also seen as a foreign conqueror, ruling through his trusted followers and the deployment of strong military force, paid for by a new and punitive taxation system.

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.

**12 Why did Harold II both gain and lose the crown in 1066?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The focus should be on the events leading up to the campaigns of 1066, but should not merely provide a narrative of those campaigns. Answers should, for example, display knowledge of Harold's relationship to Edward the Confessor and his support amongst the English nobility, as well as the strength of his claim to the throne. They should also discuss the rival claims from Norway and Normandy, and the military challenges which these provided for Harold in 1066, as well as Harold's responses to these, in the campaigns in both the north and the south.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, Harold's loss of the throne could be attributed to his own difficulties in keeping together his army in such a long campaign, as well as to the decision to march from London to Kent, or it could be seen as due to William's military skill and planning, both in organising supplies for his men and in persuading Harold to leave London by his tactics in Kent. Alternatively, the military differences between the two armies, and the extent to which these reflect differences in society and government between England and Normandy, could be discussed.

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.

**13 How is the consolidation of Norman rule in England in the period 1066–1087 best explained?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The focus should be on the measures taken by William I to secure and maintain his rule, and these should be placed within the context of the existing political, military and social structures of the country. Answers should, for example, display knowledge of William's responses to the early rebellions, the construction and maintenance of castles, the use of the existing government systems and officials such as the sheriffs, the use of feudalism and of the church, William's support from his Norman followers.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, William's success could be attributed to the strengths of the existing Anglo-Saxon system of government, which remained largely unchanged, or to the military control imposed by the changes in landholding, castle-building and the replacement of much of the ruling class by Normans. Reference here could be made to the evidence of Domesday Book.

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.

**14 To what extent was the breach between William II and Anselm a matter of personality rather than principle?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The focus should be on the issues which divided King and Archbishop, and the extent to which these were caused, or at least worsened, by their personalities. Answers should, for example, display knowledge of the Investiture Contest and the ways in which this related to the English Church, as well as of William's treatment of and attitude towards the English Church, and Anselm's own position within that church, and the main features of the disagreement between them, such as papal authority and Anselm's feudal obligations to William.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, Anselm's refusal to compromise over the issues of Gregorian Reform may be seen as an issue of principle, but also as a sign of his distrust of a King whose behaviour towards the church was the subject of much critical comment in the contemporary sources. Similarly, William could be seen as temperamentally hostile towards the church, and especially to such a spiritual leader as Anselm, but he could also be seen as maintaining the strongly independent, but not necessarily confrontational, stance of William I towards the Gregorian papacy and its ambitions.

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.

**15 Assess the significance of Henry I's governmental and legal reforms.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The focus should be on the measures taken by Henry in central and local government and in the legal system and the significance of these reforms for both the country and the monarchy. Answers should, for example, show knowledge of the Charter of Liberties, of the reforms to the royal household and their effects, of the reforms to the financial system, such as the Exchequer, to the administration of justice through the eyres and local justices, and the increase in both physical and financial penalties for breach of the law. Answers should not simply list reforms but should attempt to address their impact.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, Henry's reforms could be seen in the short-term context of the unpopularity of his predecessor, and his own need to gain and maintain support, but also as part of a longer-term process of the development of a more specialised and bureaucratic monarchy, at least partly due to the conquest of Normandy and the consequent need for systems and individuals who could be trusted to rule the country in the monarch's absence. The aims of the reforms, in terms of strengthening and enriching the monarchy, and the extent to which they succeeded, could also be discussed

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.

**Section 4: Themes c. 300–1066****16 A significant number of urban settlements had grown up by 1000. How and why had this development occurred?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. The question is a two-part one. Equal attention to ‘how’ and ‘why’ is not expected, though more emphasis on the latter is likely. ‘How’ should not invite description. Analysis, evaluation, explanation are required, with some range of examples to support arguments.

Examples of urban settlements will be needed and one approach might be to answer the question by assessing several such examples. Another approach might be to use examples on a broader level.

Some Roman centres survived, often as religious or royal centres. By the seventh and eighth centuries, signs of revival were evident: organised trade sites, settled locations. London, York and Southampton are examples of development on old Roman sites; Ipswich an example on a non-Roman site. More inland, smaller towns sprang up, often linked to religious and royal needs. The Alfredian burghal system – towns as military, economic and commercial centres – was an important impetus and indeed the period c. 943–1066 saw the flourishing of more new towns, often shire or mint towns, as trade grew and wealth expanded. Hereford, Tamworth, Oxford and Winchester are but four examples.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The formulation of the question invites a good focus on explanation, in a context of size and scale of urban settlements after the end of Roman occupation and the interruptions of Anglo-Saxon invasions and settlements. There is argument here; there are debate issues. Candidates may argue that there was a natural stimulus to recovery; or else that settlements arose out of political, economic and religious needs; defence and security (of trade, centres of rule, markets) would be other dimensions. Periods of peace can be assessed, set against tension, strife, challenge, invasion and attack.

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.

**17 How far, and in what ways, did the nature of Anglo-Saxon kingship change after the conversion to Christianity?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Description is unlikely here. Narrative will not suffice. Good focus on analysis and evaluation is needed. There are two parts here – ‘How far’, ‘in what ways’ – and both need coverage, albeit not in equal measure. No dates are given but a start around 597 is likely and the culmination may be seen in Bede’s work and what he had to say about the impact of conversions. By the eighth century paganism had been removed and Christianisation confirmed. Anglo-Saxon kingship developed with a base in Romanic and Germanic elements and a strong input from Christianity. Power politics intruded: overlords converted clients (Aethelberht, Oswald, Oswiu, for example). Clearly, Christianity offered attractions: command; a sense of God’s representative on earth; links to the prestige of the late Roman Empire; literacy, classical learning. Roman law; parallels on the Continent, not least the Frankish rulers; the copying of Carolingian advances in the Christian concept of Kingship; coronation ritual; Alfredian and successor law codes – some or all might be considered here. The likes of Alfred and Edgar may be seen as the personification of sacralised kingship.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Apart from a good focus on the two parts of the question, candidates need to examine ‘nature’ and ‘change’ in their assessments. There is scope for argument and debate. Some may see change as great and extensive, the product of the infusion of religious-spiritual ideas and values. Some may see change as more measured, with Christianity grafted on to pre-existing ideas and values. Certainly, motives for adoption of Christianity can be assessed here. Mention can be made of what was passed on from pagan kingship (e.g. the importance of genealogy and pedigree, the king as a warrior leader).

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.

**18 How important were the links between England and continental Europe in the seventh and eighth centuries?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Given the long span, candidates will need to be selective in their knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, with suitable illustrative examples. Links can embrace religious, commercial and economic, political and diplomatic. Links to the developing Carolingian lands and Empire may well feature strongly but a sense of range across the period is required. Missionary activity – initially from the Continent into England but later in reverse – will be a feature. Examples of such as Wilfrid, Egberht, Willibrord and Boniface could be used. Alcuin may be seen as a good example of combined religious and scholarly activity. Relations with the Papacy might be examined with profit. Others, of course, were involved in that phase of burgeoning Carolingian Court cultural activity. Trade links did develop, reflected in coinage movements and finds. Ports were active places and there is evidence of commercial-mercantile penetration well inland on both sides of the Channel. The dealings of Offa with Charlemagne may be cited. Marriages were arranged; diplomatic contacts made; envoys exchanged; gifts exchanged. The shaping of English royal ideas and practices by Continental exemplars might be another fruitful arena of evaluation.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The formulation ‘How important ...’ invites a review of factors and a sense of relative importance, with awareness of connections. Argument and debate are embedded here. Some may see the links as growing, extensive, major, helping to shape a range of actions and responses. Others may argue that the links, though important, can be over-estimated. There are considerations as to how far developments depended upon external influences as well as how far such links reflect the growing strength of Anglo-Saxon territories and their rulers.

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.

**19 To what extent can the impact of Scandinavian incursions into Britain from c. 786 to c. 1069 be regarded as a period of integration of peoples rather than conquest?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Given the long time span, bounded by the beginning of attacks on monasteries in the North-East and the incursion to support native unrest against William I, candidates will need to be selective in their knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a description or narrative of events. They are likely to assess the raids, conquests and settlements, with some focus on the Danelaw in England and developments in the North, including around York. There were two phases: c. 780–c. 900 and c. 980–1069. References to both and to their features would be useful. The Kingship of the very successful Cnut and less impressive Harefoot and Harthacnut could be considered. The Danelaw might be a fruitful area for discussion – a mix of settlers and native peoples; subject to English reconquest in the early tenth century and incorporated into the English state; then re-shaped by the events of Aethelred II's reign. Urbanisation, markets, coins, the pace of commercial activity, the relatively high density of population, the role of the Church, the development of special laws and organisational units (e.g. wapentakes, carucates), could all be assessed. In addition, issues such as intermarriage, language, a shared culture could be assessed. After 1042 and 1066 the threat of Scandinavian attacks remained, with the fear that settled social groups might aid such. Place names, toponyms, topography, the nature of laws and dispensations, and economic interchanges could be areas of assessment of integration.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'To what extent ...' invites argument and counter-argument – there are debates here – and a good focus on 'integration' set against 'conquest' will be important here. It could be argued that conquest preceded settlement and integration. The extent of penetrative integration could be considered. There are issues of whether the Scandinavian attackers and settlers were barbaric, violent, destructive or more sophisticated (if over time), more constructive. The nature of the attacks and of the settlements created will need some good examination here.

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.

## 20 How strong was the late Anglo-Saxon economy?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Description is unlikely to succeed here. Analysis and evaluation are required. A timespan of c. 900 or c. 950–1066 is likely. Given this, illustrative material will have to be selective. Strength can be measured in evidence of prosperity, wealth, commercial and urban activity, mints and coins, contemporary views. Some use of post-1066 evidence would be appropriate: it can be argued that the Normans conquered an economically strong and viable Kingdom. No matter the upheavals of renewed Viking attacks in the 980s and then dynastic changes in 1016 and 1042, economic activity remained at a good level. Indeed, the geld sums of Aethelred II's reign point to a wealthy land. Towns, trade (internal, external), markets, produce and products, sound coinage (regularly changed, controlled), the generation of wealth, the role of the economy as a successful underpinning of the monarchy, all can be considered. Contemporary evidence of economic strengths and the benefits that Cnut and his successors drew from England, and those that William I was to derive, could be used. Continental awareness of English wealth drew admiration, envy, plundering raids and invasion.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'How strong ...' sets up argument and possible counter-argument. Indeed, there has been debate here and changed views are a feature. Opinion has shifted markedly in favour of the strength and resilience of the economy, in part the result of close examination of what the Normans took over in 1066 and, indeed, of Domesday Book references. It is likely that answers will favour an economy that was strong, robust, powerful, though questioning of this and a sense of unevenness in some areas would be useful here.

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.

## 21 How healthy was the late Anglo-Saxon Church?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A description of the Church or a narrative of Church-related events will not go very far here. Rather, analysis and evaluation are required, drawing upon a range of selected examples. A timespan of c. 950 to 1066 is likely, with a good focus on what has been seen as a ‘tenth-century reformation’. Norman churchmen took a poor view of the late Anglo-Saxon Church but this was excessive in many cases. Answers that work back from the Norman Conquest and the state of the Church then could be useful, though they will need the required links. The features of the tenth-century reform movement could be addressed: Dunstan, Aethelwold, Oswald; monastic foundations; the *Regularis Concordia*; the state of the secular Church; the effects on bishops, organisations, learning, the ordinary clergy. The anti-monastic reaction of the late 970s, the impact of renewed Scandinavian attacks, the roles of such as Wulfstan, Cnut’s relationship with the Church, literary works, monastic activity, the Confessor’s piety and patronage, the example of Stigand could be further assessed. Continental links and the issue of how far the English Church fitted into a European framework in scholarship, learning, piety, good works, could offer an extra dimension.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. ‘How healthy ...’ invites argument and counter-argument here. There has been debate as to health, vibrancy, strength; some have argued that these features extended well into the last phase of the Anglo-Saxon kingdom; not all agree, believing that Stigand represents a Church ill at ease with itself. Candidates may well use elements of a post-Conquest perspective (Norman propaganda) to adjudge the state of the Church, arguing that there was a tendency to overplay weaknesses and problems. There are those who argue that the extent of contacts with the Continent suggests a Church falling behind the development of new religious ideals and functions, a Church very insular and narrowly focused, untouched by developing reform ideas. Others argue that this was a Church of some strength and appeal, with occasional bad practices and examples.

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.

**Section 5: 1135–1272****22 To what extent, and in what ways, did the kings of Scotland consolidate their authority in the period 1124–1286?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. There are two parts to the question here – ‘to what extent’ and ‘in what ways’. Given the long time span, candidates will have to be selective in their use of knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are needed, not a narrative based around key events. Answers are not expected to offer equal treatment to the two parts of the question. 1124 marked the accession of King David I; 1286 the sudden death of King Alexander III. David I’s reign (1124–53) is seen as very effective and successful. He transformed the political culture by using and importing the personnel and policies of the Norman nobility, church, government and trade, though native elements and power remained. He and his immediate successors (Malcolm IV, William I the Lion) harnessed the new techniques of government, administration and war to enhance royal authority, resisting attempts at overlordship by the kings of England and pursuing designs on areas of Northern England. The position of the kings of England, their attitudes and responses, distractions, periodic weaknesses will form something of a context.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Apart from the two parts to the question – not to be answered in equal measure – a good focus is needed on ‘consolidate their authority’. There is scope for argument and debate here. ‘To what extent ...’ opens up issues of scale or scope. Selection will be a feature here, even if (for example) David I’s reign is seen as pivotal. A balance of internal Scottish factors, albeit of Norman-French character, and external English factors, is likely; but the former need to be paramount. It could be argued that the effective harnessing and deployment of Norman-French ways, methods and personnel (creating a new aristocracy) were crucial here. The personalities of the kings, their energy, ambition and pragmatism, will be features. Over time, more native elements and the appearance of a definable Scottish dimension may be seen as important.

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.

**23 How convincing is the argument that Stephen's reign was a period of anarchy?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A narrative or description of Stephen's reign will not answer the question unless there is explanation. Good analytical and evaluative focus will be required. 'Anarchy' will need definition and explanation: unrest; civil war; baronial feuding; the seizure of castles, property, general lawlessness; robber barons; a sense of the breakdown of royal authority and control. Then again, a perspective could be offered that looks at the extent and nature of breakdown; the temporary division of England into three power blocs; the nature of royal authority, law and order; local government; feudal-proprietary rights being upheld; baronial interests including local pacts and truces; the control of and use of writs and coinage; the place of castles and the proliferation of earldoms. All or many of these could be considered, yet without them being evidence of 'anarchy'. A perspective, albeit brief, from the early years of Henry II's reign may help – though this is not a prerequisite.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'How convincing ...' invites debate, argument and counter-argument. Candidates are likely to be aware of the considerable debate and of changed views here, with much re-evaluation of Stephen as a ruler, of the nature of the unrest and of the applicability of 'anarchy'. A more measured appraisal has emerged. Candidates may still see elements of 'anarchy' (disorder, unrest, challenges to authority, the breakdown of normal government). But others may take a more positive view, arguing for an almost measured, pragmatic approach to Stephen's rulership, the arrival of the Empress Matilda and the intrusions of King David I of Scotland.

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.

## 24 'Ultimately a failure.' How valid is this judgement of the reign of Henry II?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A narrative of the reign will not succeed, unless there is embedded explanation. Analysis and evaluation matter, with significant focus on failure (or indeed success). It is hard to view Henry II as a failure, given his prolific energy and activism, his frequent cross-channel crossings, warlike moments, involvement in major legal and ecclesiastical events, promotion of important administrative reforms. It could be said he bequeathed problems, not least a restless family and a massive Empire requiring constant vigilance, oversight and input of resources. Even over Becket, and the events of 1172, he could be said to have retained much control over the Church. Ecclesiastical areas are likely to be discussed as are the major administrative, governmental, judicial and legal reforms. References can be made to civil and criminal law and to the use of juries, sheriffs, itinerant justice and returnable writs; to the major Inquests (1166, 1176); to the developments in the Exchequer and the office of Justiciar; to the relationship with the nobility, patronage, challenges (including 1173–4). The context of the demands of the Angevin Empire, fiscal and feudal-royal requirements, warfare and support from England, relations with the Capetians can be assessed. The difficulties of handling his own family, not least his sons, and the problems of dividing the inheritance could well be addressed.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'How valid ...' invites argument and counter-argument here. There is plenty of scope for debate. Was Henry II a failure? Was he successful? In what ways might he be viewed as failing in the end? What of the significant developments (e.g. administrative, legal) in the reign? How far do they denote a successful, important reign? How important, in an English context, was the extensive Angevin Empire and its demands?

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.

**25 Account for the collapse of the Angevin Empire in the early-thirteenth century.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A narrative of the events associated with the swift collapse under King John will not answer the question, unless there is explanation. Focused analysis and evaluation are required, assessing internal and external factors, personal, institutional, structural, military, strategic, diplomatic. Brief reference to the nature and extent of the Angevin Empire would help. Given that the Paper is on British history, knowledge of continental developments is not expected to be full; rather it should be related to King John's position in England, not least either side of 1202–4. Coverage should extend at least to 1214 (Bouvines). Factors that can be considered: John's leadership, political and military; the uneven support he enjoyed on both sides of the Channel; military issues of strategy and tactics; diplomacy; comparative resources, English and French; the nature of Philip Augustus's power and challenge; the feudal suzerainty issues; mistakes made by John; the collapse of John's military-diplomatic network and plans in 1214.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'Account for ...' invites measured explanation and evaluation. There is scope for debate here; indeed there has been plentiful debate. For example, was collapse self-generated, internalised, structural? Was collapse simply the result of the poor leadership of King John? Was it inherent in the very nature of the Angevin Empire and system of government? Or was it the result of massive external pressures, the resources available to the skilful, strong, increasingly powerful Philip Augustus?

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.

**26 How far were the events of 1258–65 a response to Henry III's failings as King?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A narrative of 1258–65 or of the reign as a whole is not required here. Rather, well-focused analysis and evaluation are needed, with good linkage of the issues at the core of 1258–65 and the nature of Henry III's personal kingship. Focus on Henry III is important but a wider context is also expected. The nature and causes of baronial opposition need to be assessed as do long- and short-term causes, including pressures on the relationship of the Crown and political élite inherited from John's reign. The Provisions of Oxford and of Westminster, the Mise of Amiens, armed conflict should feature as should the background and issues involved: Henry's reliance on foreigners, his personal household government, the Sicilian adventure, the personal ambitions of such as de Montfort and Prince Edward, for example. The question does require a sense of the reign as a whole, albeit with the 1250s and 1260s prominent.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'How far ...' invites argument and counter-argument. There is debate, not least given quite substantial re-evaluations of Henry III as a king and of the character of the events of 1258–65. Henry III can be seen as a rather limited ruler, over-dependent upon a narrow clique of advisers and barons. Then again, he can be seen as altogether stronger, perhaps unlucky in his manner of facing opposition from a strident, ambitious baronial group. Some have seen the events, issues and ideas of 1258–65 as very significant in the arenas of developing crown-baronial relations and of the concept of a meaningful 'community of the realm'. Not all agree.

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.

**Section 6: 1272–1399****27 How successfully did Edward I rule England?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A narrative of the reign will need embedded explanation to respond to the question. A good level of analysis and evaluation is required here, with a persistent focus on success as against failure. The phrase ‘rule England’ means a priority and dominance of emphasis on internal, domestic areas. This was a reign of high energy, activism, personal involvement and some significant reforms. Some reference to the demands of war would be acceptable, especially as these affected Edward’s relationship with the political community, with parliament, with merchants and towns – the raising of revenues, for example. Linkage should be made to the 1297 crisis, its place and outcome in political-constitutional areas. Legislative and governmental activity before 1290, focused upon a range of statutes and enquiries (e.g. Westminster I and II, Mortmain, Acton Burnell, Rhuddlan, Winchester, *Quo Warranto*, *Quia Emptores*), should be considered; so, too, the last years of the reign and administrative-fiscal demands and strains then. It is possible that the political élite remained restless.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. ‘How successfully ...’ sets up debate, argument and counter-argument, consideration of the levels, nature and substance of successes across a range of activities and policies. A sense of the pattern of the reign, the importance of the 1297 crisis and the impact of major wars will be featured as the context to an examination of key policy areas, legal, administrative, fiscal (etc.). Edward I has a high reputation but it could be argued that early achievement were never maintained and that wars came to detract from a truly successful government 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.

**28 Why did it prove difficult for the English to assert themselves effectively in Scotland in the period 1286–1357?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A narrative of events is not required. Analysis and explanation are needed; a sense of reasons and context, with some balancing of English and Scottish factors. The dates chosen encompass the sudden death of Alexander III of Scotland in 1286 and the treaty of Berwick of 1357, ending what have been seen as the Scottish Wars of Independence. The issues of the Balliol family and English overlordship, the roles of Robert Bruce and William Wallace, factional politics between the Bruces and Balliols, internal attitudes to English overtures, internal civil war, cross-border raids, guerilla warfare, the place of treaties (e.g. 1328), the effects of the capture of David II, the genesis of the eventual treaty of 1357, all are likely areas for assessment; so, too, French involvement, distractions facing kings of England, are wider issues that can be considered. In reality, there were three phases: c. 1295–1304; 1306–28; 1332–57. Scottish resilience, loyalty to the dynasty, nobles' responses, may be set against English tactics, interventions, weaknesses or errors, distractions by domestic or French events.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'Why ...' sets up explanation and evaluation of a range of factors, with a likely sense of relative importance, though the connections of such factors should be shown. An exact balance of English and Scottish factors is not necessary; argument may favour the former or the latter. Key words include 'assert themselves effectively': in what ways? in what forms? Some may argue that English rulers made some important mistakes and were never able to create a powerful partisan group inside Scotland. Some may argue that the Scots were well capable of organised resistance, often using those English mistakes.

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.

**29 'Outstandingly successful to 1360; thereafter a king beset with problems.' To what extent do you agree with this verdict on the reign of Edward III?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A narrative of the reign will not answer the question unless there are attempts at explanation. Rather, persistent analysis and evaluation are required on this long reign. 1360 was the year of the treaty of Brétigny, arguably a high point and a turning point. An exact balance (1327–60, 1360–77) is not required but both parts of the question do need coverage, to establish the extent of contrast and difference. Wars will clearly be a feature here, but the political, financial, social and social aspects should be assessed. There are two levels of operation here, internal and external. The good answer will make the necessary links. Internally, reference may be made to areas such as the overthrow of Mortimer in 1330, the crisis of 1341 and its lessons, domestic harmony thereafter, the use of chivalry and forms of propaganda, support from the political élite and parliament for warfare, the crisis of 1376 and its outcome, the situation at Edward's death. Externally, reference can be expected to the campaigns against Scotland, the events of 1337–40, preparations for war in France and the successes (1346–58), the situation in 1360, the end of peace in 1369 and subsequent setbacks on land and at sea, contrasting with earlier successes. The significance of the 1360 treaty, the centrality of Edward's relationship with the political nation and the extent of concessions in pursuit of support for his wars may be features of assessment. And it could well be argued that Edward's physical and mental decline from the late 1360s was a major factor.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The formulation used here sets up argument and counter-argument. Candidates may agree or disagree, according to their interpretation of the evidence – though they are more likely to agree: Edward III has a good reputation, not least as a result of the military successes in France. But the fall-away after 1360 is important in evaluation, with a sense of drift and uncertainty. Some have seen the events of Richard II's reign as a commentary on the later years of Edward III's reign.

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.

### 30 How serious a threat to the established order was the Peasants' Revolt?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A description or narrative of the Revolt is not required. Analysis and evaluation of the nature of any threat and of its seriousness are needed here. Some consideration of the causes of the Revolt will be in order here, though much of the response should focus on the impact on contemporary thinking and estimates of the peasants' challenges. The 'established order' would be Crown, Church, political élite, manorial lords, urban oligarchs and property owners. Candidates will need to consider something of the background to and causes of the Revolt in 1381 and its key features, regional and local; the threats in the politically important and sensitive areas of the South-East and especially London; the demands made by the peasants; the evidence for an underlying ideology of protest and reform; leadership (lay, lesser clergy); scale of support; pressures on landlords and manors; levels of violence; the ability to break down peasant support and resistance; the ease or otherwise of the restoration of order.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'How serious ...' invites argument and counter-argument. There is debate over the nature, content and scope of the Revolt and so of how far it did challenge the established political and social order. Much will turn on the linkage of causes and outcomes, with the latter paramount. Some may argue that the Revolt was large in the contemporary imagination, yet less significant with hindsight. Some may argue that popular discontent, even in the important South-East, was containable. Others may feel that this represented something dangerous and potentially destabilising.

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.

### 31 How valid is the judgement that Richard II brought about his own downfall?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A narrative of the reign will not answer the question unless there is embedded explanation. Good analysis and evaluation are needed here, assessing the personality of the King, the context of the reign, key actions and events, a growing royal assertiveness-cum-absolutism, the reactive nature of aristocratic groups. The events and issues of 1386–88 and 1397–99 will feature strongly but there needs to be some attention to the early years of the reign and to the interlude of the early and mid-1390s. There are a good many factors to consider here: political-constitutional issues; the nature and style of kingship practised (growingly absolute?); the handling of the nobility and especially key families; patronage; the role of household government, centrally and locally; the make-up of the royal affinity; property and title rights; the choice and role of key advisers; the King as a war leader, foreign policy, the preference for peace, quite possibly the attention given to Ireland. Key themes will be Richard's views on kingship, the centrality of Crown-noble relations and an awareness of how long it was before Richard faced serious opposition and deposition (reluctance to face up to the King was a feature).

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'How valid ...' opens up debate, argument and counter-argument, over the reasons for Richard II's fall and deposition. It could be argued that his personal failings, failure to learn from mistakes, patronage, vindictiveness were paramount. Then again, it could be argued that there were wider, institutional-structural factors involved, in part centred on noble ambitions. It could be said that Richard inherited a bad situation from Edward III. Then again, it could be argued that he threw away a strong early position and residual support. His apparent passion for revenge, his wealth and power but alleged tyranny, are seen as important issues by many. There were parallels with Edward II's reign and the broader issues of what have been seen as the pendular swings between royal authoritarianism and baronial assertiveness, leading to overthrow.

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.

**Section 7: 1399–1461****32 To what extent did the domestic problems of Henry IV's reign arise out of the circumstances of his acquisition of the crown?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. The question highlights 'circumstances of Henry IV's acquisition of the crown' but in order to discuss the problems of the reign the whole period 1399–1413 will need to be addressed. Long chronological narratives should be avoided; the question is best considered by topics. These might include: reputation of Henry as a usurper; the circumstances of Richard II's death and remaining support for him, which gave the new King's enemies opportunities and excuses for opposition and open rebellion. However, the question asks 'to what extent' so structural and inherited problems will need to be put in the balance: finance; relations with France and Scotland; Lollardy; Wales and the Marches; rival claims to the throne; the development of the King's ill-health.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, it could be argued that Richard II was generally unpopular, his subjects were alienated because of the King's 'tyranny' and his ministers and close associates were disliked. Certainly there were high-handed actions including the confiscation of the Lancastrian inheritance. Furthermore, after an initial period of turbulence, there followed six or seven years of stability. Thus it could be argued that Henry's opponents acted out of self-interest. Whether Bolingbroke actually set out to seize the throne might be doubted. A properly evaluated answer might also make reference to Henry's ability to handle problems such as rebellion and Henry's initial policy of leniency. At the same time, of course, the English accounts of the period were written in Henry's reign.

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.

### 33 How are the military successes of Henry V best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – ‘military successes’ (although, where relevant, some domestic issues will need to be explained). Chronological narratives of the military campaigns should be avoided. A good balance should be struck between English strengths and French weaknesses. The incapacity of Charles VI and the connected rivalries between the nobility should be stressed. Henry’s success in the period 1417–19 owed a great deal to what amounted to a civil war in France between Armagnacs and Burgundians and he was able to occupy Normandy almost unopposed. Nevertheless, the King’s generalship, powers of military organisation and diplomacy need to be stressed as well as his ruthlessness in both tactics and strategy. Particular points can be made about Agincourt (good fortune, French errors, successful English tactics and Henry V’s leadership), although answers will need to go beyond just one battle. The role and importance of the longbow may be assessed. Success on the foreign battlefield depended importantly on domestic factors such as general stability, financial support of Parliament, the successful pacification of Wales and the crushing of the Southampton Plot.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. The formulation ‘best explained’ invites an attempt to put the relevant factors into some order of relative importance, although candidates should also recognise connections between the issues. Furthermore, differing emphases on the various explanations of Henry V’s success produce competing interpretations. For example, it could be argued that, despite Henry’s leadership and the undoubted professionalism of much of the English soldiery, success on this scale could not have been achieved without the divisions which wracked France.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**34 What was the significance of the rising of Owain Glyndwr?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – that is, an assessment of the ‘significance’ of the rising rather than a narrative of events. Nevertheless, a firm grasp of the chronology is required since the length of the rising aids an assessment of its significance – Owain’s declaration of himself as Prince of Wales in 1400 through to the fall of Aberystwyth and Harlech castles in 1409 and then to his disappearance in 1413. The fact that Owain ruled in Wales for a decade is in itself significant especially since in this time he called parliaments, negotiated with the papacy, made a treaty with France, gave himself the title of King and attempted reform of the Welsh Church. His daughter married Edmund, Earl of March, who had a rival claim to the English throne. The rising added to Henry IV’s problems – coinciding, for example, with a campaign in Scotland and the challenges of Percies and Scropes. For ten years Wales and the Marches were a battleground with important economic, social and political consequences. Owain acquired a mythical status because he was never caught and became linked to the Arthurian legend. The role of the future Henry V in the suppression of the rebellion is also significant.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing historical interpretations may be relevant. Although the achievements of Owain in his period of rule may seem impressive, kinglike and independent, their significance will need to be evaluated and an argument as to the permanence of his work would be helpful. A further opportunity for evaluation lies in the seriousness of the challenge to the newly established Lancastrian dynasty. Again, the question of how far the rising was a successful expression of Welsh nationalism (with possibly permanent significance) as against it being simply an extension of conflicts and issues in the Marches would make for relevant argument.

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.

**35 Why did the English position in France collapse in the reign of Henry VI?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – an explanation of the collapse of the English position in France. Again, the focus should be on the period 1422–1453, although reference will need to be made to Henry VI's legacy from his father. Narrative accounts of the period, even if concentrating upon events in France, is not the required approach. Among the explanations to be considered are: the ability and success of Charles VII in bringing about the resurgence and greater unity of France; a comparison between the resources available to the Kings of France and England; England's financial difficulties; the role of Joan of Arc; the impact of the Congress of Arras and the death of Bedford, both in the same year; mismanagement by Suffolk and the Beauforts; the unsuitability of Henry VI; his French marriage; quarrels among the English nobility.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, it could be argued that Henry V's legacy was more important to the collapse of the English empire in France than the events of his son's reign. Henry V's achievements were, perhaps, unsustainable. By making a partisan treaty (Troyes) Henry V committed his successor to an unwinnable war in France. This, taken with the extent of territories to be defended, meant that the collapse was simply a matter of time. On the other hand it could be argued that eventual defeat was not inevitable or that the English position in France could have been sustained longer. Henry V's achievements were maintained, and even extended after his death, but 1435 was the watershed, not 1422.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**36 How is the outbreak of civil strife in England in 1455 best explained?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – ‘outbreak’ with the First Battle of St. Albans, rather than continuation or development is intended. The more successful approach will be to deal with issues linked to and illustrated by events rather than a chronological narrative (although a chronological framework is permissible). Among the issues to be considered are: the aftermath of defeat in France and, in particular, its impact on the nobility; underlying social unrest as demonstrated by Cade’s rebellion; the ambitions of Richard, Duke of York, his claim to the throne and rivalry with Somerset; noble feuds, especially the Percies and Nevilles and their alignment with Lancaster and York respectively before the clash at St. Albans; the kingship of Henry VI, the view that the court was in the hands of a clique, the background of Suffolk’s supremacy, the influence of Margaret of Anjou, the King’s mental illness and breakdown.

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 relevant and relative factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. The formulation ‘best explained’ invites an attempt to put the relevant factors into some order of relative importance, although candidates should also recognise the connections between the issues. This question also presents good opportunities for the exploration and evaluation of differing interpretations. For example, how far can the outbreak of civil strife be regarded as a dynastic conflict, a contest for the throne between York and Lancaster? Alternatively, was it simply the escalation of private feuds? Was it the outcome of an inherently unstable society – the ‘Bastard Feudalism’ argument? Was it more the result of an undermighty King than an overmighty nobility? What was the balance between long-term and short-term factors?

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.

**Section 8: 1461–1547****37 Why did Edward IV lose the throne in 1470 yet regain it in 1471?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, especially a clear set of explanations and a balanced coverage of ‘lose’ and ‘regain’. Straight chronological narratives should be avoided but argument, analysis and explanation within a chronological framework would certainly be acceptable. In considering Edward’s loss of the throne the following issues might be considered: the breach between Edward and Warwick and the Earl’s ambitions; Warwick’s ability to exploit grievances surrounding the existence of a court clique and the narrowness of Edward’s support amongst the nobility; the defection and grievances of Clarence; the role of Louis XI in negotiating a settlement between Warwick and Margaret of Anjou; the existence of an alternative king in Henry VI (and the Prince Edward); the alienation of John Neville. Edward’s success in regaining the throne might be explained by reference to the following: support from Burgundy, strengthened by Warwick committing himself to Louis XI against Burgundy; Edward’s successful landing and initial ‘manifesto’; divisions within the Lancastrian and Neville alliance; the defection of Clarence; Edward’s victories at Barnet and Tewkesbury; the deaths of Warwick and Prince Edward and the capture of Henry VI.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. Candidates may, for example, look to compare and construct the same sort of issues across the two sets of events. For example: the importance of foreign involvement; the role of Edward himself, his inactivity in 1470 as against his energy and shrewdness in 1471; the Lancastrian/Neville alliance which made the Readeption possible but also undermined it; the changing allegiance of Clarence.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

### 38 How effective a king was Henry VII?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required and it has to be on ‘effectiveness’ rather than a straightforward account of Henry VII’s successes and failures. Some comparisons with Edward IV would be appropriate. Treatment by topics rather than chronology is much more likely to meet the requirements of the question and the emphasis should be on the exercise of personal monarchy. Among the issues to be considered are: the balance between a traditional approach and innovation; his treatment of and relationship with the nobility, grants of land, attainders and reversals, bonds and recognisances, cautious policy towards new creations and giving power in the provinces to a few great men; stress on the dignity of the Crown; the extent of personal supervision of the machinery of government and finances; personal conduct of relations with foreign rulers, its skilful and cautious nature; the avoidance of war; dynastic policies and marriages; the effective suppression of rebellion.

AO2 – to 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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, candidates may consider the extent to which the methods, style and achievements of Henry VII were foreshadowed in the reign of Edward IV. What did Henry VII inherit? How much depended upon good fortune? For example the death of Northumberland and the minority of Buckingham. Henry had no close relatives (like Clarence or Gloucester) who might have challenged him. Candidates might discuss the extent to which Henry VII’s policies resulted in greater stability and a more quiescent nobility. For example, how do we account for the policies of reconciliation and the winning of popularity in the early years of Henry VIII?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**39 (Candidates offering Paper 5c: The Reign of Henry VIII should not answer this question).****'The King's servant.' How convincing is this view of Wolsey's position as chief minister?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – primarily, a discussion of Wolsey's relationship with the King and the extent of his authority and room for independent initiatives in policy rather than a descriptive account of the Cardinal's policies, successes and failures. For example, candidates may be expected to deal with the extent to which Wolsey followed the policies the King wanted; the significance of Wolsey's personal enrichment, his influence abroad and his success in excluding the influence of other advisers; his role in presiding over the Council. As to specific policies, the following should be explored: the main direction of foreign policy including war and the pursuit of the King's international prestige and dynastic concerns; the Divorce; the provision of finance to further the King's ambitions and glory; policies designed to establish and maintain internal order. Wolsey's dominance over domestic affairs was never seriously called into question and he was not really challenged by court faction until the late 1520s.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, candidates might explore the interpretation based upon the differing personalities and abilities such as the Cardinal's penchant for detail and the King's apparent neglect of it. What were the motives behind foreign policy: either to support the Papacy and, possibly, Wolsey's candidature for it or to pursue the King's glory? Wolsey did have great influence but why and when did it change? Was this entirely because of the failure of the Divorce process or was Wolsey earlier being used as a scapegoat for the failure of the Amicable Grant? In the end, of course, the King both made and broke Wolsey.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**40 How far, and in what ways, was the power and prestige of the Scottish monarchy extended by James IV and James V?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required: ‘how far’ requires assessment and ‘in what ways’ needs explanation. The chronological focus should be on the period from the accession of James IV (1488) to the death of James V (1542) but some reference should be made to their inheritance and their legacy. Certain broad themes should be addressed including internal order, primacy over other power bases in the Kingdom, the prestige of the court and relations with other kingdoms, especially England and France. James IV (1488–1513) had qualities of energy and piety; earned respect abroad; concluded a marriage alliance with England (Margaret Tudor); maintained a brilliant Renaissance court, patronised the arts and instituted an ambitious building programme; extended royal control over the Church. James V was aged two on accession and his independent rule began in 1528; he extended his father’s control over the Church; restored the finances; concluded prestigious marriages to Madeleine of France and Mary of Guise; robust policy towards the nobility; a glittering court.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations may enhance responses. Here, candidates might explore a series of counter arguments to the generally favourable verdict on the achievements of James IV and James V. Both Kings died prematurely (James IV at Flodden in 1513 and James V immediately after, and perhaps because of, Solway Moss in 1542).

How far did their influence depend upon relations with France and England? How well did James V handle the nobility? Were the Kings too committed to an alliance with France? How secure was the frontier with England? How far did James V’s achievements survive him?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show both a sense 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.

**41 (Candidates offering Paper 5c: *The Reign of Henry VIII should not answer this question*).**

**Who was chiefly responsible for the religious changes in England in the period 1529–47, the King or his ministers?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – ‘chiefly responsible’ and ‘religious changes’. A narrative, chronological account of the changes in the period 1529–47 would meet the demands of the question only to a limited extent. The coverage of ‘ecclesiastical’ and organisational changes is to be expected in addition to the purely ‘religious’ or doctrinal changes. There should be a clear idea of the implications of ‘chiefly responsible’ in the sense of initiating policy, gaining the King’s support for it and carrying it out. Candidates will concentrate largely upon Cromwell and Cranmer but reference may be made to other ministers/councillors such as Gardiner. A major issue is, of course, the King’s own preferences and, to the end, whilst keeping the Supremacy, he observed the Catholic Mass. How far did the King permit some Protestant advances for reasons of international diplomacy or to safeguard his son’s accession? Candidates may be expected to explore the following: the Breach with Rome, legislation connected with it, jurisdictional and financial policies, the Supremacy; the Visitation and Dissolution of the Monasteries; the Ten Articles, the Bishops’ Book, Cromwell’s injunctions, the English Bible; the attack on traditional practices, the appointment of Protestant bishops; the Six Articles, later restrictions on reading the Bible, the burning of heretics.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing historical interpretations may enhance responses, as will the ability to engage with controversy. For example, candidates may look to the possible influence of others such as Anne Boleyn and Catherine Parr and of Parliament. They may draw attention to the swings of the pendulum in the direction of policy and suggest how far this was a response to the influence of ministers or the exigencies of foreign and domestic policy. Was there a change in direction and tempo with the rise of Cromwell? How important was the personality of Henry VIII? Was he able to be influenced? How far can the Six Articles be considered to be his preference and his final position? How far were changes in religious policy connected with the politics of the Court and the King’s manipulative nature?

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.

## Section 9: Themes c. 1066–1547

## 42 'The relationship between peasants and their lords between c. 1066 and c. 1300 can best be described as conflict-ridden.' How accurate is this view?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Some flexibility in dealing with the chronology can be allowed but should, broadly, be adhered to. Entirely descriptive approaches will not work well but explanation of relationships is necessary as a preparation for argument. The social structure of the period implies social conflict and there is evidence that servitude was resented. Domesday Book identifies a group of free peasants (freemen and sokemen) which made up some 15% of the peasantry. The rest were in varying degrees unfree. Domesday Book records 10% of the rural population as 'servi' but not all were slaves as such; many were domestic servants. There certainly were slaves (as there had been in Anglo-Saxon England) and a slave trade (although this had been prohibited by the Church at the Council of Westminster in 1102). By 1120 or so slavery seems to have been diminishing. There was manumission but the apparent decline may be explained by a change in nomenclature ('famulus' or household servant). It might be argued that the potential for social conflict between peasants and lords increased in the twelfth century as the Common Law drew sharper lines between the concepts of 'free' and 'unfree'. The majority of peasants remained unfree. There is some evidence to demonstrate that the most irksome aspects of 'unfreedom' were resented and, indeed, resisted. Court records have examples of peasants being treated harshly. A fundamental liberty that was denied was the freedom to leave the manor. Runaway peasants were tracked down by their lords and the authorities. Peasants could be bought and sold; labour services were required, the right to bear arms was confined to free men. Candidates might well argue that the condition of 'unfreedom' led to antagonism and social conflict. Nevertheless, in this period lower class risings were virtually unknown and there was certainly no large scale rebellion.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here, candidates may be expected to explore and evaluate the evidence, its nature and relative paucity. The problems of clear definitions of groups within the peasantry may also be raised. There are good opportunities, too, for reinforcing the counter-intuitive argument. Some useful contrasts could be made with the more obviously troubled social scene in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

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.

### 43 How significant a contribution did the Cistercians make to the Church and society in twelfth-century Britain?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – on the Cistercians (not monastic orders in general) and on the twelfth century (although some flexibility can be allowed). Some account of the Cistercian achievement will be necessary but it has to be accompanied by explanation, analysis and assessment of significance. A fair balance between the contribution to ‘the Church’ and to ‘society’ should be expected. Candidates may draw attention to the scale of the Cistercian achievement and the speed with which it was established. Waverley was founded in 1128, Tintern in 1131 and Rievaulx in 1132. Over a period of twenty years an average of two houses a year were founded with seven new foundations in 1147. Foundations were not on the same scale in Wales and Scotland as in England but important houses were founded in both countries. As far as the Church was concerned, the Cistercians represented reform based on the perfection, purity and austerity of the religious life. This engaged the enthusiasm of both patrons and postulants. Some Cistercians had already been members of other monastic orders. The Cistercians offered a new kind of organisational structure which linked back to Citeaux itself (mother and daughter houses) with an annual Chapter-General for all abbots. Such a structure facilitated the spread of ideas such as the writings of Bernard of Clairvaux and Ailred of Rievaulx. All abbeys were dedicated to the Virgin Mary, which gave added impetus to her cult. In terms of their contribution to society, the Cistercians created a labour force of their own in the form of lay brothers. Figures may have been exaggerated but Rievaulx under Ailred was said to number 400 monks and 500 lay brothers. More accurately, perhaps, but still impressive was Waverley which in 1187 numbered 70 monks and 120 lay brothers. In terms of their economic contribution to society, candidates should explain the importance of the Cistercians’ exploitation of marsh, forest and heathland, their fostering of agriculture and sheep farming and the impetus this gave to colonisation of previously uncultivated areas in a period of rising population. Their contribution to England’s expanding wool trade was especially important. In 1193 the English Cistercians’ contribution to the ransom of Richard I was a year’s worth of wool. Some mention might also be made of the Cistercians’ use of mills and the development of technology associated with them including forges and ironwork.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. An especially sharp appreciation of significance should be expected and in judging what was special about the Cistercian contribution some comparisons with other orders would be helpful.

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.

**44 To what extent did the economic and social status of women change between c. 1100 and c. 1500?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is upon the ‘economic and social’ status of women and the extent of change over the period identified (here some degree of flexibility with the chronology may be allowed). The question is not really about ‘political power’ so an account of the influence of queens and noblewomen from, say, the Empress Matilda, through Eleanor of Aquitaine to Isabella of Valois and Margaret of Anjou will not really hit the mark. However, the cultural, literary and religious influence of noblewomen and queens would be relevant. There are some common features concerning the status of women across the whole period, although the position was not static. Society was patriarchal and relative independence was very much a matter of single status (widow or heiress, in particular). The prevailing cultural attitude regarded women as emotionally and intellectual inferiors: certainly in theory, they could not hold public office or belong to guilds, for example; in a very real sense women were the chattels of fathers, husbands and brothers; once married, heiresses lost control over their property; unless destined for the religious life women were expected to marry; feudal lords had the right to control the marriages of their tenants’ daughters (especially if they were heiresses) as did lords of the manor of marriages of unfree peasant women; higher standards of sexual conduct were expected of women than of men. At the same time, women did exert economic and social influence: within families and households, although it was a very individual matter, there is evidence for considerable influence on the part of mothers, wives and daughters; women could be influential in the Church as abbesses and as mystics such as Margery Kempe and Julian of Norwich (although this may have been a more important phenomenon in the later part of the period); there were numerous women saints and the cult of the Virgin Mary became increasingly powerful as the period went on; widows had extensive rights and dowagers ran estates, women ran businesses and workshops (the brewing industry, for example, was dominated by women) and there are examples of women being members of craft guilds; there is evidence for peasant women owning land and appearing in courts and they certainly worked in the fields. The argument really lies in the extent to which this general picture changed over the period in question. A number of factors may have caused accelerated change. The laws of marriage came to be more closely defined in the twelfth century and placed sharper emphasis on the consent of the parties. The flowering of chivalry in the late-thirteenth and fourteenth centuries gave women an important part in chivalric culture. Perhaps, most important of all, the demographic disaster of the Black Death made it necessary for women to play a bigger role in land management, commerce and trade. In certain circumstances too, women took on a greater role in the religious life of society even to the extent of administering the sacraments. How much of a watershed was this phenomenon?

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Answers should be aware of the element of continuity as well as change. There should be an appreciation of the problems of evidence and that some issues are difficult to define and quantify, for example, the matter of ‘influence’ within the family. Again, candidates should be aware of the variety in the nature of status according to social rank.

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.

**45 'The severity of the impact of the Black Death has been over-stated.' How accurate is this view?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is upon the impact of the Black Death rather than its causes or a narrative account of its course. The initial impact of the Black Death in 1348–9 certainly caused unprecedented levels of mortality and it could be regarded, with some justice, as a demographic catastrophe. The contemporary chronicler, Henry Knighton, gave a sweepingly gloomy verdict – prices fell, wages rose, crops rotted in the fields, religious services went unsaid, lords abandoned labour services, town houses were left vacant, villages were abandoned. The impact upon mortality rates was, so the evidence shows, uneven. Some areas escaped largely unscathed. In some towns it may have been as high as 50%. The clergy seem to have suffered particularly badly. The mortality rate in York was 40% and in the diocese of Lincoln 45%. Some parish churches were abandoned and it was not easy to appoint to benefices. In some religious houses mortality rates were very high, in others, perhaps because of isolation, they were unaffected. A number of distinguished intellectuals succumbed – William of Ockham, Thomas Bradwardine, John Dumbleton and Thomas Buckingham. The epidemic hit different ranks of society unevenly; the higher aristocracy, for example, was not as hard hit as the general population and only one member of the royal family died. Across Britain as a whole probably between 40% and 50% of the population died. The government continued to function – Exchequer, Chancery and the law courts. Labour was scarce and wages rose. The government responded by legislation such as the Ordinance of Labourers, 1349 and the Statute of Labourers, 1351. The reality of the impact of the epidemic, although disastrous in many ways, was rather less dramatic than portrayed by Knighton. Society proved to be very resilient. The proportion of direct female heirs rose. Peasant holdings did become vacant, but on many estates lords had no difficulties in finding tenants. The number of villages entirely abandoned was small. The vacancies in ecclesiastical benefices were dealt with in part by reducing the age of presentation.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. A shrewdly balanced approach is necessary here. Candidates may point out that the evidence is patchy, complex and often unreliable. There is no global picture such as that offered by, say, Domesday Book. The evidence of poll tax returns for 1377, 1379 and 1381 is open to challenge. Historians have come to different conclusions as to the size of population in the early fourteenth century and estimates vary between 7 and 3.4 million. The demographic consequences of the famine years of the early part of the century, particularly 1315–16, need to be set alongside those of the Black Death. Again, and to put the Black Death into perspective, the effects on the mortality rate of the severe droughts of the 1350s need to be assessed. As a further perspective, candidates may draw attention to the effects of the periodic reoccurrence of epidemic for the rest of the fourteenth century and into the fifteenth. How far did the Black Death simply accelerate or confirm developments already in train such as the commutation of labour services? Perhaps the true impact of the Black Death was long-term; the reoccurrence of epidemic kept the population in check until the latter part of the fifteenth century. A rise in population led to a new set of economic and social problems in the sixteenth century.

AO3 [not applicable to Outline]

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.

#### 46 How popular was the English Church in the fifteenth century?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, especially a clear set of explanations. The chronology of ‘fifteenth century’ can certainly be stretched and candidates may wish to terminate their answers in c. 1529. Narratives are unlikely but description should always be accompanied by analysis, argument and assessment. There are, perhaps, two main themes: the popularity of the Church as a vocation or career (which is linked to the liveliness of the institution); and the popularity of the Church as an institution, its doctrines, practices and clergy (secular and regular) with the laity. The Church offered a career open to talent regardless of origin and William of Wykeham and Wolsey provide good examples. Again many residentiary canons were from humble backgrounds. There was an increase of graduates amongst canons and parish clergy. The regular clergy were probably no longer the force they had been but they enjoyed a fair measure of popular support and recruitment held up. Candidates may also be expected to explore: the relationship between laity and clergy at parish level; popular piety as expressed through, say, pilgrimages and religious guilds; the willingness of the laity to attend churches, maintain their fabric and provide financial support; the foundation of chantries; bequests by wills. The other side of the coin, of course, is that Lollardy had an appeal both in its doctrinal aspects and the case it made against the corruption and wealth of the Church. There is also evidence of anti-clericalism over such matters as tithe, mortuary fees and Church courts.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source materials and differing historical interpretations may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. There is a real debate about the nature and extent of the popularity/unpopularity of the clergy. There are some difficulties with the evidence for anti-clericalism and contemporary sources such as Chaucer and Langland should be evaluated with care. The extent of support and influence of Lollardy as the fifteenth century went on would be a further matter for debate.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**47 'A land of great economic prosperity.' Discuss this view of England in the fifteenth century.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required in terms of assessing 'economic prosperity' and chronology. Answers may be expected to address the following set of issues. Demographic changes, the levelling out of the effects of plague and results; static prices and rising wages. How favourable were these to peasant farmers and labourers? Other issues to be addressed are: the decline in the wool trade but an expansion of the cloth trade and industry; growth in other industries such as building, salt production and tin mining; evidence of an increase in English merchant shipping; the rising wealth of London and of some provincial towns; the rise of substantial tenant farmers. Commutation of labour services became universal. Consolidation of holdings by landlords and peasants and enclosure.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. One obvious debate to explore is the idea of the 'golden age of the English labourer' (using evidence of long leases, low and fixed rents, rising wages and stable prices). How beneficial was enclosure and sheep farming (evidence of depopulation, Enclosure Act of 1488–9)? How did the growth of London affect provincial towns? There is mixed evidence about the prosperity of provincial towns and generalising is difficult. What were the 'pros' and 'cons' of the growth of oligarchies of great merchants?

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/01B**

Paper 1b British History Outlines 1399–1815

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN PAPER

**2 hours 15 minutes**

---

**READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST**

Answer **three** questions which must be chosen from **at least two** sections of the paper.  
All questions in this paper carry equal marks.

You are reminded of the need for analysis and critical evaluation in your answers to questions. You should also show, where appropriate, an awareness of links and comparisons between different countries and different periods.

---

This document consists of **4** printed pages.



**Section 1: 1399–1461**

- 1 To what extent did the domestic problems of Henry IV's reign arise out of the circumstances of his acquisition of the crown?
- 2 How are the military successes of Henry V best explained?
- 3 What was the significance of the rising of Owain Glyndwr?
- 4 Why did the English position in France collapse in the reign of Henry VI?
- 5 How is the outbreak of civil strife in England in 1455 best explained?

**Section 2: 1461–1547**

- 6 Why did Edward IV lose the throne in 1470, yet regain it in 1471?
- 7 How effective a king was Henry VII?
- 8 ***(Candidates offering Paper 5c: The Reign of Henry VIII should not answer this question.)***  
 'The King's servant.' How convincing is this view of Wolsey's position as chief minister?
- 9 How far, and in what ways, was the power and prestige of the Scottish monarchy extended by James IV and James V?
- 10 ***(Candidates offering Paper 5c: The Reign of Henry VIII should not answer this question.)***  
 Who was chiefly responsible for the religious changes in England in the period 1529–47, the King or his ministers?

**Section 3: 1547–1603**

- 11 How well judged were the domestic and foreign policies of Mary I and her government?
- 12 Who opposed Elizabeth I's religious policies and why?
- 13 How serious a threat did Mary Stuart pose to Elizabeth I and the stability of England?
- 14 'Largely unsuccessful until 1588, wholly ineffective thereafter.' How accurate is this view of Elizabethan foreign policy?
- 15 How successful was Tudor policy towards Ireland in the period 1547–1603?

**Section 4: Themes c. 1399–c. 1603**

- 16 How popular was the English Church in the fifteenth century?
- 17 'A land of great economic prosperity.' Discuss this view of England in the fifteenth century.
- 18 Assess the importance of the role of women in society in either the fifteenth or the sixteenth century.
- 19 How important were the effects of population growth on economic and social developments in Tudor England?
- 20 In what respects were art and architecture in sixteenth-century Britain influenced by the continental Renaissance?
- 21 How seriously was the Tudor monarchy threatened by rebellion?

**Section 5: 1603–1689**

- 22 'Idle, extravagant and politically naïve.' How accurate is this verdict on James I?
- 23 *(Candidates offering 5e: The reign of Charles I should not answer this question.)*  
'A time of peace and prosperity.' Discuss this view of the personal rule of Charles I, 1629–1640.
- 24 How valid is the concept of the 'British Civil Wars' with reference to the period 1639–51?
- 25 How consistent were the actions and policies of Oliver Cromwell in the period 1647–1658?
- 26 Why did the attempt to alter the succession fail during the Exclusion Crisis, yet succeed at the Glorious Revolution?

**Section 6: 1689–1760**

- 27 To what extent, and why, was there a redefinition of the powers of the Crown in the period 1689–1714?
- 28 Account for the emergence of Britain as a great power in the period 1689–1714.
- 29 How seriously did the Jacobite rebellions of 1715 and 1745 threaten the Hanoverian regime?
- 30 'Walpole's long tenure of office depended entirely upon his control of Parliament.' How accurate is this view?
- 31 'A personal triumph for the elder Pitt.' How valid is this judgement on the conduct and outcome of the Seven Years War?

**Section 7: 1760–1815**

- 32 How successful was George III in his attempts to assert the powers of the Crown in the period 1760–84?
- 33 To what extent does the popularity of the campaigns of John Wilkes and Christopher Wyvill suggest that the British political system was ‘fundamentally corrupt’ in the period 1760–1783?
- 34 Why did Britain lose the American War of Independence?
- 35 ‘The most constructive period of Pitt the Younger’s premiership was over by 1789.’ Discuss.
- 36 Why was Britain able to sustain such a long and ultimately successful conflict against France in the period 1793–1815?

**Section 8: Themes c. 1603–1815**

- 37 Assess the importance of the role played by the gentry in the political, economic and social life of England in the eighteenth century.
- 38 How is the growth of Protestant dissent in the seventeenth century best explained?
- 39 Why did interest in scientific enquiry flourish in later seventeenth-century Britain?
- 40 How appropriate is the term ‘revolution’ in describing the changes in British agriculture in the eighteenth century?
- 41 Why did the population of Britain grow so rapidly in the course of the eighteenth century?
- 42 Assess the role of women in eighteenth-century society.

---

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

University of Cambridge International Examinations is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/01B**

Paper 1b British History Outlines 1399–1815

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

**2 hours 15 minutes**

---

**MAXIMUM MARK: 90**

---

This document consists of **43** printed pages and **1** blank page.



**Section 1: 1399–1461****1 To what extent did the domestic problems of Henry IV's reign arise out of the circumstances of his acquisition of the crown?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. The question highlights 'circumstances of Henry IV's acquisition of the crown' but in order to discuss the problems of the reign the whole period 1399–1413 will need to be addressed. Long chronological narratives should be avoided; the question is best considered by topics. These might include: reputation of Henry as a usurper; the circumstances of Richard II's death and remaining support for him, which gave the new King's enemies opportunities and excuses for opposition and open rebellion. However, the question asks 'to what extent' so structural and inherited problems will need to be put in the balance: finance; relations with France and Scotland; Lollardy; Wales and the Marches; rival claims to the throne; the development of the King's ill-health.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, it could be argued that Richard II was generally unpopular, his subjects were alienated because of the King's 'tyranny' and his ministers and close associates were disliked. Certainly there were high-handed actions including the confiscation of the Lancastrian inheritance. Furthermore, after an initial period of turbulence, there followed six or seven years of stability. Thus it could be argued that Henry's opponents acted out of self-interest. Whether Bolingbroke actually set out to seize the throne might be doubted. A properly evaluated answer might also make reference to Henry's ability to handle problems such as rebellion and Henry's initial policy of leniency. At the same time, of course, the English accounts of the period were written in Henry's reign.

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.

## 2 How are the military successes of Henry V best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – ‘military successes’ (although, where relevant, some domestic issues will need to be explained). Chronological narratives of the military campaigns should be avoided. A good balance should be struck between English strengths and French weaknesses. The incapacity of Charles VI and the connected rivalries between the nobility should be stressed. Henry’s success in the period 1417–19 owed a great deal to what amounted to a civil war in France between Armagnacs and Burgundians and he was able to occupy Normandy almost unopposed. Nevertheless, the King’s generalship, powers of military organisation and diplomacy need to be stressed as well as his ruthlessness in both tactics and strategy. Particular points can be made about Agincourt (good fortune, French errors, successful English tactics and Henry V’s leadership), although answers will need to go beyond just one battle. The role and importance of the longbow may be assessed. Success on the foreign battlefield depended importantly on domestic factors such as general stability, financial support of Parliament, the successful pacification of Wales and the crushing of the Southampton Plot.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. The formulation ‘best explained’ invites an attempt to put the relevant factors into some order of relative importance, although candidates should also recognise connections between the issues. Furthermore, differing emphases on the various explanations of Henry V’s success produce competing interpretations. For example, it could be argued that, despite Henry’s leadership and the undoubted professionalism of much of the English soldiery, success on this scale could not have been achieved without the divisions which wracked France.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

### 3 What was the significance of the rising of Owain Glyndwr?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – that is, an assessment of the ‘significance’ of the rising rather than a narrative of events. Nevertheless, a firm grasp of the chronology is required since the length of the rising aids an assessment of its significance – Owain’s declaration of himself as Prince of Wales in 1400 through to the fall of Aberystwyth and Harlech castles in 1409 and then to his disappearance in 1413. The fact that Owain ruled in Wales for a decade is in itself significant especially since in this time he called parliaments, negotiated with the papacy, made a treaty with France, gave himself the title of King and attempted reform of the Welsh Church. His daughter married Edmund, Earl of March, who had a rival claim to the English throne. The rising added to Henry IV’s problems – coinciding, for example, with a campaign in Scotland and the challenges of Percies and Scropes. For ten years Wales and the Marches were a battleground with important economic, social and political consequences. Owain acquired a mythical status because he was never caught and became linked to the Arthurian legend. The role of the future Henry V in the suppression of the rebellion is also significant.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may be relevant. Although the achievements of Owain in his period of rule may seem impressive, kinglike and independent, their significance will need to be evaluated and an argument as to the permanence of his work would be helpful. A further opportunity for evaluation lies in the seriousness of the challenge to the newly established Lancastrian dynasty. Again, the question of how far the rising was a successful expression of Welsh nationalism (with possibly permanent significance) as against it being simply an extension of conflicts and issues in the Marches would make for relevant argument.

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.

#### 4 Why did the English position in France collapse in the reign of Henry VI?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – an explanation of the collapse of the English position in France. Again, the focus should be on the period 1422–1453, although reference will need to be made to Henry VI's legacy from his father. Narrative accounts of the period, even if concentrating upon events in France, is not the required approach. Among the explanations to be considered are: the ability and success of Charles VII in bringing about the resurgence and greater unity of France; a comparison between the resources available to the Kings of France and England; England's financial difficulties; the role of Joan of Arc; the impact of the Congress of Arras and the death of Bedford, both in the same year; mismanagement by Suffolk and the Beauforts; the unsuitability of Henry VI; his French marriage; quarrels among the English nobility.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, it could be argued that Henry V's legacy was more important to the collapse of the English empire in France than the events of his son's reign. Henry V's achievements were, perhaps, unsustainable. By making a partisan treaty (Troyes) Henry V committed his successor to an unwinnable war in France. This, taken with the extent of territories to be defended, meant that the collapse was simply a matter of time. On the other hand it could be argued that eventual defeat was not inevitable or that the English position in France could have been sustained longer. Henry V's achievements were maintained, and even extended after his death, but 1435 was the watershed, not 1422.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

## 5 How is the outbreak of civil strife in England in 1455 best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – ‘outbreak’ with the First Battle of St. Albans, rather than continuation or development is intended. The more successful approach will be to deal with issues linked to and illustrated by events rather than a chronological narrative (although a chronological framework is permissible). Among the issues to be considered are: the aftermath of defeat in France and, in particular, its impact on the nobility; underlying social unrest as demonstrated by Cade’s rebellion; the ambitions of Richard, Duke of York, his claim to the throne and rivalry with Somerset; noble feuds, especially the Percies and Nevilles and their alignment with Lancaster and York respectively before the clash at St. Albans; the kingship of Henry VI, the view that the court was in the hands of a clique, the background of Suffolk’s supremacy, the influence of Margaret of Anjou, the King’s mental illness and breakdown.

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 relevant and relative factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. The formulation ‘best explained’ invites an attempt to put the relevant factors into some order of relative importance, although candidates should also recognise the connections between the issues. This question also presents good opportunities for the exploration and evaluation of differing interpretations. For example, how far can the outbreak of civil strife be regarded as a dynastic conflict, a contest for the throne between York and Lancaster? Alternatively, was it simply the escalation of private feuds? Was it the outcome of an inherently unstable society – the ‘Bastard Feudalism’ argument? Was it more the result of an undermighty King than an overmighty nobility? What was the balance between long-term and short-term factors?

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.

**Section 2: 1461–1547****6 Why did Edward IV lose the throne in 1470 yet regain it in 1471?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, especially a clear set of explanations and a balanced coverage of ‘lose’ and ‘regain’. Straight chronological narratives should be avoided but argument, analysis and explanation within a chronological framework would certainly be acceptable. In considering Edward’s loss of the throne the following issues might be considered: the breach between Edward and Warwick and the Earl’s ambitions; Warwick’s ability to exploit grievances surrounding the existence of a court clique and the narrowness of Edward’s support amongst the nobility; the defection and grievances of Clarence; the role of Louis XI in negotiating a settlement between Warwick and Margaret of Anjou; the existence of an alternative king in Henry VI (and the Prince Edward); the alienation of John Neville. Edward’s success in regaining the throne might be explained by reference to the following: support from Burgundy, strengthened by Warwick committing himself to Louis XI against Burgundy; Edward’s successful landing and initial ‘manifesto’; divisions within the Lancastrian and Neville alliance; the defection of Clarence; Edward’s victories at Barnet and Tewkesbury; the deaths of Warwick and Prince Edward and the capture of Henry VI.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. Candidates may, for example, look to compare and construct the same sort of issues across the two sets of events. For example: the importance of foreign involvement; the role of Edward himself, his inactivity in 1470 as against his energy and shrewdness in 1471; the Lancastrian/Neville alliance which made the Readeption possible but also undermined it; the changing allegiance of Clarence.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

## 7 How effective a king was Henry VII?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required and it has to be on ‘effectiveness’ rather than a straightforward account of Henry VII’s successes and failures. Some comparisons with Edward IV would be appropriate. Treatment by topics rather than chronology is much more likely to meet the requirements of the question and the emphasis should be on the exercise of personal monarchy. Among the issues to be considered are: the balance between a traditional approach and innovation; his treatment of and relationship with the nobility, grants of land, attainders and reversals, bonds and recognisances, cautious policy towards new creations and giving power in the provinces to a few great men; stress on the dignity of the Crown; the extent of personal supervision of the machinery of government and finances; personal conduct of relations with foreign rulers, its skilful and cautious nature; the avoidance of war; dynastic policies and marriages; the effective suppression of rebellion.

AO2 – to 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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, candidates may consider the extent to which the methods, style and achievements of Henry VII were foreshadowed in the reign of Edward IV. What did Henry VII inherit? How much depended upon good fortune? For example the death of Northumberland and the minority of Buckingham. Henry had no close relatives (like Clarence or Gloucester) who might have challenged him. Candidates might discuss the extent to which Henry VII’s policies resulted in greater stability and a more quiescent nobility. For example, how do we account for the policies of reconciliation and the winning of popularity in the early years of Henry VIII?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**8 (Candidates offering Paper 5c: The Reign of Henry VIII should not answer this question).**

**'The King's servant.' How convincing is this view of Wolsey's position as chief minister?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – primarily, a discussion of Wolsey's relationship with the King and the extent of his authority and room for independent initiatives in policy rather than a descriptive account of the Cardinal's policies, successes and failures. For example, candidates may be expected to deal with the extent to which Wolsey followed the policies the King wanted; the significance of Wolsey's personal enrichment, his influence abroad and his success in excluding the influence of other advisers; his role in presiding over the Council. As to specific policies, the following should be explored: the main direction of foreign policy including war and the pursuit of the King's international prestige and dynastic concerns; the Divorce; the provision of finance to further the King's ambitions and glory; policies designed to establish and maintain internal order. Wolsey's dominance over domestic affairs was never seriously called into question and he was not really challenged by court faction until the late 1520s.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, candidates might explore the interpretation based upon the differing personalities and abilities such as the Cardinal's penchant for detail and the King's apparent neglect of it. What were the motives behind foreign policy: either to support the Papacy and, possibly, Wolsey's candidature for it or to pursue the King's glory? Wolsey did have great influence but why and when did it change? Was this entirely because of the failure of the Divorce process or was Wolsey earlier being used as a scapegoat for the failure of the Amicable Grant? In the end, of course, the King both made and broke Wolsey.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**9 How far, and in what ways, was the power and prestige of the Scottish monarchy extended by James IV and James V?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required: ‘how far’ requires assessment and ‘in what ways’ needs explanation. The chronological focus should be on the period from the accession of James IV (1488) to the death of James V (1542) but some reference should be made to their inheritance and their legacy. Certain broad themes should be addressed including internal order, primacy over other power bases in the Kingdom, the prestige of the court and relations with other kingdoms, especially England and France. James IV (1488–1513) had qualities of energy and piety; earned respect abroad; concluded a marriage alliance with England (Margaret Tudor); maintained a brilliant Renaissance court, patronised the arts and instituted an ambitious building programme; extended royal control over the Church. James V was aged two on accession and his independent rule began in 1528; he extended his father’s control over the Church; restored the finances; concluded prestigious marriages to Madeleine of France and Mary of Guise; robust policy towards the nobility; a glittering court.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations may enhance responses. Here, candidates might explore a series of counter arguments to the generally favourable verdict on the achievements of James IV and James V. Both Kings died prematurely (James IV at Flodden in 1513 and James V immediately after, and perhaps because of, Solway Moss in 1542).

How far did their influence depend upon relations with France and England? How well did James V handle the nobility? Were the Kings too committed to an alliance with France? How secure was the frontier with England? How far did James V’s achievements survive him?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show both a sense 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.

**10 (Candidates offering Paper 5c: *The Reign of Henry VIII should not answer this question*).**

**Who was chiefly responsible for the religious changes in England in the period 1529–47, the King or his ministers?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – ‘chiefly responsible’ and ‘religious changes’. A narrative, chronological account of the changes in the period 1529–47 would meet the demands of the question only to a limited extent. The coverage of ‘ecclesiastical’ and organisational changes is to be expected in addition to the purely ‘religious’ or doctrinal changes. There should be a clear idea of the implications of ‘chiefly responsible’ in the sense of initiating policy, gaining the King’s support for it and carrying it out. Candidates will concentrate largely upon Cromwell and Cranmer but reference may be made to other ministers/councillors such as Gardiner. A major issue is, of course, the King’s own preferences and, to the end, whilst keeping the Supremacy, he observed the Catholic Mass. How far did the King permit some Protestant advances for reasons of international diplomacy or to safeguard his son’s accession? Candidates may be expected to explore the following: the Breach with Rome, legislation connected with it, jurisdictional and financial policies, the Supremacy; the Visitation and Dissolution of the Monasteries; the Ten Articles, the Bishops’ Book, Cromwell’s injunctions, the English Bible; the attack on traditional practices, the appointment of Protestant bishops; the Six Articles, later restrictions on reading the Bible, the burning of heretics.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing historical interpretations may enhance responses, as will the ability to engage with controversy. For example, candidates may look to the possible influence of others such as Anne Boleyn and Catherine Parr and of Parliament. They may draw attention to the swings of the pendulum in the direction of policy and suggest how far this was a response to the influence of ministers or the exigencies of foreign and domestic policy. Was there a change in direction and tempo with the rise of Cromwell? How important was the personality of Henry VIII? Was he able to be influenced? How far can the Six Articles be considered to be his preference and his final position? How far were changes in religious policy connected with the politics of the Court and the King’s manipulative nature?

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.

**Section 3: 1547–1603****11 How well judged were the domestic and foreign policies of Mary I and her government?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, with a balanced coverage of domestic and foreign policies and a recognition that not all of the policies were entirely Mary's own. Narrative accounts of the reign would not be an appropriate approach, although analysis and argument within a chronological framework would meet the demands of the question in large part. Candidates may be expected to deal with the following issues: success in establishing the regime; the restoration of Papal authority; the resolution of the Church lands question; the revival of the heresy laws; the Spanish marriage and responses to it; war with France; relationship with Parliament; the composition of the Council; administrative reforms, the restoration of the currency, new Book of Rates.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses, as will the ability to engage with controversy. A sharp sense of evaluation is to be expected in dealing with 'how well judged'. Among the major issues to be evaluated are the extent to which policies were successful and constructive or whether, together, they constitute a sterile interlude; how much opposition there was to, say, the Spanish marriage (how serious a threat was Wyatt's rebellion?) and to religious persecution; how popular was the restoration of Catholicism? Candidates might also refer to Mary's treatment of Elizabeth. It might also be relevant to assess some of the mitigating factors such as bad harvests, famine, inflation and epidemic disease (which caused unrest but over which the government had little control) and the shortness of the reign.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

## 12 Who opposed Elizabeth I's religious policies and why?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required and a good balance between identifying 'who' and explaining 'why'. Purely descriptive approaches will meet the demands of the question to only a limited extent. Candidates will need to see the reign as a whole and to be aware of the development and nature of the Protestant and Catholic opposition (for example, the later development of more radical Protestantism and the role of the seminarist and Jesuit missions). Candidates may be expected to refer to the following. From the Protestant side: some objections to the Settlement of 1559 in that it did not go far enough; attempts to modify the Settlement and to abolish, for example, remaining Popish ceremonies; the Vestiarian controversy; objections to Church government by bishops and the Royal Supremacy; attempts to introduce a Presbyterian or 'Genevan' system; the issue of prophesyings; Martin Marprelate tracts; Separatism. From the Catholic side: objections to the Settlement, in particular, the Royal Supremacy and the Act of Uniformity (largely based on the Prayer Book of 1552); resistance of the Marian bishops; opposition to the 39 Articles; objections to the Church of England as a 'political' creation; resistance to and avoidance of recusancy fines; support for the seminarist and Jesuit missions.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations, may enhance answers, as will the ability to engage with controversy. Candidates might argue that the religious policies had considerable political significance (the dynastic issue, doubts about Elizabeth's legitimacy and Mary Stuart's claim; Church government and the Supremacy), and this will colour views about why religious policies were opposed. It could also be relevant to assess the extent to which Catholic opposition diminished during the reign and Puritan opposition increased.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

### 13 How serious a threat did Mary Stuart pose to Elizabeth I and the stability of England?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required with a balanced coverage across the period 1558–87. Candidates should concentrate on assessing the seriousness of the threat rather than relying upon a narrative account of events. The threat to Elizabeth and to the stability of the country are clearly very closely connected, but better answers may make some distinctions and both aspects should be addressed. The major themes may be identified as: Mary's Catholicism contrasted with Elizabeth's Protestantism and Elizabeth's possible illegitimacy; the extent of support for Mary in England and abroad. Candidates may recognise the differences between the periods 1558–68 and 1568–87. In the first period Mary was queen of France and then ruled directly in Scotland with continued French support, and the importance of her marriage will need assessing. Different problems were raised by Mary's flight to England in 1568 and candidates may consider the following: the Northern Rebellion of 1569 and how far it was in support of Mary; the effects of the Papal Bull of excommunication; the Ridolfi Plot; Mary as an issue in Parliament; the various attempts by the French to re-establish themselves in Scotland; the extent of support by Philip II; English plots – Throckmorton's and Babington's; the Bond of Association; and how far the eventual decision to execute Mary bears out the seriousness of the threat.

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 relative and relevant factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations may enhance responses, as will the ability to engage with controversy. A sharp sense of evaluation is to be expected in dealing with 'how serious'. Candidates may debate whether there was a greater threat before 1568 or after. The scale of support for Mary may be addressed and the extent to which support fluctuated and differed according to the chronology and region. How far was the threat presented by Mary exaggerated by ministers? In addressing AO2 candidates may make sharper distinctions between the threat to Elizabeth and to the security of the realm.

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.

**14 'Largely unsuccessful until 1588, wholly ineffective thereafter.' How accurate is this view of Elizabethan foreign policy?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required and, clearly, a balanced coverage of the whole reign is necessary. A narrative survey would be a limited response to the demands of the question. There are two propositions, both of which need to be addressed. Candidates are free to agree or disagree: no set response should be expected and it is the quality of the argument which should be rewarded. However, the propositions are so strongly worded that it would be surprising if candidates did not seek to modify them in varying degrees. There are four main areas: Scotland, France, Spain and the Netherlands, with the last two being especially closely connected. As to Scotland, it could be argued that Mary's claim to the English throne was never fully relinquished. French Guise attempts to influence Scotland continued but Elizabeth was able to reach a *modus vivendi* with James VI. Candidates will be aware that in the early years of the reign generally good relations with Spain were maintained but that after Alva's arrival in the Netherlands in 1567 relations deteriorated. Candidates should attempt to judge the success with which England was able to interfere with complete Spanish domination of the Netherlands up to the Treaty of Nonsuch in 1585. The Armada was defeated and subsequent Armadas failed but how effective were English counter-attacks? As for France, there was a failure to recover Calais. Candidates might then consider motives and the degree of success in further interventions in France, the impact of the religious wars on English foreign policy in general, the attempt to build a rapprochement by, for example, the Treaty of Blois and marriage diplomacy. In the post-Armada years relations with Henry IV should be explored.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses, as will the ability to engage with controversy. Candidates might be expected to explore the argument that Elizabeth's aims were very limited and success/failure must be seen in the light of this. So, there are fundamental questions as to how far national security was safeguarded and the extent to which Elizabeth was able to balance the two great powers (given that developments such as civil strife in France were beyond her control). It might be furthered argued that England's resources, certainly compared to those of France and Spain, were limited. A further area of debate might be as to whether English foreign policy erred on the side of caution.

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.

## 15 How successful was Tudor policy towards Ireland in the period 1547–1603?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required and a reasonably well balanced coverage across the period 1547–1603 (although there may be some gaps). The main thrust is an assessment of success, so aims, policies and outcomes will need to be explained and put into the balance against the difficulties faced. In dealing with the ‘Irish problem’ candidates may be expected to refer to some of the following: political, tribal and social structures, Gaelic and Old English communities; the limited area of effective control in 1547; religious complications as England moved further towards Protestantism; the background of Irish resistance; limited resources available and the huge cost involved in any systematic subjugation. The policy followed was largely one of coercion. Candidates may refer to the following strands of policy: the use of garrisons, for example, by Somerset (as in Scotland) and by Mary; plantation or colonisation used more or less throughout the period; divide and rule and the use of the Anglo-Irish nobility such as Shane O’Neill; provincial councils modelled on the Councils in the North and the Marches; appointment of English Lord Deputies; use of the Irish Parliament (but only four met in the whole period); the suppression of rebellions (by, for example, Kildare and Hugh O’Neill), accompanied by conquest and devastation (e.g. Essex and Mountjoy); the prevention of Spanish invasion in the 1590s.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of the 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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing historical interpretations may enhance responses, as will the ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may wish to consider whether English aims and policies went beyond subjugation and exploitation. How important were strategic considerations? How far was plantation a response to a rising population in England? What was the relative importance of the ‘Irish Reformation’? Would better results have been obtained with greater resources? To what extent can it be argued that the position in 1603 represented the ultimate triumph of English policy?

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.

**Section 4: Themes c. 1399–c. 1603**

**16 How popular was the English Church in the fifteenth century?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, especially a clear set of explanations. The chronology of ‘fifteenth century’ can certainly be stretched and candidates may wish to terminate their answers in c. 1529. Narratives are unlikely but description should always be accompanied by analysis, argument and assessment. There are, perhaps, two main themes: the popularity of the Church as a vocation or career (which is linked to the liveliness of the institution); and the popularity of the Church as an institution, its doctrines, practices and clergy (secular and regular) with the laity. The Church offered a career open to talent regardless of origin and William of Wykeham and Wolsey provide good examples. Again many residentiary canons were from humble backgrounds. There was an increase of graduates amongst canons and parish clergy. The regular clergy were probably no longer the force they had been but they enjoyed a fair measure of popular support and recruitment held up. Candidates may also be expected to explore: the relationship between laity and clergy at parish level; popular piety as expressed through, say, pilgrimages and religious guilds; the willingness of the laity to attend churches, maintain their fabric and provide financial support; the foundation of chantries; bequests by wills. The other side of the coin, of course, is that Lollardy had an appeal both in its doctrinal aspects and the case it made against the corruption and wealth of the Church. There is also evidence of anti-clericalism over such matters as tithes, mortuary fees and Church courts.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source materials and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. There is a real debate about the nature and extent of the popularity/unpopularity of the clergy. There are some difficulties with the evidence for anti-clericalism and contemporary sources such as Chaucer and Langland should be evaluated with care. The extent of support and influence of Lollardy as the fifteenth century went on would be a further matter for debate.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**17 'A land of great economic prosperity.' Discuss this view of England in the fifteenth century.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required in terms of assessing 'economic prosperity' and chronology. Answers may be expected to address the following set of issues: demographic changes, the levelling out of the effects of plague and results; static prices and rising wages. How favourable were these to peasant farmers and labourers? Other issues to be addressed are: the decline in the wool trade but an expansion of the cloth trade and industry; growth in other industries such as building, salt production and tin mining; evidence of an increase in English merchant shipping; the rising wealth of London and of some provincial towns; the rise of substantial tenant farmers. Commutation of labour services became universal. Consolidation of holdings by landlords and peasants and enclosure could also be considered.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. One obvious debate to explore is the idea of the 'golden age of the English labourer' (using evidence of long leases, low and fixed rents, rising wages and stable prices). How beneficial was enclosure and sheep farming (evidence of depopulation, enclosure act of 1488–9)? How did the growth of London affect provincial towns? The mixed evidence about the prosperity of provincial towns and the difficulty in generalising? What were the pros and cons of the growth of oligarchies of great merchants?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**18 Assess the importance of the role of women in society either in the fifteenth or the sixteenth century.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required and answers will be expected to go beyond description to assessment and analysis. It may not be possible to make very many different points about the two centuries but, depending on which is chosen, the examples will be different. In both centuries society was patriarchal and independence depended very much upon status, especially when women were heiresses or widows. Once married or remarried, women legally lost control over their property. There is evidence of women being members of craft guilds and running workshops and businesses but, again, they tended to be widows and single women. The influence of women within and over families and households and relationships with husbands and fathers and brothers was very much an individual matter but there is evidence from both centuries to enable some discussion of this. Women could be influential in the Church (as abbesses, for example, although this ceased with the Reformation) and religious life (Margery Kempe and Julian of Norwich provide examples). Wider influence was very much a matter of rank: Cecily Neville, Bess of Hardwick and Joan Thynne of Longleat among the nobility. The coverage of the role of women as rulers or being close to rulers may be considered to be part of the answer, but answers which are entirely concerned with these roles (especially if based upon one or two individuals) will not get far. Examples which spring to mind are: Margaret of Anjou, Elizabeth Woodville, Margaret Beaufort, Anne Boleyn, Catherine Parr, Mary Tudor, Mary Stuart and Elizabeth I.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. One area of debate concerns the nature of the evidence which is patchy but more plentiful for the upper reaches of society. How far did the demographic changes of the fourteenth century increase the importance and influence of *femmes seules* during the fifteenth century? How was the position of women influenced by the religious changes of the sixteenth 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.

**19 How important were the effects of population growth on economic and social developments in Tudor England?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required in terms of both chronology and the need to assess importance. Answers will need to spend some time in indicating the scale of population change. There may have been some recovery of population by the end of the fifteenth century but perhaps the safest estimates for England and Wales are 2.8 million in 1547 and 4 million by 1603. Among the most important effects are: land hunger and effects upon land utilisation and reorganisation and new farming methods; a rise in prices, especially of food; a fall in real wages for most of the sixteenth century; the development of centres of conspicuous consumption (especially London) and changes in food production to serve them; the impact upon provision for poor relief.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations may enhance responses as will an ability to engage in controversy. There is a debate about when the population rise began and its scale. There were regional variations and intermittent checks to growth caused by epidemic disease and a run of bad harvests. Reliable sources and evidence are scarce for the end of the fifteenth century and the early sixteenth. Other explanations for price inflation may be offered: the debasement of the mid-sixteenth century, for example, and the relative importance of population growth alongside these may be evaluated.

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 the area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

**20 In what respects were art and architecture in sixteenth-century Britain influenced by the continental Renaissance?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required ('art' being concerned with the visual arts) with a reasonably balanced coverage of both art and architecture. Ideally, there should be a British approach but candidates should not be unduly penalised for concentrating upon English examples. The influence of the continental Renaissance was disseminated by a number of means: returning British visitors to continental Europe, especially France and Italy; patronage of continental artists, architects and craftsmen by the nobility and rulers of England and Scotland (some examples should be given); by the printed word and illustrations, for example, from Renaissance Italy. Architecture demonstrates a mixture of styles – Italian, French and Flemish – and discussion of the use of materials and internal decoration (such as plaster and woodwork) would be relevant. Sculpture and painting were largely confined to portraiture and examples of foreign artists such as Holbein, Zuccaro, Eworth and Gheeraerts can be given.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. One area of debate is the extent of continental influence and the balance between continental and British styles and models. How far were building styles (such as English Gothic) and artists native to Britain? How far did great houses, for example, embrace a mixture of styles? What contribution was made by British architects such as Thorpe and Smythson (Wollaton, Longleat, Hardwick), and painters (largely miniaturists) and sculptors (largely tomb statuary), and what were the influences upon them?

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.

## 21 How seriously was the Tudor monarchy threatened by rebellion?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, the concentration being upon organised rebellion against the Crown rather than conspiracy, riot or general unrest. A narrative of rebellions would not be an appropriate response. A good, balanced coverage across the period should be expected. Rebellions took four broad forms, sometimes in combination: a threat to the stability of the government; to its policies; to the monarch personally; to the dynasty. The rebellions in support of Simnel and Warbeck challenged Henry VII and the Tudor dynasty and their seriousness will need to be assessed but perhaps only Wyatt's rebellion had the potential for overthrowing a reigning monarch. The Northern Rebellion (1569) also offered the possibility of an alternative monarch. Some rebellions challenged ministers, although opposing ministers could also be seen as challenging the Crown itself; the Pilgrimage of Grace (Cromwell) and the Northern Rebellion (Cecil) could be quoted as examples, as might resistance to the Amicable Grant of 1525 (Wolsey). Religious policies were opposed by the Pilgrimage and the Western Rising (1549), and economic and social issues by Ket's Rebellion (1549). The Pilgrimage and the Northern Rebellion were, in part, concerned to oppose policies which disadvantaged particular regions. The Cornish Rebellion (1497) and opposition to the Amicable Grant were largely concerned with resistance to increased taxation. Essex's Rebellion (1600), an aristocratic rebellion arising out of court faction, was on a small scale, but the fact that it was in London and led by a royal favourite demonstrates a degree of seriousness.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here candidates should take an especially sharp and critical approach towards 'how seriously' and towards the relative importance of the various rebellions. Were rebellions more serious during the early period of the Tudor dynasty (whilst it was still being established) or, say, after the Reformation when religion provided an additional and potent cause of grievance? It might be argued that some rebellions arose out of class conflict and threatened the social order rather than the monarchy. Others, perhaps, arose out of circumstances, such as inflation, rather than opposition to the monarchy and its policies. How far were rebellions regional – local protests about local grievances? To what extent was the threat presented by rebellion limited by the failure (in most cases) to unite all classes?

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.

## Section 5: 1603–1689

## 22 'Idle, extravagant and politically naïve.' How accurate is this verdict on James I?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – that is, on James I's alleged indolence, extravagance and naïvety. A chronological narrative should be avoided, and instead these charges considered in turn. For 'idle' there is the evidence of James I's devotion to hunting, and his impatience with routine business such as patronage, which after 1615 he delegated to Buckingham. On the other hand, he was an active player in international diplomacy, especially after the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War, and an informed supreme governor of the church, convening the Hampton Court conference and thereafter balancing rival schools of churchmen at court. James I was famously extravagant, and rarely supported the reforming measures of successive lord treasurers, but he did inherit a rickety and inadequate financial position. His visionary plan to unify England and Scotland right at the beginning of his reign, and promotion of a reunion of a divided Christendom via a general council chaired by the pope, could be regarded as examples of political naïvety, although he was also a hard-headed and shrewd operator, seen in his balancing of factions at court, and his refusal to bow to parliamentary and popular pressure and go to war after 1618.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, the three charges against James I in the question represent the traditional view of the king, and more recent writing has offered a more balanced assessment, identifying strengths as well as weaknesses. Thus a rounded evaluation might concede James I's undoubted extravagance, while acknowledging the damning financial legacy he inherited and his need as an in-coming monarch to be a generous patron, and his occasional flights of visionary fancy which achieved little – but balance this against considerable evidence of activity and political skill, as, for example, a celebrated peace-broker. His handbook to princes, *Basilikon Doron*, contains a wealth of experience and political sense, even if James did not always observe it. Thus there is considerable scope here to offer a carefully calibrated assessment of this verdict on James I.

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.

**23 'A time of peace and prosperity.' Discuss this view of the personal rule of Charles I, 1629–1640.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – that is, on the peace and prosperity of the personal rule. A chronological account of 1629–40 should be avoided, and the question is best considered by topics. These might include: diplomatically, the ending of war in 1629–30 with peace treaties with France and Spain and the maintenance of peace until the Bishops' Wars of 1639–40; economically, unemployment and dearth in the early 1630s and intermittent plague throughout the decade, but some improvement too after 1630, as long-term pressures of population increase and inflation eased; the contested imposition of Laudian reforms in the church and prerogative taxation, most prominently ship money, in the state. Set pieces, such as the trial and punishment of the puritan trio of Bastwick, Burton and Prynne, and Hampden's ship money trial, are particular examples of controversy and opposition rather than peace. There is also a case for considering change across the decade, and contrasting the relative peace of the early part of the 1630s with the gathering troubles from 1637–40.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. The 1630s can be viewed as a more peaceful and prosperous decade than the 1620s, with its regular unsuccessful parliaments, as well as the decade of civil war which followed. The severe criticism levelled at Charles I's government in the Short and Long Parliaments in 1640 may suggest that the political peace of the 1630s was more apparent than real, and that most contemporaries lacked a platform, in the absence of parliament, on which to express their grievances. Alternatively, it could be argued that it was only the problems with two unpopular and unsuccessful wars against Scotland which fomented discontent. Some, of course, supported Laudianism or believed ship money was legal, so a case can be made for the variety of reactions to the personal rule. Moreover, 'peace' and 'prosperity' can be uncoupled and different judgements reached on each. Prosperity can also be judged (as contemporaries did) against the sufferings and misery of the Thirty Years' War abroad.

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.

**24 How valid is the concept of the ‘British Civil Wars’ with reference to the period 1639–51?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – on the validity of ‘British Civil Wars’ as a concept – and although a chronological narrative should be avoided, there might be a case for analysing developments in chronological blocs, such as 1639–41, 1642–6, and 1648–51, in which the interconnection of events in England, Wales, Scotland and Ireland can be examined. Among the key developments are the Bishops’ Wars of 1639–40 which ended the Personal Rule and precipitated political crisis in England, which the Irish Rebellion helped to tip into civil war. Both Civil Wars (1642–6, 1648) involved theatres of war in all four countries, with Irish troops recruited by English royalists and the Scottish Covenanters supporting parliament; some of the latter then in 1648 taking the Engagement and fighting for Charles I. Scotland was also the launching pad for Charles II’s attempts to recover his throne in 1650–1, while the English republic was only secure upon the military conquest of both Scotland and Ireland (1649–51).

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. The formulation ‘how valid’ requires explicit evaluation of the phrase ‘British Civil Wars’, particularly the case for the connections and interdependence of developments across three kingdoms, making the conflict more than merely three civil wars fought concurrently. Much could also be made of the similar causes for conflict, particularly religious division and the controversial, and arguably authoritarian, political rule of Charles I over his multiple kingdoms of Britain.

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.

**25 How consistent were the actions and policies of Oliver Cromwell in the period 1647–1658?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, on the consistency of Cromwell's actions and policies, and a chronological narrative should not be adopted. Instead, there are topics to investigate across the period 1647–58 which might suggest inconsistency: his role in the regicide of Charles I and his agreement to become lord protector, king in all but name in the view of some contemporaries; his belief in parliament as a national assembly and the rule of law, while allowing the army a major role in national politics, including the dissolution of the Rump Parliament in April 1653 or the major-generals experiment; his support for a written constitution (the Instrument of Government) and his infractions of it by, for example, imposing the decimation tax; his commitment to 'healing and settling' divisions and trying to engage with the wider nation, while at the same time pursuing the generally unpopular goals of puritan reformation. Equally, he was generally consistent in his religious radicalism, social conservatism and impatience with forms of 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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. The question requires evaluation of Cromwell's consistency, a contemporary charge, for Cromwell was sometimes depicted as a hypocrite who was only consistent in his accumulation and retention of power. Candidates need to balance Cromwell's consistencies and inconsistencies to reach a judgement. Some may recognise that few politicians can be expected to be entirely consistent, and in Cromwell's case his remarkable change of circumstance between 1647 and 1658 – from a major politician and soldier to lord general to head of state – may account for some inconsistencies. It may be possible, too, to see consistencies in his policies but some inconsistency in implementing them, or else friction between different policies which account for such inconsistency.

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.

## 26 Why did the attempt to alter the succession fail during the Exclusion Crisis, yet succeed at the Glorious Revolution?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, on explaining the failure in 1679–81 and the success in 1688–9 to alter the succession. A chronological account across the whole period is best avoided, although candidates could well examine failure in 1679–81 then success in 1688–9. The very different circumstances of the two periods need analysis: in the first, Charles II was firmly against altering the succession and manipulated when and where parliament met in 1678–81 to frustrate his opponents – and after 1681 never convened it again; there were various solutions to the succession question (exclusion, limitations, Charles II to remarry, a regency and Monmouth's candidature) which divided those in favour of alteration; Charles played a canny hand (recruiting able supporters such as Halifax) and allied with the emergent Tory party to defeat Exclusion, the favoured solution of their enemies the Whigs. In 1688–9 things were very different: James II had forfeited the active support of the Tories and created a fragile alliance of Catholics and Dissenters, and had an unreliable army to face an invasion force led by William of Orange, who cleverly appealed to the majority of the political nation by pushing for a free parliament, which almost all could support, while piling on the psychological pressure on James II, whose nerve snapped and he fled in December 1688. With William thereafter eventually running the country, the most likely outcome of the Convention Parliament was that William and/or Mary would be offered the throne.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. The contrast between a parliament-centred struggle in 1678–81 and a much broader struggle in 1688–9 is worth emphasising. For the first, the Whigs had limited options since they did not command a majority in both houses, and with increasing revenue from trade and a renewed French subsidy, Charles II could dispense with parliament in 1681 for good. In 1688–9 with a foreign army in England, James II was cornered in a way his brother had never been, and only had the options of fighting, negotiating or fleeing. Once he had reached France (27 December 1688), with a Dutch army occupying London and William as *de facto* head of state, there is a good case for seeing the dynastic revolution, and the alteration of the succession, effectively accomplished before Parliament met.

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.

**Section 6: 1689–1760****27 To what extent, and why, was there a redefinition of the powers of the Crown in the period 1689–1714?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – namely the extent of, and reasons for, an alteration of Crown powers under William III, Mary II and Anne. The obvious starting-points are the limitations imposed on the Crown in the revolution settlements of 1689 (the Declaration of Rights in England, and the Claim of Right in Scotland) and the concessions granted by the Crown thereafter, notably the Triennial Act (1694), the Place Bills (1694–1701) and the Act of Settlement (1701), which determined the succession through parliament and guaranteed MPs' consent over war in defence of continental possessions of a foreign prince. These changes were largely driven by the need for the Crown to finance large-scale continental war for most of the period 1689–1713, which resulted in annual meetings of parliament and concessions from the Crown over some of its prerogatives in return for extra revenue, as well as fears from MPs of the Crown extending its executive powers. This redefinition might well be described as limited monarchy, or government through king-in-parliament, a significant change from politics before 1689 – although the Crown retained very extensive powers and initiatives in and outside parliament.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. There is a case here for distinguishing between the conservative settlement of 1689 and the changes of the 1690s, stimulated by William's style of government and the burdens of war. Nevertheless, 1689 did end the possibility of royal absolutism through a packed parliament. The exact nature of the 'limited' monarchy which emerged can be debated with reference not just to legislative concessions by the Crown and its relationship with the operation of party politics, but also its own extensive patronage within parliament (bishops, placemen etc.).

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.

**28 Account for the emergence of Britain as a great power in the period 1689–1714.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – that is, on the reasons why Britain became a great power between 1689 and 1714. Some working definition of ‘great power’ should be stated or should develop in the course of the answer, in terms of Britain’s weight as a military, commercial and imperial player, confirmed by the terms of the Peace of Utrecht in 1713. Wars of 1689–97 and 1702–13 were the midwife of Britain’s changing status, and what made the coalitions and victories on land and sea possible was in part the leadership of figures such as William III and Marlborough, but fundamentally the underpinning of the war effort through parliamentary revenue and the financial revolution of the creation of the National Debt, and of the Bank of England to manage it. Political support at home for the high price of these wars was also vital: wars were defended as necessary to see off the Jacobite threat, protect Protestantism at home and abroad, and, especially in the origins of the renewal of war in 1702, to safeguard and advance British commercial interests.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. There are several competing explanations here, which need sorting and ranking, with the financial arrangements established through annual sittings of parliament perhaps the most important. Whether Britain was a Great Power by 1697 or not until 1713 is worth considering. Certainly the balance sheet at Utrecht points to Britain’s dominance as a great power, and Britain’s overseas acquisitions such as Newfoundland underlined her recognised status as a great power on a global scale.

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.

**29 How seriously did the Jacobite rebellions of 1715 and 1745 threaten the Hanoverian regime?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – that is, the seriousness of the Jacobite threat in 1715 and 1745. Both rebellions represented a threat to the Hanoverian regime, but the more serious was that of 1715: the new Hanoverian dynasty was barely established, with discontent in England and national restiveness in Scotland, fuelled by opposition to the Act of Union of 1707. The uprising in both Scotland and northern England caught the government off-guard. On the other hand, there was poor leadership from Mar, inadequate co-ordination between English, Scottish and exiled Jacobites, and no significant foreign support. While this is clear in retrospect, the government took the matter extremely seriously, sending 8000 Dutch troops to England and Scotland. The rising of 1745 did not have the same groundswell of support in Scotland, though it did have some modest French military backing, and its limited success owed much to the charismatic leadership of the Young Pretender. While the Jacobite army did reach Derby by December 1745, crucially it failed to enlist significant English support, and amid acrimony in the high command retired back to Scotland, to be annihilated at Culloden.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. Answers may well treat the two rebellions in turn, but there is the opportunity here for contrasting the threat represented by each. Despite the Jacobite army getting so close to London in 1745, the English remained hostile or indifferent, in contrast to the 1715 uprising. Arguably the '15 had the potential to topple the Hanoverian regime, at least in Scotland, but poor organisation, and the failure to seize the political or military initiative meant that the ill-prepared government in London was able to rally its forces and re-impose its authority.

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.

**30 'Walpole's long tenure of office depended entirely upon his control of Parliament.'  
How accurate is this view?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, namely the accuracy of the view that Walpole's tenure depended entirely on parliamentary control. Walpole's parliamentary management is clearly important and needs a full assessment: not just in his manipulation of patronage to build up a phalanx of followers in the Lords, as well as in the Commons, but also his personal involvement in the workings of the Commons. He recognised the importance of remaining a member of the Commons and worked hard to win the respect and support of Whig backbenchers and pursue policies that they would endorse. Just as significant was the support he received from the Crown and from Queen Caroline, and he was very much at home in the Hanoverian court. Walpole's personal abilities as an outstanding politician, in court and Parliament, also count for much. So too did the stability he helped to further, with the recovery of trade, low taxation and a pacific foreign policy, which were broadly popular in and outside parliament. A key to his success was the ability to win elections as well as control parliament when it met. Though he was attacked in journals like *The Craftsman*, there was also a pro-Walpolean press. He took advantage of existing trends – the weaknesses of the opposition, the disarray of the Tories, their association with Jacobitism, the Septennial Act, and the refusal of George I and II to trust the Tories – not simply to acquire office, but then to consolidate his grip on power.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. The precise significance of Walpole's parliamentary control is central to this question, and it could be argued that more vital still was his dominant role in both court and Parliament. The contemporary charge of corruption is important here, but so too the broader context of politics in which Walpole worked – the attitude of the Crown, the nature of the opposition to Walpole, the policies he pursued. The reasons for his fall help throw light on why he had survived for so long, in particular the revival of opposition in the later 1730s (among his opponents was Frederick Prince of Wales) and the decision to go to war, which by 1741 was going badly and damaged his standing outside parliament, which in turn led to a loss of control within it.

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.

**31 'A personal triumph for the elder Pitt.' How valid is this judgement on the conduct and outcome of the Seven Years War?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, on Pitt's personal responsibility for the conduct and outcome of the Seven Years War. Clearly Pitt contributed a good deal as an inspired wartime leader, with a grasp of the global scope of the struggle against France, shown in his support for Frederick the Great, which tied down French troops in Europe, and in his foresight in ordering the blockade of French ports in 1757–8 to prevent enemy reinforcements being sent to North America. He was also a willing patron of a group of outstanding military and naval commanders (Amherst, Wolfe, Hawke, Rodney). But Pitt owed much to Newcastle, who helped to organise the financing of the army in Germany and North America, and who ensured that George II remained a strong supporter. Anson was also a key figure at the Admiralty. Pitt was also able to benefit from the absence of parliamentary opposition at home, from British naval strength which had been built up over several decades, and abroad from Spanish neutrality and the military prowess of Frederick the Great. So victory in the Seven Years War was not just Pitt's personal triumph. Nor was its outcome: Pitt fell from power in October 1761, and was an outspoken critic of the Peace of Paris, which he regarded as far too generous to the French and Spanish.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. The traditional view of Pitt's heroism and genius has been revised in recent years, and the challenge here is to give credit to Pitt's own contribution, while acknowledging the role of others (politicians, military commanders and allies) and the influence of external factors, such as British naval power and Spanish neutrality. Pitt's own imperial vision was a *post hoc* rationalisation after he left office. Rather, credit should go to his leadership and dogged determination to push for victory across several continents.

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.

## Section 7: 1760–1815

**32 How successful was George III in his attempts to assert the powers of the Crown in the period 1760–84?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – that is, the success of George III's attempts to reassert the powers of the crown. The character of that attempt needs establishing, before its success can be assessed. George III was determined to use his prerogative powers to appoint ministers of talent, regardless of party, and free the monarchy and constitution from the allegedly corrupt great Whig ministers who had dominated politics for so long. More broadly, George III saw himself as an active monarch, interested in the minutiae of government, and rather self-consciously a parliamentary monarch. Thus he supported the American War of Independence on the grounds that the colonial rebels were defying the British parliament's right to legislate in the colonies. George had some success and reversals: the five short-lived ministries of the 1760s were largely the result of George's inexperienced interventions, but with North (1770–82) George found a reliable minister he could trust and took more of a backseat. In 1783 the King dismissed the Fox-North coalition, although it had a parliamentary majority, and his decision was vindicated by the general election result of 1784, when Pitt the Younger, the King's choice, won a majority of over 100. Overall, then, George III enjoyed mixed success in reasserting the powers of the crown.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. Some nineteenth-century historians suggested that George III was attempting to establish an unconstitutional or arbitrary government, but this has been convincingly refuted. George III was determined to make his mark on politics, but in defence not defiance of his understanding of the constitution. Stronger answers may well draw comparisons and contrasts with the role of George II, who could intervene and embarrass his ministers on church or military appointments, but was content to co-operate with successive Whig administrations.

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.

**33 To what extent does the popularity of the campaigns of John Wilkes and Christopher Wyvill suggest that the British political system was 'fundamentally corrupt' in the period 1760–1783?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – that is, on the extent to which the popularity of Wilkes and Wyvill's campaigns suggest that the British political system was fundamentally corrupt. Wilkes championed liberty and had some success in clipping back the authority and secrecy of the executive and legislature, for example with general warrants being declared illegal (1765) and freedom of the press upheld (1771). Wilkes's expulsion from Parliament and his imprisonment were seen as tyranny, but legally both MPs and the government were within their rights, even if they acted with political folly and gave opportunities for Wilkes to exploit. That Wilkes was freed from prison since it violated his privileges as a MP, and his repeated re-election, implies that 'corruption' was only one characteristic of the British political system, but his campaigns did suggest that government and Commons were a self-interested oligarchy. His popularity also derives from his self-fashioning as a national popular politician, addressing the mass of the people at a time of growing literacy, wealth and political awareness among the middling sorts. Wilkes himself had no political programme as such, and only as late as 1769 did he become associated with parliamentary reform. Wyvill's petitioning campaign was based on old accusations of ministerial corruption and incompetence as the explanation for failure in the American war, and aimed at reducing the power of the executive over Parliament. The fact that the campaign was taken up by some MPs suggests that the political system was not wholly or 'fundamentally' corrupt. As North pointed out in 1783, his ministry's fall showed that parliament was susceptible to public opinion.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. There needs to be a balanced treatment of both Wilkes's and Wyvill's campaigns, and some sense of their differences as well as similarities. 'Corruption' is a matter of definition, though candidates may note long-standing fears of this reaching back to the early part of the century. The charge of 'fundamental' corruption seems an exaggeration, not least given the prominence and persistence of, and minor victories for, both campaigners.

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.

### 34 Why did Britain lose the American War of Independence?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – that is, on the reasons why Britain lost the American War of Independence. One was the logistical problems of fighting a war 3000 miles away, with slow communications, on irregular and unfamiliar terrain, against a superior number of colonial adversaries who used guerrilla warfare very effectively; another would be the colonists' alliance with France and Spain (1778–9), which turned the conflict into a global war, with the English Channel, for example, having to be protected from the threat of invasion. Inadequate political leadership, principally by North, is another reason; to which one could add the failure to seize the initiative, both politically and militarily, at the beginning of the war, and to exploit the local militias and the considerable body of loyalists.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. The various explanations here need ranking in importance, and several could be combined to argue that Britain lost because its resources were overstretched. The traditional view that North was a poor wartime leader has been recently questioned, and he had some able subordinates including Admiral Lord Sandwich and Lord George Germain. It is possible to identify turning-points, notably defeat at Saratoga, which meant that a long and expensive war was necessary for British success, and the military alliances of America with France and Spain. The fact that Britain could win victories (saving Canada, holding New York, and winning All Saints) indicates that the battlefield was not necessarily the key determinant of the eventual outcome.

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.

**35 'The most constructive period of Pitt the Younger's premiership was over by 1789.'**  
**Discuss.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – that is, on identifying the most constructive period of Pitt's premiership, almost unbroken from 1784–1806. The case for 1784–8 being 'the most constructive' rests on his successful measures for national economic recovery and modest administrative reform, including the India Act (1784), the Consolidation Act (1787), a commercial treaty with France (1786), and the reduction of the national debt and government spending. Equally, there were defeats, such as over parliamentary reforms and Irish manufactures (1785). After 1789, or more correctly from 1792–3, Pitt was involved in the military struggle against Revolutionary and Napoleonic France, and repressed reformers, pro-Jacobin groups and trade unions at home, and framed the Act of Union (1800) with Ireland, following the Irish rebellion of 1798. By his death in 1806, the war was not won, even though Trafalgar (1805) had given the British supremacy at sea. Yet it could be argued that after 1792–3 Pitt adapted to new challenges, and devised 'constructive' methods to sustain a successful series of wars – through repression at home, which enjoyed the support of a significant section of the population, through the introduction of income tax (1799) and diplomatically through the construction of coalitions against France.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. Candidates' answers need to range widely, across the period after as well as before 1789. They may consider that Pitt was equally constructive in both periods, the difference being between a peacetime leader and a war leader achieving, initially at least, little success and not living to see final victory. Again, it could be argued that the challenges after 1789 were the greater and needed more constructive solutions than the situation facing him on taking office in December 1783.

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.

**36 Why was Britain able to sustain such a long and ultimately successful conflict against France in the period 1793–1815?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, namely the reasons that Britain was able to sustain over twenty years of almost unbroken conflict with France. One major explanation is the manpower Britain could draw on, mobilising as many men as France with a population half its size. The British navy was immensely strong, and growing in size during these 20 years, and able to protect trade, defend the country and, by 1805, enjoy supremacy on the high seas. The war effort was also underpinned by the growing economic power of Britain, in the early stages of the Industrial Revolution, with increases in, for example, iron production and shipbuilding. The economic damage of the Orders in Council (1807) was reversed by the government in 1812 and business thereafter boomed. Agriculture was also prospering, which helped finance a prodigiously expensive war, including subsidies to continental allies. The high cost of war in money, men and materials was politically acceptable because of the threats revolutionary and then Napoleonic France posed to British political values and commercial interests. Britain found allies (often ineffectual) abroad and helped form successive coalitions against France. Individual leaders (Pitt, Nelson, Wellington) and the unpopularity of Napoleon also helped to sustain support for war during this protracted struggle.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. The various explanations here need ranking in importance, and the connections between economic strength, manpower and the costs of war invite careful analysis. Equally, there is a danger of privileging structural explanations over the impact of events and personalities. Thus Napoleon's restless ambition helped Britain recruit allies, and his mistakes (such as the Russian campaign) contributed to the eventual allied success.

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.

## Section 8: Themes c. 1603–1815

**37 Assess the importance of the role played by the gentry in the political, economic and social life of England in the eighteenth century.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, namely the importance of the gentry's role in English political, economic and social life. All three aspects need to be tackled, though comprehensiveness can hardly be expected. Some working definition of gentility needs to be provided, or to emerge in the body of the answer, which might include changing contemporary notions of gentle status, as the term was broadened over the century, even to include 'pseudo-gentility'. Politically, the gentry dominated the House of Commons, and were key agents in local government, as magistrates and deputy-lieutenants. Their number, wealth and influence made them central figures in the political process. As for economy, gentry contributed significantly to agricultural improvement (most famously Jethro Tull's invention of the seed drill and horse-hoe, and Robert Bakewell's breeding of livestock), and though established gentry played a lesser role in industrial development, successful entrepreneurs (such as Sir Richard Arkwright) and city merchants (Sir Gilbert Heathcote) were eventually absorbed into their ranks. Socially, gentry were patrons of the London season, and participated in the renaissance of urban social life at York, Norwich, Bath and elsewhere; their literary tastes were addressed in a burgeoning print culture, most famously *The Spectator*, established to record the discussions of a 'society of gentlemen'.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, the fluidity of notions of gentility needs consideration, with an eye to upward social mobility, and also to the overlapping worlds of aristocracy and greater gentry. The question's focus on 'importance' will allow candidates to weigh the respective contributions of the gentry in these three spheres of activity, and perhaps to distinguish between the rather different contribution of 'greater' and 'parochial' gentry.

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.

### 38 How is the growth of Protestant dissent in the seventeenth century best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – that is, on different explanations for the growth of Protestant dissent. ‘Dissent’ could be taken to refer to early Stuart Puritanism and Separatism for the period 1600–40, as well as the more familiar groups such as the Presbyterians, Independents and Quakers which emerged from the 1640s onwards. One explanation for growth would be religious: the impulse within Protestantism towards greater purity of doctrine and worship, driven on by fears of popery (and in its English guise, by Laudianism), and also by tensions between word-centred (Presbyterians, for example) and spirit-centred (Quakers) understandings of true religion. A second explanation would be political circumstances: the collapse of censorship and then civil war and destruction of the established church allowed for experimentation and the rise of competing sects, who enjoyed powerful backing so that they could develop, not least from Cromwell, who offered ‘liberty of conscience’ to dissenters during the protectorate. Although the period 1660–1700 was not one of ‘growth’ so much as survival under persecution, opportunities for further growth came intermittently with indulgence offered by Charles II and James II (1662, 1672, 1687–8) and more significantly after the Toleration Act of 1689, a product of Anglican gratitude for Dissenting support over the seven bishops’ trial of May 1688, and with powerful backing from Whigs and William III. A third explanation might be the inspirational leadership and writings of figures such as Thomas Godwin, Richard Baxter, George Fox or John Bunyan. A fourth might be the growing acceptability (though much resisted in some quarters) of the idea of toleration from the 1640s onwards.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. There are competing explanations here, and a sense of the interrelationship between them is important: Protestantism may have had a tendency towards fragmentation, but this was largely resisted until the break-up of the national church in the 1640s. That decade also provided the means for disseminating ideas, through the explosion of the printed press, as well as the urgency to shore up positions, as an intolerant Presbyterian state church seemed to threaten the development of rival groups. The atmosphere of experimentation is also evident, as some Independents and Baptists of the 1640s then moved on to radical ideas of Quakerism in the 1650s. There is scope here to highlight the rather different experiences for the growth of dissent across different parts of the century. Candidates might wish to examine the trajectory of Scottish dissent as an alternative or counter-point to England: here the key is changing political and religious priorities, so that ‘dissenters’ in the 1630s were those Presbyterians who resisted Laudianism, subscribed to the National Covenant, joined the English parliamentary forces in the 1640s, and were persecuted in the period 1660–85, after the restoration of monarchy. The tables were turned at the Glorious Revolution, however, as William III threw his weight behind the Presbyterians, so that dissenters were now their opponents the episcopalians; this, however, is less to do with the growth than the changing identification of dissent.

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.

### 39 Why did interest in scientific enquiry flourish in later seventeenth-century Britain?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – that is, on the reasons why scientific enquiry flourished in later seventeenth-century Britain. Part of the explanation must be the increasingly lively interest in science in and beyond the universities from the 1650s, led by figures of European stature such as Boyle, Hooke and Newton, several of whom turned to science as a refuge from religious and political controversy of the Interregnum, but also built on the advances in Baconian science in the first half of the century. A second explanation would be institutional and social, notably with the foundation of the Royal Society (1662), with its regular meetings, house journal (*Philosophical Transactions*) and the cult of the ‘virtuosi’ who took a fashionable but amateur interest in science. While it is easy to ridicule the unsystematic and sometimes Heath-Robinson contributions of ‘virtuosi’, their existence demonstrates how a scientific approach – of rational enquiry, and concentration on mechanical rather than occult causes – had entered the intellectual mainstream in post-Restoration Britain: put another way, science after 1660 was added to the gentry’s customary literary, antiquarian and topographical interests. They were reassured by leading theologians that scientific enquiry did not undermine traditional religion, but instead uncovered the wonders of God’s creation.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. There is an opportunity here to discuss the timing and genesis of the Scientific Revolution, and whether or not it was the product of the Puritan Revolution of the 1640s–50s. The forms of ‘scientific enquiry’ could also be addressed, ranging from Cambridge’s expertise in the biological sciences, Oxford’s in the physical sciences, and the more practical ‘science’ of the virtuosi. Its tenuous links with technological improvement are also significant: the high level of ‘interest’ was not always matched by technological advances.

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.

**40 How appropriate is the term ‘revolution’ in describing the changes in British agriculture in the eighteenth century?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, namely on the aptness of ‘revolution’ to describe agriculture change in eighteenth-century Britain. Certainly there are plenty of signs of agricultural improvement over the century: Jethro Tull’s seed drill, Robert Bakewell’s improvement of the size and shape of livestock, Coke of Holkham’s popularising of methods of crop-rotation and marling of the soil, were widely practised and connected to the sharp rise in enclosure acts in the period 1760–1810. The wealth to be made from farming, especially with a growing population and the years of scarcity during the French and Napoleonic wars, led to increased interest in improved techniques for agriculture, and the formation of the Board of Agriculture (1793) is symptomatic of this keener appreciation of agrarian matters. But did this constitute a ‘revolution’? This is a matter of debate, and definition, for much of it was gradual and long-term, and in many areas old traditions and old-fashioned practices lingered on.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. The notion of an eighteenth-century ‘Agricultural Revolution’ has been challenged in recent years on two principal grounds: first, that the long period of agricultural improvement dates back to the middle of the seventeenth century, with evidence of advances in animal feeding, fertilisation, more effective methods of crop-growing, some of them popularised by the Royal Society. Second, many of the improvements over the later seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were slowly disseminated, loosely connected and often resisted, which must qualify, if not sabotage, the notion of a ‘revolution’.

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.

**41 Why did the population of Britain grow so rapidly in the course of the eighteenth century?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is on identifying the reasons for the rapid population growth in eighteenth-century Britain. Population growth was in fact sluggish until mid-century when there was a rapid and accelerating growth, though not evenly across Britain, with Scotland lagging behind England, which in turn did not match the percentage growth in Wales or Ireland. The key reason for growth was a decline in the death rate, which in turn can be explained by a host of factors. Among them are improved midwifery (the product of the Edinburgh school of medicine), the foundation of lying-in hospitals and orphanages, improved nutrition, better standards of domestic hygiene, the spread of inoculation against smallpox. The growth of towns was followed, by the end of the century, by the growth of activity by local authorities, which helped combat diseases of filth and the provision of water, so that in the 1790s for the first time the birth-rate in London passed the death rate.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. Wrigley and Schofield have seen the population surge as a result of both increasing birth-rate and lowering death-rate, but the former has been challenged as less demonstrable than the latter. The various explanations behind the decline in the death-rate need ranking in terms of their importance, which could be given slightly different chronological emphases – urban improvement, for example, was very much a feature of the end of the eighteenth 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.

**42 Assess the role of women in eighteenth-century society.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – that is, an assessment of women’s roles in eighteenth-century society. The prime context here is the theory of patriarchy, which regarded women as inferior to men, and largely confined to the household – as daughters, wives, mothers and servants, important roles nevertheless, since the family was regarded as the basic unit of society. Married women also possessed few legal rights. Nevertheless, the practice of patriarchy was rather different from the theory, and women who were widows, or prosperous, or members of the aristocracy, could become important independent figures – such as the Duchess of Marlborough’s roles at court and in local politics, the Countess of Huntingdon’s contribution to Methodism, or the literary work of Mary Astell, Mary Wollstonecraft and others. The woman engaged in business, such as printing, was also a feature of eighteenth-century society. Some were widows, but others remarried yet retained control over their commercial activities.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. There is plenty of scope here to approach the question from a number of different angles, but whatever themes are addressed, the emphasis should be on assessment rather than mere description. One way forward would be to consider elements of continuity and change: while there was nothing new about the theory of patriarchy, and the compromises that accompanied its observance, the context in which women operated was changing: thus regular parliaments and elections gave some aristocratic women such as the duchess of Marlborough the chance to be influential electoral agents, while the shift from an agrarian to a commercial if not proto-industrial economy saw more women involved as independent operators in business.

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.





UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/01C**

Paper 1c British History Outlines 1689–2000

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN PAPER

**2 hours 15 minutes**

---

**READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST**

Answer **three** questions, which must be chosen from **at least two** sections of the paper.

All questions in this paper carry equal marks.

You are reminded of the need for analysis and critical evaluation in your answers to questions. You should also show, where appropriate, an awareness of links and comparisons between different countries and different periods.

---

This document consists of **6** printed pages.



**Section 1: 1689–1760**

- 1 To what extent, and why, was there a redefinition of the powers of the Crown in the period 1689–1714?
- 2 Account for the emergence of Britain as a great power in the period 1689–1714.
- 3 How seriously did the Jacobite rebellions of 1715 and 1745 threaten the Hanoverian regime?
- 4 ‘Walpole’s long tenure of office depended entirely upon his control of Parliament.’ How accurate is this view?
- 5 ‘A personal triumph for the elder Pitt.’ How valid is this judgement on the conduct and outcome of the Seven Years War?

**Section 2: 1760–1815**

- 6 How successful was George III in his attempts to assert the powers of the Crown in the period 1760–84?
- 7 To what extent does the popularity of the campaigns of John Wilkes and Christopher Wyvill suggest that the British political system was ‘fundamentally corrupt’ in the period 1760–1783?
- 8 Why did Britain lose the American War of Independence?
- 9 ‘The most constructive period of Pitt the Younger’s premiership was over by 1789.’ Discuss.
- 10 Why was Britain able to sustain such a long and ultimately successful conflict against France in the period 1793–1815?

**Section 3: Themes 1689–c. 1815**

- 11 Why did interest in scientific enquiry flourish in later seventeenth-century Britain?
- 12 Assess the importance of the role played by the gentry in the political, economic and social life of England in the eighteenth century.
- 13 How is the growth of Methodism in the eighteenth century best explained?
- 14 How appropriate is the term 'revolution' in describing the changes in British agriculture in the eighteenth century?
- 15 Why did the population of Britain grow so rapidly in the course of the eighteenth century?
- 16 Assess the role of women in eighteenth-century society.

**Section 4: 1815–1868**

- 17 How successful was British foreign policy in the period 1812–1827?
- 18 How important were economic circumstances in determining the fortunes of Lord Liverpool's ministries from 1815 to 1827?
- 19 'Reluctant reformers enacting limited reforms.' Discuss this verdict on the Whigs in the period 1830–1841.
- 20 'To dismiss the Chartist movement as mere hunger politics is to underestimate the breadth and depth of its political support.' How valid is this judgement?
- 21 How successful a Prime Minister was Peel?

### Section 5: 1868–1914

**22** *(Candidates offering Paper 5h: Gladstone and Disraeli should not answer this question.)*

‘Necessary but unpopular.’ Discuss this verdict on the domestic and foreign policies of Gladstone’s First Ministry.

**23** *(Candidates offering Paper 5h: Gladstone and Disraeli should not answer this question.)*

How is the term ‘Disraelian Conservatism’ best understood?

**24** Explain the principles guiding the conduct of British foreign policy towards Europe in the period 1886–1905.

**25** Assess the importance of the contribution of Lord Salisbury to the success of the Conservative Party in the period 1886–1902.

**26** How is the term ‘New Liberalism’ best explained?

### Section 6: Themes c. 1815–c. 1914

**27** How great a threat to the British control of Ireland was the growth of Irish nationalism in the period c. 1850–1914?

**28** ‘The industrialisation of Britain between 1815 and 1850 lowered the standard of living for urban workers.’ How far do you agree with this view?

**29** How convincing is the argument that the Oxford Movement ‘revitalised’ the Church of England?

**30** *(Candidates offering Paper 5i: The Campaign for Female Suffrage should not answer this question.)*

How far did the role of women in British society change in the period 1867–1914?

**31** How successful was the British economy in the years from 1880 to 1914?

**32** How are the changing fortunes of trade unions in the period c. 1880–1914 best explained?

**Section 7: 1914–1951**

- 33 To what extent, and in what ways, did the First World War change British society?
- 34 How substantial was the progress made by the Labour Party in the period 1918–1931?
- 35 Explain and assess the extent of Britain's changing attitudes and policies towards Indian nationalism in the period 1918–1947.
- 36 Why did Britain go to war in 1939?
- 37 How significant were the social and welfare reforms of the Attlee governments, 1945–1951?

**Section 8: 1951–2005**

- 38 Assess the importance of Britain's role in the development of the Cold War in the period 1951–1979.
- 39 How successful were Conservative social and economic policies in the period 1951–1964?
- 40 How far has the success of the premiership of Harold Wilson (1964–70, 1974–6) been underestimated?
- 41 What did Margaret Thatcher stand for as Conservative leader and Prime Minister?
- 42 Account for the electoral success of 'New Labour'.

**Section 9: Themes c. 1914–2000**

- 43** 'Immigration into Britain after the Second World War produced unmanageable racial tensions.' How far do you agree with this view?
- 44** How far did the role and status of women change in the period 1914–68?
- 45** Assess the impact of educational changes in the period 1945–1990.
- 46** Why did the British economy experience so many problems in the period 1951–1989?
- 47** How accurate is the view that the 1960s and 1970s represented a period of 'massive cultural change'?
- 48** 'Powerful in the 1960s and 1970s; powerless in the 1980s and 1990s.' Discuss this view of the trade unions.

---

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

University of Cambridge International Examinations is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/01C**

Paper 1c British History Outlines 1689–2000

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

**2 hours 15 minutes**

---

**MAXIMUM MARK: 90**

---

This document consists of **66** printed pages.



**Section 1: 1689–1760****1 To what extent, and why, was there a redefinition of the powers of the Crown in the period 1689–1714?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, namely the extent of, and reasons for, an alteration of crown powers under William III, Mary II and Anne. The obvious starting-point are the limitations posed on the Crown in the revolution settlements of 1689 (the Declaration of Rights in England, and the Claim of Right in Scotland) and the concessions granted by the Crown thereafter, notably the Triennial Act (1694), the Place Bills (1694–1701) and the Act of Settlement (1701), which determined the succession through parliament and guaranteed MPs' consent over war in defence of continental possessions of a foreign prince. These changes were largely driven by the need for the Crown to finance large-scale continental war for most of the period 1689–1713, which resulted in annual meetings of parliament, concessions from the Crown over some of its prerogatives, in return for extra revenue, as well as fears from MPs of the Crown extending its executive powers. This redefinition might well be described as limited monarchy, or government through king-in-parliament, a significant change from politics before 1689, although the Crown retained very extensive powers and initiatives in and outside parliament.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. There is a case here for distinguishing between the conservative settlement of 1689 and the changes of the 1690s, stimulated by William's style of government and the burdens of war. Nevertheless, 1689 did end the possibility of royal absolutism through a packed parliament. The exact nature of the 'limited' monarchy which emerged can be debated with reference not just to legislative concessions by the Crown, and its relationship with the operation of party politics, but also its own extensive patronage within parliament (bishops, placemen etc.).

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.

## 2 Account for the emergence of Britain as a great power in the period 1689–1714.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is on the reasons why Britain became a great power between 1689 and 1714. Some working definition of ‘great power’ should be stated or should develop in the course of the answer, in terms of Britain’s weight as a military, commercial and imperial player, confirmed by the terms of the Peace of Utrecht in 1713. Wars of 1689–97 and 1702–13 were the midwife of Britain’s changing status, and what made the coalitions and victories on land and sea possible was in part the leadership of figures such as William III and Marlborough, but fundamentally the underpinning of the war effort through parliamentary revenue and the financial revolution of the creation of the National Debt, and of the Bank of England to manage it. Political support at home for the high price of these wars was also vital: wars were defended as necessary to see off the Jacobite threat, protect Protestantism at home and abroad, and, especially in the origins of the renewal of war in 1702, to safeguard and advance British commercial interests.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. There are several competing explanations here, which need sorting and ranking, with the financial arrangements established through annual sittings of parliament perhaps the most important. Whether Britain was a Great Power by 1697 or not until 1713 is worth considering. Certainly the balance sheet at Utrecht points to Britain’s dominance as a great power, and Britain’s overseas acquisitions such as Newfoundland underlined her recognised status as a great power on a global scale.

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.

### 3 How seriously did the Jacobite rebellions of 1715 and 1745 threaten the Hanoverian regime?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is the seriousness of the Jacobite threat in 1715 and 1745. Both rebellions represented a threat to the Hanoverian regime, but the more serious was that of 1715: the new Hanoverian dynasty was barely established, with discontent in England and national restiveness in Scotland, fuelled by opposition to the Act of Union of 1707. The uprising in both Scotland and northern England caught the government off-guard. On the other hand, there was poor leadership from Mar, inadequate co-ordination between English, Scottish and exiled Jacobites, and no significant foreign support. While this is clear in retrospect, the government took the matter extremely seriously, sending 8000 Dutch troops to England and Scotland. The rising of 1745 did not have the same groundswell of support in Scotland, though it did have some modest French military backing, and its limited success owed much to the charismatic leadership of the Young Pretender. While the Jacobite army did reach Derby by December 1745, crucially it failed to enlist significant English support, and amid acrimony in the high command retired back to Scotland, to be annihilated at Culloden.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. Answers may well treat the two rebellions in turn, but there is the opportunity here for contrasting the threat represented by each. Despite the Jacobite army getting so close to London in 1745, the English remained hostile or indifferent, in contrast to the 1715 uprising. Arguably the '15 had the potential to topple the Hanoverian regime, at least in Scotland, but poor organisation, and the failure to seize the political or military initiative meant that the ill-prepared government in London was able to rally its forces and re-impose its authority.

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.

**4 'Walpole's long tenure of office depended entirely upon his control of Parliament.'  
How accurate is this view?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, namely the accuracy of the view that Walpole's tenure depended entirely on parliamentary control. Walpole's parliamentary management is clearly important and needs a full assessment: not just in his manipulation of patronage to build up a phalanx of followers in the Lords, as well as in the Commons, but also his personal involvement in the workings of the Commons. He recognised the importance of remaining a member of the Commons and worked hard to win the respect and support of Whig backbenchers and pursue policies that they would endorse. Just as significant was the support he received from the Crown and from Queen Caroline and he was very much at home in the Hanoverian court. Walpole's personal abilities as an outstanding politician, in court and Parliament, also count for much. So too did the stability he helped to further, with the recovery of trade, low taxation and a pacific foreign policy which were broadly popular in and outside parliament. A key to his success was the ability to win elections as well as control parliament when it met. Though he was attacked in journals like *The Craftsman*, there was also a pro-Walpolean press. He took advantage of existing trends – the weaknesses of the opposition, the disarray of the Tories, their association with Jacobitism, the Septennial Act, and the refusal of George I and II to trust the Tories – not simply to acquire office, but then to consolidate his grip on power.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. The precise significance of Walpole's parliamentary control is central to this question, and it could be argued that more vital still was his dominant role in both court and Parliament. The contemporary charge of corruption is important here, but so too the broader context of politics in which Walpole worked – the attitude of the Crown, the nature of the opposition to Walpole, the policies he pursued. The reasons for his fall help throw light on why he had survived for so long, in particular the revival of opposition in the later 1730s (among his opponents was Frederick, Prince of Wales) and the decision to go to war, which by 1741 was going badly and damaged his standing outside parliament, which led to a loss of control within it.

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.

**5 'A personal triumph for the elder Pitt.' How valid is this judgement on the conduct and outcome of the Seven Years War?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is, on Pitt's personal responsibility for the conduct and outcome of the Seven Years War. Clearly Pitt contributed a good deal as an inspired wartime leader, with a grasp of the global scope of the struggle against France, shown in his support for Frederick the Great, which tied down French troops in Europe, and his foresight in ordering the blockade of French ports in 1757–8 to prevent enemy reinforcements being sent to North America. He was also a willing patron of a group of outstanding military and naval commanders (Amherst, Wolfe, Hawke, Rodney). But Pitt owed much to Newcastle, who helped to organise the financing of the army in Germany and North America, and ensured that George II remained a strong supporter. Anson was also a key figure at the Admiralty. Pitt was also able to benefit from the absence of parliamentary opposition at home, from British naval strength which had been built up over several decades, and abroad from Spanish neutrality and the military prowess of Frederick the Great. So victories in the Seven Years War were not just Pitt's personal triumph. Nor was its outcome: Pitt fell from power in October 1761, and was an outspoken critic of the Peace of Paris, which he regarded as far too generous to the French and Spanish.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. The traditional view of Pitt's heroism and genius has been revised in recent years, and the challenge here is to give credit to Pitt's own contribution, while acknowledging the role of others (politicians, military commanders and allies) and the influence of external factors, such as British naval power and Spanish neutrality. Pitt's own imperial vision was a *post hoc* rationalisation after he left office. Rather, credit should go to his leadership and dogged determination to push for victory across several continents.

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.

**Section 2: 1760–1815****6 How successful was George III in his attempts to assert the powers of the Crown in the period 1760–84?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is the success of George III's attempts to assert the powers of the crown. The character of that attempt needs establishing, before its success can be assessed. George III was determined to use his prerogative powers to appoint ministers of talent, regardless of party, and free the monarchy and constitution from the allegedly corrupt great Whig ministers who had dominated politics for so long. More broadly, George III saw himself as an active monarch, interested in the minutiae of government, and rather self-consciously a parliamentary monarch. Thus he supported the American War of Independence on the grounds that the colonial rebels were defying the British parliament's right to legislate in the colonies. George had some success and reversals: the five short-lived ministries of the 1760s were largely the result of George's inexperienced interventions, but with North (1770–82) George found a reliable minister he could trust and took more of a backseat. In 1783 the King dismissed the Fox-North coalition, although it had a parliamentary majority, and his decision was vindicated by the general election result of 1784, when Pitt the Younger, the King's choice, won a majority of over 100. Overall, then, George III enjoyed mixed success in asserting the powers of the crown.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. Some nineteenth-century historians suggested that George III was attempting to establish an unconstitutional or arbitrary government, but this has been convincingly refuted. George III was determined to make his mark on politics, but in defence not defiance of his understanding of the constitution. Stronger answers may well draw comparisons and contrasts with the role of George II, who could intervene and embarrass his ministers on church or military appointments, but was content to co-operate with successive Whig administrations.

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.

**7 To what extent does the popularity of the campaigns of John Wilkes and Christopher Wyvill suggest that the British political system was 'fundamentally corrupt' in the period 1760–1783?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is on the extent to which the popularity of Wilkes and Wyvill's campaigns suggest that the British political system was fundamentally corrupt. Wilkes championed liberty and had some success in clipping back the authority and secrecy of the executive and legislature, for example with general warrants being declared illegal (1765) and freedom of the press upheld (1771). Wilkes' expulsion from Parliament and his imprisonment were seen as tyranny, but legally both MPs and the government were within their rights, even if they acted with political folly and gave opportunities for Wilkes to exploit. That Wilkes was freed from prison since it violated his privileges as a MP, and his repeated re-election, implies that 'corruption' was only one characteristic of the British political system, but his campaigns did suggest that government and Commons were a self-interested oligarchy. His popularity also derives from his self-fashioning as a national popular politician, addressing the mass of the people at a time of growing literacy, wealth and political awareness among the middling sorts. Wilkes himself had no political programme as such, and only as late as 1769 did he become associated with parliamentary reform. Wyvill's petitioning campaign was based on old accusations of ministerial corruption and incompetence, as the explanation for failure in the American war, and aimed at reducing the power of the executive over Parliament. The fact that the campaign was taken up by some MPs suggests that the political system was not wholly or 'fundamentally' corrupt. As North pointed out in 1783, his ministry's fall showed that parliament was susceptible to public opinion.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. There needs to be a balanced treatment of both Wilkes' and Wyvill's campaigns, and some sense of their differences as well as similarities. 'Corruption' is a matter of definition, though candidates may note long-standing fears of this reaching back to the early part of the century; the charge of 'fundamental' corruption seems an exaggeration, not least given the prominence and persistence of, and minor victories for, both campaigners.

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.

## 8 Why did Britain lose the American War of Independence?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is on the reasons why Britain lost the American War of Independence. One was the logistical problems of fighting a war 3000 miles away, with slow communications, on irregular and unfamiliar terrain against a superior number of colonial adversaries who used guerrilla warfare very effectively; another would be the colonists' alliance with France and Spain (1778–9), which turned the conflict into a global war, with the English channel, for example, having to be protected from the threat of invasion. Inadequate political leadership, principally by North, is another reason; to which one could add the failure to seize the initiative, both politically and militarily, at the beginning of the war, and to exploit the local militias and the considerable body of loyalists.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. The various explanations here need ranking in importance, and several could be combined to argue that Britain lost because its resources were overstretched. The traditional view that North was a poor wartime leader has been recently questioned, and he had some able subordinates including Admiral Lord Sandwich and Lord George Germain. It is possible to identify turning-points, notably defeat at Saratoga, which meant that a long and expensive war was necessary for British success, and the military alliances of America with France and Spain. The fact that Britain could win victories (saving Canada, holding New York, and winning All Saints) indicates that the battlefield was not necessarily the key determinant of the eventual outcome.

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.

**9 'The most constructive period of Pitt the Younger's premiership was over by 1789.' Discuss.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is on identifying the most constructive period of Pitt's premiership, almost unbroken from 1784–1806. The case for 1784–8 being 'the most constructive' rests on his successful measures for national economic recovery and modest administrative reform, including the India Act (1784), the Consolidation Act (1787), a commercial treaty with France (1786), and the reduction of the national debt and government spending. Equally, there were defeats, such as over parliamentary reforms and Irish manufactures (1785). After 1789, or more correctly from 1792–3, Pitt was involved in the military struggle against Revolutionary and Napoleonic France, and repressed reformers, pro-Jacobin groups and trade unions at home, and framed the Act of Union (1800) with Ireland, following the Irish rebellion of 1798. By his death in 1806, the war was not won, even though Trafalgar (1805) had given the British supremacy at sea. Yet it could be argued that after 1792–3 Pitt adapted to new challenges, and devised 'constructive' methods to sustain a successful series of wars – through repression at home, which enjoyed the support of a significant section of the population, through the introduction of income tax (1799) and diplomatically through the construction of coalitions against France.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. Candidates' answers need to range widely, across the period after as well as before 1789, and may consider that Pitt was equally constructive in both periods, the difference being between a peacetime leader and a war leader achieving, initially at least, little success and not living to see final victory. Again, it could be argued that the challenges after 1789 were the greater and needed more constructive solutions than the situation facing him on taking office in December 1783.

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.

**10 Why was Britain able to sustain such a long and ultimately successful conflict against France in the period 1793–1815?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, namely the reasons that Britain was able to sustain over twenty years of almost unbroken conflict with France. One major explanation is the manpower Britain could draw on, mobilising as many men as France with a population half its size. The British navy was immensely strong, and growing in size during these 20 years, and able to protect trade, defend the country and, by 1805, enjoy supremacy on the high seas. The war effort was also underpinned by the growing economic power of Britain, in the early stages of the Industrial Revolution, with increases in, for example, iron production and shipbuilding. The economic damage of the Orders in Council (1807) was reversed by the government in 1812 and business thereafter boomed. Agriculture was also prospering, which helped finance a prodigiously expensive war, including subsidies to continental allies. The high cost of war in money, men and materials was politically acceptable because of the threats revolutionary and then Napoleonic France posed to British political values and commercial interests; Britain found allies (often ineffectual) abroad and helped form successive coalitions against France. Individual leaders (Pitt, Nelson, Wellington) and the unpopularity of Napoleon also helped to sustain support for war during this protracted struggle.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. The various explanations here need ranking in importance, and the connections between economic strength, manpower and the costs of war invite careful analysis. Equally, there is a danger of privileging structural explanations over the impact of events and personalities. Thus Napoleon's restless ambition helped Britain recruit allies, and his mistakes (such as the Russian campaign) contributed to the eventual allied success.

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.

### Section 3: Themes c. 1689–1815

#### 11 Why did interest in scientific enquiry flourish in later seventeenth-century Britain?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is on the reasons why scientific enquiry flourished in later seventeenth-century Britain. Part of the explanation must be the increasingly lively interest in science in and beyond the universities from the 1650s, led by figures of European stature such as Boyle, Hooke and Newton, several of whom turned to science as a refuge from religious and political controversy of the Interregnum, but also built on the advances in Baconian science in the first half of the century. A second explanation would be institutional and social, notably with the foundation of the Royal Society (1662), with its regular meetings, house journal (*Philosophical Transactions*) and the cult of the ‘virtuosi’ who took a fashionable but amateur interest in science. While it is easy to ridicule the unsystematic and sometimes Heath-Robinson contributions of ‘virtuosi’, their existence demonstrates how a scientific approach – of rational enquiry, and concentration on mechanical rather than occult causes – had entered the intellectual mainstream in post-Restoration Britain: put another way, science after 1660 was added to the gentry’s customary literary, antiquarian and topographical interests. They were reassured by leading practitioners that scientific enquiry did not undermine traditional religion, but instead uncovered the wonders of God’s creation.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. There is an opportunity here to discuss the timing and genesis of the Scientific Revolution, and whether or not it was the product of the Puritan Revolution of the 1640s–50s. The forms of ‘scientific enquiry’ could also be addressed, ranging from Cambridge’s expertise in the biological sciences, Oxford’s in the physical sciences, and the more practical ‘science’ of the virtuosi. Its tenuous links with technological improvement are also significant: the high level of ‘interest’ was not always matched by technological advances.

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.

**12 Assess the importance of the role played by the gentry in the political, economic and social life of England in the eighteenth century.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, namely the importance of the gentry's role in English political, economic and social life. All three aspects need to be tackled, though comprehensiveness can hardly be expected. Some working definition of gentility needs to be provided, or to emerge in the body of the answer, which might include changing contemporary notions of gentle status, as the term was broadened over the century, even to include 'pseudo-gentility'. Politically, the gentry dominated the House of Commons, and were key agents in local government, as magistrates and deputy-lieutenants. Their number, wealth and influence made them central figures in the political process. As for economy, gentry contributed significantly to agricultural improvement (most famously Jethro Tull's invention of the seed drill and horse-hoe, and Robert Bakewell's breeding of livestock), and though established gentry played a lesser role in industrial development, successful entrepreneurs (such as Sir Richard Arkwright) and city merchants (Sir Gilbert Heathcote) were eventually absorbed into their ranks. Socially, gentry were patrons of the London season, and participated in the renaissance of urban social life at York, Norwich, Bath and elsewhere; their literary tastes were addressed in a burgeoning print culture, most famously *The Spectator*, established to record the discussions of a 'society of gentlemen'.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, the fluidity of notions of gentility needs consideration, with an eye to upward social mobility, and also to the overlapping worlds of aristocracy and greater gentry. The question's focus on 'importance' will allow candidates to weigh the respective contributions of the gentry in these three spheres of activity, and perhaps to distinguish between the rather different contribution of 'greater' and 'parochial' gentry.

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.

### 13 How is the growth of Methodism in the eighteenth century best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is on the reasons for Methodism's growth from the 1730s to about 1800. Its origins lie in the 'Great Awakening', that Protestant revival evident across Europe and North America, and the movement took advantage of the pastoral shortcomings of the established Church, especially in large and dispersed parishes in England and Wales; its popularity derived from its charismatic leadership, notably John Wesley and George Whitefield; from its methods, such as itinerant preaching, love feasts, hymn-singing and watch-nights, offering powerful religious and supernaturalist experiences; its structure, with lay men and women acting as class leaders and preachers; and its message, especially Wesley's Arminianism, that Christ had died for all. Its appeal was particularly to women, the young, and skilled artisans and servants.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. The various explanations for the growth of Methodism need sorting and ranking; the weaknesses of Anglicanism can only take us so far, and some candidates may note that the Church of England was itself addressing these deficiencies, and it is not clear that they were any worse than fifty years before. The traditional view that Methodism was a response to economic crisis has now been challenged, and its appearance at the height of Whig anti-clericalism is a more plausible association. Methodist membership has also been debated, and it is now clear that it especially appealed to servants and artisans rather than the very poor.

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.

**14 How appropriate is the term ‘revolution’ in describing the changes in British agriculture in the eighteenth century?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, namely the aptness of ‘revolution’ to describe agriculture change in eighteenth-century Britain. Certainly there are plenty of signs of agricultural improvement over the century: Jethro Tull’s seed drill, Robert Bakewell’s improvement of the size and shape of livestock, Coke of Holkham’s popularising of methods of crop-rotation and marling of the soil, were widely practised and connected to the sharp rise in enclosure acts in the period 1760–1810. The wealth to be made from farming, especially with a growing population and the years of scarcity during the French and Napoleonic wars, led to increased interest in improved techniques for agriculture, and the formation of the Board of Agriculture (1793) is symptomatic of this keener appreciation of agrarian matters. But did this constitute a ‘revolution’? This is a matter of debate, and definition, for much of it was gradual and long-term, and in many areas old traditions and old-fashioned practices lingered on.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. The notion of an eighteenth-century ‘Agricultural Revolution’ has been challenged in recent years on two principal grounds: first, that the long period of agricultural improvement dates back to the middle of the seventeenth century, with evidence of advances in animal feeding, fertilisation, more effective methods of crop-growing, some of them popularised by the Royal Society. Second, many of the improvements over the later seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were slowly disseminated, loosely connected and often resisted, which must qualify, if not sabotage, the notion of a ‘revolution’.

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.

**15 Why did the population of Britain grow so rapidly in the course of the eighteenth century?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is on identifying the reasons for the rapid population growth in eighteenth-century Britain. Population growth was in fact sluggish until mid-century when there was a rapid and accelerating growth, though not evenly across Britain, with Scotland lagging behind England, which in turn did not match the percentage growth in Wales or Ireland. The key reason for growth was a decline in the death rate, which in turn can be explained by a host of factors. Among them are improved midwifery, the product of the Edinburgh school of medicine, the foundation of lying-in hospitals and orphanages, improved nutrition, better standards of domestic hygiene, the spread of inoculation against smallpox. The growth of towns was followed, by the end of the century, by the growth of activity by local authorities, which helped combat diseases of filth and the provision of water, so that in the 1790s for the first time the birth-rate in London passed the death rate.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. Wrigley and Schofield have seen the population surge as a result of both increasing birth rate and lowering death rate, but the former has been challenged as less demonstrable than the latter. The various explanations behind the decline in the death rate need ranking in terms of their importance, which could be given slightly different chronological emphases – urban improvement, for example, was very much a feature of the end of the eighteenth 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.

**16 Assess the role of women in eighteenth-century society.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is an assessment of women's roles in eighteenth-century society. The prime context here is the theory of patriarchy, which regarded women as inferior to men, and whose roles were largely confined to the household – as daughters, wives, mothers and servants, important roles nevertheless, since the family was regarded as the basic unit of society. Married women also possessed few legal rights. Nevertheless, the practice of patriarchy was rather different from the theory, and women who were widows, or prosperous, or members of the aristocracy could become important independent figures – such as the Duchess of Marlborough's roles at court and in local politics, the Countess of Huntingdon's contribution to Methodism, or the literary work of Mary Astell, Mary Wollstonecraft and others. The woman engaged in business, such as printing, was also a feature of eighteenth-century society. Some were widows, but others remarried but retained control over their commercial activities.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. There is plenty of scope here to approach the question from a number of different angles, but whatever themes are addressed, the emphasis should be on assessment rather than mere description. One way forward to consider elements of continuity and change: while there was nothing new about the theory of patriarchy, and the compromises that accompanied its observance, the context in which women operated was changing: thus regular parliaments and elections gave some aristocratic women such as the Duchess of Marlborough the chance to be influential electoral agents, while the shift from an agrarian to a commercial if not proto-industrial economy saw more women involved as independent operators in business.

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.

### Section 4: 1815–1868

#### 17 How successful was British foreign policy in the period 1812–27?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the foreign policy of the period. The focus will be on the foreign policy of Castlereagh, to his death in 1822, and of Canning thereafter. The ‘successes’ should not be articulated merely as a narrative, although candidates should be aware that Castlereagh’s diplomacy was concerned largely with the ‘Concert of Europe’ whereas Canning’s concerns in the 1820s were with developments in the Americas as well as Europe. Key issues which candidates are likely to draw on are: the Congress of Vienna and the Second Peace of Paris (1815) and Britain’s gains in it; the increasingly divergent view taken by Castlereagh and other European monarchs or emperors, especially Tsar Alexander I, of the best way to secure peace and harmony; Castlereagh’s State Paper of 1820; the Congress of Troppau (1820) which made the different perspectives plain; the Congress of Verona (1822), where Wellington, rather than the new foreign secretary, represented Britain; recognising independence of Buenos Aires, Mexico and Colombia (1824); Canning’s attitude to Spanish and French involvement in Portuguese affairs – his sending of troops to Lisbon to preserve ‘liberal constitution’; diplomacy over Greek independence, ending with 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 judgment about the degree of success of British foreign policy within the stated period. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, many will be aware of the extent to which the old view of Castlereagh as an enthusiastic ‘involver’ of Britain in European diplomacy and Canning as someone much more interested in ‘nations struggling to be free’ has been modified. Many candidates will see Congress Diplomacy as primarily Castlereagh’s achievement and note that, one way and another, it preserved the peace of Europe for 40 years and so might be considered a major success (especially after the frequent conflicts of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries). Against that, Congress Diplomacy could be seen as having been hi-jacked by autocratic rulers and, in failing to develop as Castlereagh wished, a failure at least in some ways. On Canning, many will concentrate on his recognition of newly-independent South American states and see this as a crucial bridgehead in expanding Britain’s informal commercial empire. Perhaps also the objective of curbing US expansionism in the south might receive a mention. However, consideration of the success of Canning’s European diplomacy, perhaps particularly in respect of Greek nationalist aspirations and of Portugal, is also relevant and should be included in a balanced discussion. Some will see this period as critical in the emergence of a world-wide British empire and thus successful in helping to develop a successful market for the import of raw materials and the export of British manufactured goods. Strong candidates will see that any coherent evaluation of success requires an articulation of British foreign policy objectives. In doing so, they are likely to light on European security, expansion and defence of British overseas territories and the promotion of greater freedom of trade, from which Britain stood to benefit. Discussions which evaluate the relative importance of policy in respect of these are likely to be particularly well rewarded. Candidates are required to reach a substantiated judgment on a question which focuses on the extent of success.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

## 18 How important were economic circumstances in determining the fortunes of Lord Liverpool's ministries from 1815 to 1827?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The focus will be on the period from 1815–27 but, since Liverpool became prime minister in 1812, reference to 1812–15 is allowable on grounds of overall coherence, although it should not be expected. The 'fortunes' should not be articulated merely as a narrative, although candidates should be aware that the ministry was under pressure. Key issues which candidates are likely to draw on are: the problematic adjustment to peace in the years 1815–20, including the perceived burden of taxation; government deficits; the challenge of extra-parliamentary radicalism, including Spa Fields, Peterloo and the use made of George IV's attempts to divorce his wife. In the period from 1821 candidates are likely to use knowledge of: economic expansion, especially in the textile districts, as the industrial revolution entered a period of 'boom'; the banking crisis of 1825–26; the weakness of the Whigs, especially after the Grenvillites threw in their lot with Liverpool; the religious question, especially over proposals to extend political rights of Roman Catholics and Dissenters. Expect knowledge also of Liverpool's virtues – and deficiencies – as a political leader.

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 judgment about the relative importance of one factor in explaining a broader development. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, many will be aware of the – perhaps illusory – distinction between a 'reactionary' and a 'reformist' phase and how historians have debated this. Candidates might use knowledge of growing government deficits and the increased burden of indirect taxation as a contributory factor to the problems faced 'out of doors' in the years 1815–20. This might be contrasted with the generally more benign and expansionist economy of the 1820s. On 'How important...' specifically, strong responses will evaluate the relative importance of economic circumstances in the broader context. Expect comment also on growing tensions over religious liberties (especially the emancipation question) and on the extent to which the Whigs were capable of mounting an effective challenge to the government. Such discussion is crucially to reaching a substantiated judgment on a question which focuses on the relative importance of one selected factor.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

**19 'Reluctant reformers enacting limited reforms.' Discuss this verdict on the Whigs in the period 1830–41.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge over the entire period. The focus of many candidates will be on parliamentary reform in the years 1830–32 but it is important that there be some balance of treatment. Thus, candidates should know about a range of reforms after 1832. Other key areas which candidates are likely to draw on are: the reform of the poor law (1834); municipal corporations reform (1835) and the emergence of more representative government in Britain's towns; Irish church reform (including 'appropriation of clerical income' which led to the resignation of Stanley); English church reform, including tithes, attempts to deal with pluralism and discrepancies in clerical income; education – the first state grants and the formation of the Committee of the Privy Council on education. Good candidates should be aware that many reforms of the period (the abolition of slavery not least) have much more to do with private members' pressure than with Whig policy.

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 judgment about a contentious historical hypothesis. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some may be aware of discussions about whether this can truly be considered as a 'decade of reform'. Equally it is possible to draw on recent work to evaluate both on Grey's objectives in 1830–32 and on how 'conservative' Melbourne's prime ministership was. Good candidates will see that two judgments need to be reached: both on whether the Whigs were 'reluctant reformers' and on whether the reforms enacted were indeed 'limited'. It is not difficult to discern keener parliamentary reformers (Russell, Grey etc.) than others (Melbourne, Palmerston). Some candidates might make the important caveat that not all members of the Grey government considered themselves 'Whigs' at all. It may be more difficult to judge that the Whigs were 'reluctant' to reform the poor law (and thus save ratepayers' money) or to embark on church reform (and thus preserve the established church from damaging radical attacks). Both of these areas saw a great deal of cross-party support. This question requires critical and informed engagement with a contentious quotation and strong candidates should both see and address both of its contentions.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

**20 'To dismiss the Chartist movement as mere hunger politics is to underestimate the breadth and depth of its political support.' How valid is this judgment?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge over the period of Chartist activity. Most will concentrate on the period 1838–48 and this is acceptable. Candidates should know about: Chartism as 'hunger politics' since its mass support coincided with periods of economic depression (1838–9, 1841–2, 1847–8); impact of unemployment and of pressure on real wages; origins of movement in reaction to Great Reform Act; extent of support in both London and old craft centres on the one hand, and in newer industrial towns on the other; 'breadth' of support suggests geographical range and Chartism could be seen as a national movement, at least in terms of urban support; 'depth' might suggest mass support in some areas and also 'depth' in terms of long-held objectives which go back before 1838 (indeed 1832) but which coalesce in Chartism as the strongest-supported radical movement of the period (indeed, of the nineteenth century); Chartism as overwhelmingly a working-class movement.

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 judgment about a contentious historical hypothesis. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some may be aware of recent debates which emphasise that Chartism was a political movement and that 'hunger politics' represent an inadequate explanation of the phenomenon. If arguing that hunger politics was dominant, candidates will probably wish to note that the movement was only a threat to the authorities during times of economic hardship and, indeed, that Peel's economic policies were directed in significant measure to lancing this particular boil. Chartist leaders frequently noted how rapidly mass support melted away when 'trade' improved and employment was easier to gain and to keep. On 'depth' of support, candidates might wish to draw attention to the phenomenon of mass meetings as a means of putting pressure on the authorities and on the extent to which working people felt 'betrayed' by 1832, with the strengthening of the institution of property. Chartism as a 'class movement' might be one way into arguing about the depth of support, though others could suggest that the falling away of middle-class support (such as it was) after the first convention is an indication that Chartism lacked requisite 'depth' of support. On 'breadth', some will wish to note that Chartism is a genuinely 'national' movement, and, arguably, the first extra-parliamentary movement of modern times not to be dominated by leadership from London. It is on 'breadth' that strong candidates might be able to make use of their material on Chartist leadership, since leaders were able to establish an effective network of pressure and made speeches to 'the mass platform' in a very large number of towns.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

## 21 How successful a Prime Minister was Peel?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge over the period of Peel's prime ministership. Thus, information about Peel before 1834 or as leader of the Tories in opposition from 1835–41 is not needed, though it may be briefly drawn upon to provide background (for example on why many Tories never trusted him after 1829). Candidates should know that Peel was prime minister twice, in 1834–5 ('Hundred Days' Ministry) and 1841–6. They should know about: Peel's first period as prime minister – no parliamentary majority and calling an election which he lost and the establishment of the Ecclesiastical Commission. In the ministry of 1841–6, the key developments chosen are likely to include: the general election of 1841 and the nature of Peel's success; financial reforms, including the budgets of 1842 and 1845 and the Bank Charter Act (1844); administrative reforms; religious reforms, especially the Maynooth Grant (1845); the movement towards free trade – sugar duties and the campaign to repeal the Corn Laws (1845–6); opposition to Peel from within his own party; the break-up of the party and Peel's resignation in 1846.

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 judgment about the effectiveness of an individual in a specific role. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some may be aware of recent interpretations which place Peel in a rather less favourable light and which give less credit to him for his victory in the election of 1841. Most candidates will seek to offer a balanced judgment with likely emphasis on the success of his financial and administrative policies contrasted against increasingly sour relations with the bulk of his party leading eventually to the break-up of that party and the absence of subsequent Conservative majorities for almost thirty years. Some might wish to discuss Peel and Ireland in the 1840s, suggesting perhaps that his intention of converting the Catholic middle classes to the value of political union was unsuccessful and that Peel did little or nothing to affect the catastrophe which was the Potato Famine. Some strong candidates might wish to set up criteria for 'successful' which enable them to argue which attributes matter most in reaching an overall judgment. Thus, they could argue that Peel governed effectively in the national interest, laying the groundwork for the economic expansion known as the 'Great Victorian Boom' and, in so doing, lancing the boil of frequent trade depressions which gave aid and comfort to political radicals. Or they could argue (as Disraeli in effect did) that a successful prime minister needs to carry his party with him and this Peel signally failed to do – thus inviting the break-up and his own loss of office. Such an argument would suggest that Peel was unsuccessful and behind the times. Since the question specifically asks 'How successful...', an 'on the one hand, political failure; on the other administrative and national success' response would meet its requirements.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

## Section 5: 1868–1914

**22 ‘Necessary but unpopular.’ Discuss this verdict on the domestic and foreign policies of Gladstone’s first Ministry.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The chronological focus here is clear and candidates must restrict their answers to the period 1868–74. In domestic policy, candidates should have knowledge of a range from: the disestablishment of the Anglican church in Ireland; Irish Land Act; the Forster Education Act; Cardwell’s Army Reforms; the University Tests Act; Trade Union and Criminal Law Amendment Act; abolition of competitive examinations for the civil service; the Secret Ballot; the Licensing Act. In foreign policy, candidates are likely to be more restricted in the material they can use. They are likely to concentrate on: the Alabama incident and US claims resulting from it; impact and implications of the Franco-Prussian war for Britain; the London Conference (1871) and Russia’s abrogation of the Black Sea Causes of the Treaty of Paris. Candidates might also wish to discuss the extent to which this administration followed Gladstone’s foreign policy precepts (which were, perhaps uncharacteristically, broadly ‘Liberal’ anyway) concerning preservation of peace; respect for national aspirations and support of liberty. Material on Ireland is properly considered as domestic policy. However, there is a case for including it as foreign policy, a view which Irish nationalists would have taken.

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 impact (or consequences) of the policies and a judgment both on ‘necessary’ and ‘unpopular’, since candidates are required to explain whether the policies were necessary and whether they were, taken as a whole, unpopular. Most candidates will present their material in two separate sections and it is reasonable to expect rather more development on domestic, than on foreign, affairs. On foreign affairs, it is difficult to argue that any of the issues were strictly ‘necessary’ since different views could have been taken of the need (or wisdom) of trying to prevent the Franco-Prussian war or of making a stand on Russia and the Black Sea. On the other hand, *some* kind of response was necessary and Gladstone proved active in foreign affairs. On lack of popularity, candidates might argue that Disraeli made much of British failures, for example, Alsace-Lorraine falling into German hands; Russia ‘getting away with’ its abrogation of the Black Sea Clauses; the payment of a substantial indemnity to the USA for damage inflicted to the Union by Confederate vessels built in Britain. Foreign policy failure does not necessarily lead to unpopularity, however, and some good candidates might wish to argue that there is little evidence of widespread unpopularity in the country – or that foreign policy was a significant cause of the Liberal defeat in the 1874 general election. On domestic affairs, candidates might wish to argue that policies in respect of Ireland were ‘necessary’ in an attempt to quieten discontent. However, the Land Act was hardly successful. The most obviously ‘unpopular’ measure will probably be identified as the Licensing Act, which allegedly deprived the working man of cheap, accessible beer and certainly served as a Conservative stick with which to beat a killjoy Liberal party. On the other hand, it was a piece of legislation which had a great deal of nonconformist support and many nonconformists were sore at what they saw as the kid-glove approach to Anglicanism under the Forster Education Act. Some strong candidates might argue that securing harmony within an increasingly fissile Liberal party was ‘necessary’ for any Liberal party leader. On the raft of administrative reforms, these might be argued to be necessary for Gladstone, who had learned the arts of efficient government at the feet of Robert Peel. They had variable impact, of course. On unpopularity, also, trade union legislation might be characterised as overly cautious and pusillanimous. There is a lot to go at in this question and criteria for ‘necessary’ will need some thought, since both ‘national’ and ‘party’ interests are in play. Very strong candidates might wish to argue that it is easy to exaggerate the overall unpopularity of the policies since Disraeli was so effective (see the ‘range of exhausted volcanoes’ speech) at

portraying a small portion of them as badly conceived and inadequately implemented. Very strong candidates will also avoid the temptation to evaluate 'success' at the expense of either 'necessity' or, especially, 'popularity'. Policies do not automatically become unpopular because the leader of the opposition says they are. That, they might wish to observe, is his job!

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

## 23 How is the term ‘Disraelian Conservatism’ best understood?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The chronological focus here need not be bounded by the Disraeli ministry of 1874–80, although many candidates will concentrate their efforts here. It is reasonable to give considerable prominence to the articulation of Conservative policies in the wake of the general election defeat of 1868. Some reference before 1868 is also permissible (perhaps in respect of Disraeli’s attempt to make the Conservatives electable again, via parliamentary reform in 1866–7), though, given the chronology of the section, this cannot be required. Candidates are likely to offer historical knowledge relating, in one way or another, to ‘bread and circuses’ – in the form of policies designed to appeal to those working people who had acquired the vote in 1867, and an active foreign and imperial policy which stressed the Conservative party as the party of ‘patriotism’. In the former case, therefore, candidates are likely to make reference to: Tory amendment of the Liberal Licensing Act (longer hours pleased brewers as well as working-class drinkers – and brewers tend to be Tory!); the 1874 Factory Act; the Artisans’ Dwelling Act; the Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act; the Sale of Food and Drugs Act; Pollution of Rivers and Merchant Shipping Acts. In the latter: Disraeli’s handling of the ‘Bulgarian Atrocities’ and the Balkan Question; relations with Russia; leading up to the Congress of Berlin; occupation of Cyprus; Victoria as Empress of India. Some candidates might also talk about economic policy which is largely characterised by continuation of the ‘liberal economics consensus’. The Disraeli of the late 1870s responding to calls for agricultural protection is not the Disraeli of 1845–6.

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 historical judgment about a key term: ‘Disraelian Conservatism’. Candidates are required to explain what they mean by the term and, in doing so, present a critical evaluation of its scope. One way of doing this would be in terms of similarity and difference. How different is ‘Disraelian Conservatism’ from Conservatism before he became leader? Is the party any less anchored to its Anglican foundations? Does its electoral focus remain in England rather than in the rest of the United Kingdom? Does its economic policy change? Some candidates might wish to argue that the main differences are presentational. In foreign policy, the Conservatives remain suspicious of Russia’s expansionist ambitions and less influenced by ‘the moral dimension’ than the Liberals. Arguably, Disraeli’s beating of the patriotic and imperialist drum does not mark a new policy, merely a more effective way of presenting basic messages. Likewise in domestic affairs, most of the ‘social legislation’ has little to do with Disraeli directly, though it does go further than Gladstone’s changes, especially in trade union matters, went. Disraelian conservatism might be seen as making an appeal to a wider constituency and, particularly, to the ‘new voters’. Other candidates might argue that Disraelian Conservatism did represent a significant break with the past because its focus was much more directly on the impact of the message and, therefore, on its presentation. The message was intended to reach a wider range of voters and, especially, working men in the towns and cities. In direct answer to the question, therefore, students might argue that it is ‘best understood’ as a new direction for Toryism or as a continuation of basic Conservative values and attitudes but presented with a wider constituency in mind.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

**24 Explain the principles guiding the conduct of British foreign policy towards Europe in the period 1886–1905.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The chronological focus here is clear and candidates must restrict their answers to the relevant period, although references to key events just outside the period (as the Conference in Berlin on African territories in 1884–1885) are allowable as setting up a key theme. Here it is acceptable to begin with the establishment of Salisbury's first government and end with the resignation of Balfour. Given its importance for wider international relations, developments in, and the expansion of, the British Empire are legitimate to be considered under 'foreign policy'. The key themes on which candidates are likely to concentrate are: the expansion of the Empire, involving agreements with France and Germany over territorial acquisitions such as those in East Equatorial Africa (1893), and, with France, east and west of the Niger (1898); the Colonial Conferences (1887 and 1897); the reconquest of the Sudan (1896–99), relations in South Africa, including the chartering of the British South Africa Company (1889), the impact of the Jameson Raid (1895–6) & Kruger Telegram, and the Second Boer War (1899–1902), leading to greater British diplomatic isolation. In the sub-continent, it is relevant to mention the annexation of Upper Burma (1886) and the Indian Councils Act (1892), the creation of the North-West Frontier Province (1891). In diplomacy and the arms race, the following issues are likely to be mentioned: Anglo-French tensions over Fashoda in the Sudan (1898); the beginning of the Anglo-German naval race; the failure of the Hague Peace Conference on Disarmament (1899); defensive alliance between Britain and Japan (1902); the *Entente Cordiale* (1904) with France and its importance in the foreign Moroccan Crisis (1905).

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 an evaluation of the ideas which underlay Britain's foreign policy. Good candidates will therefore need to go well beyond the factual details concerning wars and treaties in order to look at principles which underlay the main developments. Candidates might note that this period, in witnessing a substantial expansion of Britain's empire (particularly in Africa), saw considerable emphasis on the Empire not only as a source of wealth for the mother country but as a 'civilising, christianising, good' to which many of Britain's best-trained minds bent their attention. There is much to be said about the 'imperial mission'. Candidates may also wish to argue about long-standing principles of non- (or minimal) intervention in European affairs beyond securing a balance of power so that no 'overmighty power' threatened the security of the continent, or Britain's trading opportunities. Were these subordinated to a more active policy, which involved wars where deemed necessary in this period? Since this was a period which saw Britain ever more involved in alliance systems, candidates might debate how far eager (and less-than-eager) participation in alliances witnessed a change in emphasis in British foreign policy. Also, was fear of Germany's growing industrial and military might a key factor influencing greater intervention in European diplomacy? If so, then the 'principles' here might be an amalgam of self-interest and self-defence. Candidates can argue from quite different perspectives, placing emphasis on: increased activism and bellicosity; the emergence of a Christian imperial mission; defensive reaction to German advance; the desire to secure peace through international agreement or, of course, a combination of these. Good candidates must, however, concentrate on the principles involved.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

**25 Assess the importance of the contribution of Lord Salisbury to the success of the Conservative party in the period 1886–1902.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The chronological focus here is clear and candidates must restrict their answers to Salisbury's time as prime minister and also as Leader of the Opposition from 1892–5. The evidence on which candidates may draw can derive from both domestic and foreign policy, so long as the selection relates to the key theme of Conservative success. In domestic policy, candidates should have knowledge of Salisbury's cautious but real reforms in education and local government. He also extended safety and sanitary legislation covering houses (1890) and factories (1891). These initiatives might be said to have developed the legacy of Disraeli in a party no longer resistant to change and no longer overwhelmingly dominated by the squires and the Church of England. Salisbury's exploitation of 'Villa Toryism' and the growth of suburban support for the party is relevant. In foreign policy, it is relevant to mention Salisbury's dominance, not least since he acted as his own foreign secretary in 1886–92 and 1895–1900. The general election of 1900, widely known as the Khaki election, was turned into an issue of confidence in a government which had taken the nation to war in South Africa. Salisbury also played on divisions over foreign policy within the Liberal party.

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 the relative importance of one key individual in explaining the success of the Conservative party during a period when it enjoyed substantial electoral and political dominance. Good candidates will appreciate that they should be presenting an argument on Salisbury's relative importance. There are a number of factors in Conservative success which do not directly depend on Salisbury. These include: the groundwork done by Disraeli in broadening the social base of Tory support; the defection of many erstwhile Liberals over Ireland leading both to the creation of a 'Conservative and Unionist party' and to lasting divisions and dwindling within the Liberal party – perhaps especially while Gladstone remained leader; the impact of a widened electorate on party fortunes. In at least two of these areas, however, Salisbury can claim some influence. Candidates might wish to argue that he acted subtly and deftly in yoking the Unionists to the Conservative party and in making it less likely that Liberal Unionist defectors would return to the Liberals. Salisbury was also shrewd in his exploitation of the new opportunities created by franchise expansion and redistribution in 1884–5. The impact of these changes is relevant to the answer. Salisbury has been given credit for educational and local government reforms. Some candidates might argue that some, at least of these, were the price which Joseph Chamberlain demanded for his continued allegiance to the Conservative party. It is also possible to argue that Salisbury helped focus national attention on the jubilees and continued Disraelian initiatives designed to make imperialism politically popular. Under Salisbury, the Conservatives developed policies designed to appeal to businessmen, most of whom had been Liberal-inclined before the 1880s.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

## 26 How is the term 'New Liberalism' best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The chronological focus is not specified here. Although many candidates are likely to concentrate on the period 1905–14, with the Liberals in power, more rounded answers are likely to begin in the 1880s. Most will concentrate on domestic issues and are likely to emphasise: changing attitudes to the causes of poverty; new, more radical, social policies, including old-age pensions, new protection and support for children, labour exchanges, trade boards, national insurance; housing and town-planning proposals. These policies need to be paid for, so candidates may also look at redistributive taxation, such as that presented in the 1909 Budget. The key individuals likely to be mentioned include: J.A. Hobson, Charles Booth and Seebohm Rowntree. Among politicians, reference is likely to be made to Asquith, Lloyd George (perhaps especially) and Winston Churchill. Candidates should also have knowledge of the 'newness' of New Liberalism in the context of changing and developing attitudes towards state intervention.

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 historical judgment about a key term: 'New Liberalism'. Candidates are required to explain what they mean by the term and, in doing so, present a critical evaluation of its scope. One way of doing this would be in terms of similarity and difference. How different is 'New Liberalism' from its older forms? Here it is likely that candidates will make something of the impact of the ideas and conclusions of Hobhouse, Hobson, Booth and Rowntree which (among much else) suggested that poverty was endemic in society, and particularly at particular phases of life, and not necessarily the fault of feckless fathers or improvident families. The widening acceptance of research evidence about causes of poverty, including the impact of casual employment, caused a substantial rethink about the role of the state. So, candidates are likely to argue that New Liberalism is best understood as the result of changes in perception which lead to the much more interventionist role taken by the State after the Liberals came to power at the end of 1905. Another key feature, epitomised by Lloyd George, is overt hostility to inherited wealth, especially, to the 'unearned' privileges of the aristocracy. New Liberalism, in this encapsulation, might be seen (at least in part) as a tactic designed to 'tame' the rise of Labour and the implications of the growth of the trade union movement. New Liberalism was the best hope of keeping working men loyal to the party. Some candidates might mention debates between supporters of 'classical' Liberalism and new Liberalism. It is possible, however, to argue that there is no real break between 'classical' and 'New' liberalism and that the latter draws substantially on the former, not least in the emphasis laid on individual rights. While some candidates might interpret 'best explained' as an invitation to concentrate on the interplay of ideas about what Liberalism should be, others will wish to concentrate on 'New Liberalism' in action. Both approaches are valid, so long as there is at least some discussion of ideas in the latter approach. Students taking the latter approach will concentrate on the policies of the Liberal governments of 1905–14 seeing the key developments, such as pensions legislation, the 1909 Budget and redistributive taxation, National Insurance proposals etc. as the practical outworkings of 'New Liberal' ideas.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

**Section 6: Themes, c. 1815–c. 1914****27 How great a threat to the British control of Ireland was the growth of Irish nationalism in the period c. 1850–1914?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of an important theme. The theme here is the impact of Irish nationalism. The focus will be on the period after the Irish famine but knowledge of the legacy of the Famine is not only relevant but is likely to be central to candidates' response to the question. Material directly and specifically on Daniel O'Connell is not, however, relevant. Candidates should have knowledge of: the Irish Republican Brotherhood and the Fenian Brotherhood; the growth of nationalism under Parnell, including his fall and its impact; the Irish Land League and the work of Michael Davitt; the roles of John Redmond and Edward Carson. Candidates should also see that the 'threat' produces a government response and should therefore also have knowledge of how the nationalist challenge was met, including: attempts at repression of terrorist activity; land legislation; home rule policies; handling of the division between nationalism and unionism.

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 judgment about the extent of a specific threat. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Candidates might use their knowledge of the legacy of the famine to explain that bitterness at government response to that crisis contributed substantially to the growing 'threat' of nationalism. On 'How great a threat...' specifically, strong responses will show how the threat to public order and perhaps even the threat of revolution fluctuated over the period. It might be argued that government concessions in the form, first of land reform, and then of home rule proposals reduced the threat somewhat, although they did not stop either land wars in the late 1870s and 1880s or the real prospect of both revolution and civil war in Ireland in the years before 1914. The threat could also be evaluated in terms of discussion of the abilities and strength of nationalist and, latterly Unionist, leaders. Discussion about the extent of the threat should be central to the focus of strong answers which will reach explicit substantiated judgments on this.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

**28 'The industrialisation of Britain between 1815 and 1850 lowered the standard of living for urban workers.' How far do you agree with this view?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of an important theme. The theme here is the impact of the industrial revolution on Britain. The focus will be on the period between the end of the Napoleonic Wars and the beginning of what has been called 'the Great Victorian Boom' but some more general material on the period from c. 1780–1815 may be encountered and can be credited if the main focus is on the selected period and earlier material is linked to the later chronology. Some of the key indicators, after all, are rather difficult to locate with exact chronological precision. Candidates should have knowledge of: the general trend of wage levels for workers in industry and commerce. There may be concentration on textiles and on ports; differential wage levels for women & men, and for skilled and unskilled workers; the growing problems for skilled workers whose skills were being marginalised by machinery; changes in price levels, perhaps particularly the declining price of bread for much of the period from 1815–30; the significance of casual labour and the prevalence of unemployment; attempts to make poor law provision more stringent.

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 judgment about a contentious historical hypothesis. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Candidates might well know of 'the standard of living controversy' and of how quantitative indicators (though certainly not overwhelmingly) suggest a broadly 'optimistic' picture – albeit less so in some recent literature – while qualitative ones (conditions in towns; the working environment; very limited supplies of pure water) suggest a broadly pessimistic one. A few candidates might wish to argue (as have some economic historians) that 'standard of living issues' relate only to quantitative measures. If this line is taken, explained and appropriately contextualised, then it must be accepted. Good candidates are likely to note (reasonably enough) that the answer to the question depends partly on the methodology employed and partly on which workers one considers. More is known about skilled workers (some of whom did very well out of industrialisation – see the cases of printers and engineers) than about unskilled ones. Also periods of unemployment clearly complicate the overall picture, so much may depend on changes over the period. Good students are required to reach a substantiated judgment but they are also overwhelmingly likely to note that 'urban workers' represents a very diverse category and that experiences within it were very different, both across and at particular points within, the period.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

## 29 How convincing is the argument that the Oxford Movement 'revitalised' the Church of England?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of an important theme. The theme here is the role of the Church of England. The chronological focus is likely to be on the 1830s and on the early Victorian period. However, since the question focuses on influence, comment on the mid-late Victorian period is also acceptable. Candidates should have knowledge of: the context of the Movement, as the Church struggled to come to terms with changed circumstances in the late 1820s and early 1830s and also radical attacks on its status and authority; the work of key protagonists of the Movement, especially perhaps Newman, Keble, Pusey and Froude; *Tracts for the Times* (1833–41) and the overwhelmingly Catholic cast of these; conversions to Catholicism; the reaction of the Church of England. For candidates who take the second interpretation of the question (see under AO2 below), it is also legitimate to mention other factors which might be considered as 'revitalising agencies'. These might include: the evangelical movement; the impact of Church reforms in the 1830s and 1840s; the decline in radical protest which had in the first half of the 19th century seen attacks on the Church as an attack on the 'soft-underbelly' of established authority.

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 evaluating a specific historical proposition and examiners will wish to take into consideration that two equally valid lines of approach are possible. Candidates may either wish to argue whether the Oxford Movement did, or did not, revitalise the Established Church or they may wish to evaluate the relative importance of the Oxford Movement within an Established Church, whose revitalisation in the early and mid-Victorian periods is taken as read. Either approach is permissible, although the second is less likely to be popular. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Candidates should recognise that this question focuses on the impact of the Oxford Movement and not on its causes. Candidates may wish to argue on whether the 'Catholicising' of the Church invigorated it or not. On the one hand, the movement aimed to give the Church a more robust doctrinal basis and had a clarifying, if not a cleansing, effect. It attracted a large number of able scholars who, if nothing else, operated as a lively ginger group within the Church. On the other, by no means all members of the Church of England wished to be 'Catholicised'. Some, on the 'liberal' wing of the Church considered a certain latitudinarian elasticity essential to their tolerant perception of Anglicanism. Doctrinal debate was not perceived as part of the lifeblood of the Church of England. It is also the case that, for a number of its leading figures (not least Newman), the Oxford Movement represented a staging post on the way back to Rome. This was unlikely to have 'revitalised' the Church, even temporarily, not least since the Catholic Church was no more tolerant of Anglican 'deviationism' after Newman's *Tracts* were published than before. As stated above, it is perfectly legitimate to argue that the Oxford Movement was less important than were one or more of the factors identified at the end of the commentary relating to AO1. Commentary on factors affecting the revival of the Church of England in mid-Victorian Britain is legitimate. Good answers must, however, reach reasoned judgments about the impact of the Oxford Movement in respect of 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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

### 30 How far did the role of women in British society change in the period 1867–1914?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of an important theme. The theme here is on the changing role of women in British society. The chronological focus here is clear but good candidates will see that the question asks about the role of women in British society, which will require them to go beyond knowledge of the franchise campaign. Candidates should have knowledge of: educational advances, especially for middle-class women and the opening up of the ancient universities and of some professions; the Married Women's Property Acts (1870 & 1884) and the changes to women's status within the family; women's increasing political role before the main suffrage campaigns – female ratepayers could vote in local elections (1869), sit on School Boards (1870) and Parish Councils (1894). On national suffrage, much is likely to be known. Candidates should be able to distinguish between Suffragists and Suffragettes and should concentrate on agitation which indicated changing status in society. For working-class women, the changing world of work is relevant, particularly in expanding textile industries and as domestic servants. A changing role here is not necessarily an improving one, however.

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 making a judgment about how far women's role in society changed, so good candidates should concentrate on the impact of women in society and be able to determine the balance between change and continuity. Thus, they might argue that the Married Women's Property Acts did give women rights they lacked before, although they might conclude that this did not fundamentally challenge a predominantly patriarchal society. Candidates might wish also to argue that the role of women might have changed more in certain social classes or walks of life than of others. Perhaps the main stimulus to women as workers came earlier in the nineteenth century, although women professionals gained more opportunities for education and training. Even here, however, they might note continuity in that the overwhelming majority of doctors remained male while 'subordinate' nurses were predominantly female. On franchise, good candidates will wish to evaluate the impact political changes made in local government and on School Boards, for example, while most will presumably note that the franchise campaign, though substantial and, in the decade before the First World War, disruptive, had not brought women equal citizenship in the period covered by the question. The question requires a reasoned judgment to be developed on the *extent* of the change for women in society.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

### 31 How successful was the British economy in the years from 1880 to 1914?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of an important theme. The theme here is the performance of the British economy in a period of its industrial maturity. The chronological focus here is clear but some good candidates will wish to make at least some reference to the early stages of the depression in agriculture, which began in the 1870s. This should be allowed, if presented as background to the key developments of the period 1880–1914. Candidates should have knowledge of the problems of agriculture, caused largely by competition in the arable sector from the US in particular. Many farms in the South and East were badly hit. Agricultural prices in the pastoral sector fell much less, while market gardening prospered in many areas. In manufacturing, there were many advances: iron and steel production expanded; tonnage of British shipping more than doubled in this period. However, there were periodic depressions caused by over-production and foreign competition, and these were characterised by high unemployment. Mining industries boomed, with much coal exported in this period. In terms of balance of trade, Britain increasingly relied on ‘invisible’ export to balance the books, since balance of visible trade was usually adverse in this period.

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 making a judgment about how successful the British economy was in this period. Good candidates might wish briefly to explain what they consider to be the characteristics of a successful economy (low unemployment levels? favourable balance of trade? expansion of manufacturing and or agriculture?). With such a check-list, they can then argue their case on extent of success. Candidates will tackle the question in different ways and it will be necessary to adopt a liberal definition of what economic performance connotes. Candidates might wish to argue that industry, in general, did better than agriculture in this period but that lower food prices also meant that working people often had more disposable income, especially when in work. Expect many candidates to argue overall success on balance of expansion in mining, shipbuilding and heavy industry more generally, although they are likely to enter caveats on the basis of periods of depression, higher overall levels of unemployment and an increasing, if ‘soft’ perception that Britain was now being successfully challenged by Germany and the United States and that it was no longer unchallenged as the world’s most powerful industrial nation. The question requires a reasoned judgment to be developed on the extent of success for the British economy. The phrasing of the question should suggest to good candidates that they should conclude in terms of relative success (or, of course, failure).

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

### 32 How are the changing fortunes of trade unions in the period c. 1880 to 1914 best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of an important theme. The theme here is the role and importance of the trade union movement. The chronological focus here allows candidates some latitude in discussing the emergence of so-called ‘New Unionism’, in response to Disraeli’s trade union legislation of 1875 and also agricultural trade unionism in the wake of the emerging Depression in the arable sector. The chronological focus, clearly, should be on the period 1880–1914. Candidates should have knowledge of: the growth of socialist influence on the trade union movement from the early 1880s; the National Federation of Labour (1886); the struggles of the gas and dock workers and the foundation of the Miners’ Federation of Great Britain (1889); the growth of trade union membership contingent on opening up to unskilled workers; the strikes of the 1890s, engineering workers etc.; links between unionism and the emergence of Labour representation in Parliament (1893 & 1900); Taff Vale Case (1900) and subsequent Trade Disputes Act (1906); growth of a union-based Labour party, especially from 1906; Osborne judgment (1909) and its reversal (1913); growth of strike activity especially from 1909; the ‘Triple Alliance’.

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 causation since candidates are required to explain why trade union fortunes fluctuated. Most candidates will link this to the growth of union membership and the development of a new kind of unionism which prompted responses from the employers and, especially from 1906, the government. Some good candidates may wish to argue that increased militancy reflects perceptions of new opportunity for integrated labour activity in an expanding economy. For example, miners made headway during a period of substantial expansion to service the development of transport and heavy industry. Strikes, of course, had differing outcomes, making for further ‘variability’. Candidates might also note the significance of the emergence of a Liberal government which wished to provide greater recognition for unions and to protect their funds from legal actions for damages. In the period 1910–14, union fortunes were indeed variable but the Liberals did have need of both Labour party and ‘Lib-Lab’ votes which curbed the desire of Conservatives and right-wing Liberals to ‘teach the Unions’ a lesson. Nevertheless, the immensely ambitious ‘Triple Alliance’ of miners, railwaymen and transport workers had very limited success to 1914. Some candidates may wish to argue that variable success had something to do with changing Trade Union identity. The massive expansion in membership left many uncertain as to whether long-established craft unions had an effective future and that conciliation, rather than confrontation, remained a plausible strategy in a period of increasingly fractious labour relations.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

## Section 7: 1914–1951

**33 To what extent, and in what ways, did the First World War change British society?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Candidates should see that the chronological focus here should fall at least as much after World War I as during it, not least since many of the key changes worked their way through in the medium and longer terms. There is, quite deliberately, no terminal date here, although most candidates will not offer material beyond 1939. The number of social changes which occurred either directly or more subtly as a result of the War is very large, so do not look for a comprehensive list. The main changes which candidates are likely to mention are: new work opportunities for women (perhaps linked to franchise extensions); the impact of the war on families, not just in terms of bereavement and orphans but also family structure more generally; the knock-on effects of medical improvements; extensions in the role of, and powers taken by, the state – including conscription; implications of the war for employment – men at the front, more need for armaments and ships; increased power of unions with government desperate to avoid strikes in key war-effort industries; the cost of the war – the very considerable problems in adjusting to peace; implications for employment patterns after the war of the growth of manufacturing industries in the Empire; more generally, perhaps a sense of ‘liberation’ when the war ended – a sense that life should be lived for the moment, hedonism, flappers etc.

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 impact or consequence since candidates are required to make judgements about the nature and extent of changes as a result of the First World War. It is important that candidates both identify key changes, which they will link to the war, and also evaluate the extent of those changes. The stronger candidates should seek to distinguish between social change which can be directly attributed to the War, those in which the war played some (but not necessarily a dominant) part, and those which have no direct link to war. Given the phrasing of the question, greater stress should be laid on the first two of these. Most candidates are likely to comment on the impact of the war on the position of women, not just in terms of franchise extensions but also in terms of somewhat greater opportunities in the worlds of work and professionalisation. Candidates can legitimately disagree about the extent of ‘liberalisation’ which was effected in the 1920s and later. Candidates could also argue that the powers taken by the state during wartime gave politicians a greater sense of what social policies could be put in place. The much greater attention given to housing policy might be presented as a direct result of governments knowing that they could exercise very substantial influence over the lives of citizens. The same might be said of unemployment policies, although some candidates might ask why, given the precedent set by the war, there was not greater, and more benign, intervention. There might be sardonic comment on Lloyd George’s famous promise in November 1918 about ‘a fit country for heroes to live in’. Candidates might evaluate the extent to which the economic downturn after 1920, with its substantial social consequences, were attributable to the enormous war effort. Arguably, as more countries industrialised, Britain’s relatively high wage, primary and extractive dominated industries would find it increasingly difficult to compete in world markets, war or no war. Candidates who take this line might also mention the over-valued pound after 1925 – difficult to see Churchill’s decision as influenced by the war. Also, could the UK after 1918 afford to maintain its Empire and did its imperial subjects wish it to? The events of 1924 notwithstanding, the Empire figures less in the ‘social identity’ of the British in the 1920s, when compared with the 1890s and 1900s. There is much to argue about the decline of primary and key manufacturing industries. Comment might also be made about freer social attitudes and conventions as a result of the experience of a devastating war. It is also possible to argue that social classes remained fairly rigidly divided despite windy wartime rhetoric about ‘all in this together’.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

### 34 How substantial was the progress made by the Labour Party in the period 1918–1931?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The chronological focus here is clear and candidates should concentrate on the period from the post-war election of 1918 to the Labour split and the establishment of the Coalition government in 1931. They may, however, also wish to discuss the new Labour constitution (Clause 4 and all) which was adopted in early 1918. Key themes are likely to include: Labour as the largest opposition party in 1918 (57 seats); moving up to second largest party with 142 seats in 1922, which grew to 191 in 1923, which led directly to MacDonald's first minority government (1924); government defeats in 1924 (for example on Unemployment Insurance) showing the problems of minority status; decline in seats to 152 in the election held after Zinoviev letter, although number of votes gained increased; Labour in opposition; impact of the General Strike on Labour – loss of income as union membership falls; reassertion by Tawney and others of Labour as a socialist party; largest single party in 1929, with 287 seats and the beginning of a second minority government; coping with the Wall St Crash and the downswing in the economy; unemployment policies; the impact of the May Committee recommendations and substantial cuts in public expenditure; the cabinet split on proposed 10% cut in benefits, leading to MacDonald's heading a Coalition government of 'individuals not parties', leading to Labour split.

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 a historical judgment about the extent of progress made by the Labour party over the stated period. Candidates can, of course, argue relatively great or relatively limited progress. Those inclined to take the 'substantial progress' line are likely to use the evidence cited in AO1 above to indicate that Labour had established itself as at least the second party in the state by 1929, that it was able to form two governments (which would have seemed inconceivable in 1914), that a man of very humble origins could receive from the King the seals of office as prime minister twice in the period, that the size and growing confidence and integration of trade union movement – despite the problems of 1926 and subsequently – enabled the party to fund its activities at a level not far behind the Conservatives and, especially after 1922, substantially greater than the Liberals, that Labour effectively 'poached' middle-class progressives like Tawney who might well have been a Liberal radical thirty years earlier, that any movement from 3rd to 2nd place in the British political system, given its first-past-the-post electoral system was 'substantial' – indeed, in the modern political world unprecedented. Some sardonic characters might also argue that Labour did very well to progress as it did in the face of a new female electorate which was predominantly anti-socialist. If optimists stress what the Labour party was by 1931, it is likely that 'pessimists' will stress what Labour achieved or, rather, how little it achieved. Did it improve the fortunes either of the nation or of that working-class element in British society which was its natural constituency. Labour was in government only twice, and then only briefly. Its socialist agenda never approached fruition. It never seemed likely to win an election outright in this period. Its record in trying to handle the impact of a deep recession from 1929 to 1931 was not strong and the Labour party ended this period fundamentally divided and in deep disarray, with MacDonald and Snowden branded as traitors. Viewed from this perspective, Labour might be seen as likely in 1931 to retreat to its pre-1918 marginality as to move on to win a massive majority in 1945. So, although most will argue that Labour did make very substantial progress, there is a powerful alternative argument which can be uncoiled.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

**35 Explain and assess the extent of Britain's changing attitudes and policies towards Indian nationalism in the period 1918–1947.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The chronological focus here is clear and candidates should concentrate on the period from the end of the First World War to the granting of independence. The key issues and developments in place here are: the Montagu-Chelmsford report suggesting a route towards self-government (1918) and the Government of India Act, which follows; impact of Amritsar (1919); growth of Congress and its calls for independence; role of Gandhi and campaigns of civil disobedience, especially after 1930; Round Table Conferences; New Government of India Act, 1935, providing for Federation but with Viceroy still responsible to UK government rather than to an elected Indian council; conflict over support of India for involvement in World War II; growth of conflict over routes to independence between Hindu and Muslim politicians: impact of this conflict on reactions to Cripps mission (1942) and the offer of dominion status to India; impact of war on Britain's attitude towards its Empire and, particularly, towards Indian demands for independence; significance of the Labour election victory and the moves towards independence and partition, 1945–47.

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 both on making a historical judgment about why British attitudes and policies changed and also on the extent of change in such attitudes and policies. Candidates should attempt to maintain a reasonable balance between the two.

On 'explanation', candidates are likely to stress as key aspects in changing attitudes: the importance of British reaction to growth of an independence movement; increasing feeling in Britain that continuation of *status quo* was not desirable – and increasingly not possible anyway; realisation that constitutional concessions are not sufficient; changing British perceptions from late 1930s when possibility of religious conflict in an independent India grows; impact of a second world war on Britain's ability to sustain its empire; the significance of public opinion in Britain and, especially, the election of a Labour government in 1945; reasons for the speed with which India was granted independence and the risks involved in partition. It is, therefore, possible to present the explanation in terms of Britain's increasing reluctance to fight to retain its 'jewel in the crown'. So, attitudes and policies can be 'explained' over the period as matching a strong desire for peaceful, constitutional change rather than as increasingly panicky and hasty moves towards independence as support for the Congress Party grew. Racial issues apart, perhaps, candidates might argue the model for national self-determination within a broader commonwealth of nations was well established before 1918 and that most in Britain wished for a continuation and extension of this policy rather than rooted resistance to Indian claims.

On the 'extent' of change, British policy, at least before 1945, might be explained in terms of broad continuity. Britain did not offer ever greater, yet more grudging concessions. Rather, dominant British political opinion always favoured peaceful and judicious concessions in direction of self-determination and eventual concession of Dominion status on the lines of the 'white Commonwealth'. Such a model, albeit strenuously resisted by some Imperialists (Churchill stands out), consistently found favour. Candidates could also argue that few in Britain wished to use violence to resist Congress calls for full independence. Against this, it is possible to argue for key turning points which affected British policies and suggested that policies did change quite substantially. Turning points might include: the realisation that Congress support would not wither; the desire to maintain British strength in order to avoid internecine religious strife in India; the impact of World War II and the insupportable cost of maintaining a worldwide Empire.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

### 36 Why did Britain go to war in 1939?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The chronological focus is not given directly here, although it is reasonable to expect concentration on the later 1930s. Some will concentrate on short-term causes and therefore offer much more detail on the period August 1938 to September 1939. Others, arguing that the real seeds of the Second World War lay in the settlement of the First, may take a broader sweep. Either approach is acceptable, although all candidates should be aware that both short- and longer-term factors are at work. The balance given between these will, however, vary and perhaps considerably. ‘Long-termists’ are likely to explain why the Versailles settlement caused such widespread resentment in Germany. They might also mention the ‘10 year rule’, reaffirmed in 1928, that Britain was unlikely to be involved in war with another European power for ten years. The key factors likely to be used in explaining the build up of tension in the 1930s are: Hitler’s coming to power; failure of the naval conference (1934) and naval agreement with Germany in 1935; German occupation of the Rhineland; extent of German rearmament; annexation of Austria (Mar 1938); Munich and the Sudeten question (Sept 1938); German occupation of Bohemia and Moravia (Mar 1939); British guarantees to Poland; Hitler’s denunciation of naval agreement; Britain introduces conscription (May 1939); Hitler’s demands re ‘Polish Corridor’; ultimatum and war breaks out.

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 causation. The question could hardly be stated in a more direct way. Yet better candidates will see layers of explanation within this apparently straightforward causal question which need uncovering. Some will argue why Britain went to war in September 1939 *and not before*, since the Nazi menace to international stability (quite apart from any moral repugnance which liberal democracies may have felt) could be argued to be clear since 1935 and certainly by early 1938. They are likely to concentrate on Hitler’s apparent breach of faith after Munich and the perception that, short of war, his territorial ambitions were insatiable. On this argument, Poland was just the line in the sand which could be drawn when war, for the British politicians and strategists, became thinkable because British defences could be made stronger. Others will seek to place the weight of a decision to go to war more on longer-term factors. There is a plausible argument to be made that the Versailles settlement destabilised Germany, made it bitterly resentful, hamstrung the Weimar regime and made it unable to withstand the admittedly substantial social and economic shocks administered by the fall-out from the Wall Street Crash. Candidates can, therefore, argue that the most important factors were long-term: in Versailles were the seeds of the emergence of a totalitarian regime of one kind or another and everything else followed logically. Such candidates will need to show knowledge of the trigger points after 1933 and will also need to argue that they believe longer-term factors were more important than shorter-term ones but answers which do not concentrate substantially on 1938–39, if thus set up, are perfectly acceptable. It is important also to give weight to Britain’s own strategic calculations. Diplomacy is rarely conducted with moral imperatives uppermost and some candidates might well argue that Britain went to war in 1939, not primarily because it was outraged by Hitler, his methods and his pretensions, but because it was not prepared for war before the summer of that year anyway. Munich can thus be justified as a holding operation while the British government (whose predecessors had perhaps under-estimated Hitler’s threat to wider European stability) found both time and resources for a hasty rearmament programme. Arguably, too, Britain was still seeking in the summer of 1939 to preserve a European balance which had been at, or near, the centre of its strategic calculations at least since 1815.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

### 37 How significant were the social and welfare reforms of the Attlee governments, 1945–51?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The chronological focus here is precise enough and we should expect candidates to concentrate on the reforms passed during the Attlee governments. To discuss ‘significance’, however, some candidates might – perfectly legitimately – wish to make at least some comment on the longer-term impact of reforms such as the National Health service, so comment after 1951 is not only acceptable but might be welcomed since weighing impact will be an important element in the evaluation of ‘significance’. Issues of overall balance in the answer will, however, need to be considered. The key issues likely to be discussed are: National Insurance and National Health Acts (1946); repeal of Trade Disputes Act (1946); temporary housing measures, pre-fabs; nationalisation of Bank of England (1946); nationalisation of coal industry (1946); new legislation on industrial injuries (1946); raising of school leaving age to 15 (1947); Attlee’s Austerity Plan, with emergency powers to increase production; nationalisation of British Railways (1947) and Electricity industry (1948); NHS begins (July 1948); National Assistance Act (1948) to replace ‘dole’ and financed out of general taxation; Town and Country Planning Act (1948); clothes no longer rationed (1949); nationalisation of petrol not rationed (1950); gas, iron and steel nationalisation measures (1949).

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 a historical judgment about key pieces of legislation passed by the Attlee governments. On ‘significance’ candidates might argue significant in their time both because of the immense post-war legacy to be addressed (debts, wide range of domestic, foreign and imperial problems which needed addressing) and because of the substantial swing to the left which Labour effected. Not only did a radical welfare state come into being but the Labour government introduced a range of socialist measures – not least nationalisation of the key utilities. Significant also in expanding educational opportunities by raising the school leaving age and implementing the Butler education Act. More generally, and allowing for some comment on longer-term significance, many of the social reforms can be seen as instituting what later became known as the Post-War or ‘Butskellite’ consensus that the power of the state should be used directly and in an interventionist way to improve life chances and particularly to make mass unemployment a thing of the past. Arguably, these reforms set the tone of domestic legislation for the next twenty years. Candidates might argue that the blueprint had already been set by Beveridge in his 1944 Report. This, and the fact that Butler had instituted a major Education Act during the wartime coalition, might lead some to suggest that the significance, in terms of novelty, needs to be put in a wider context. Also, Beveridge was not a socialist. On the other hand, nationalisation measures were radical and did point in a socialist direction. Some might take this line of thought further and argue that ‘significance’ has been exaggerated, partly because of the cross-party consensus on need for radical change which had emerged by the end of World War II (and which, after all, went back in its origins at least to the Liberal welfare reforms). They might argue ‘limited significance’ in the light of what happened from 1951 onwards. The Conservatives, it could be suggested, built upon Labour’s legacy in social policy, arguably achieving more (particularly perhaps in housing and in developing the health service) in the less crisis-ridden 1950s than Labour had been able to achieve in the 1940s. Most candidates are likely to agree that these reforms were significant, but it is certainly possible to argue a different case.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

**Section 8: 1951–2005****38 Assess the importance of Britain's role in the development of the Cold War in the period 1951–1979.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The chronological focus here is precise and we should expect candidates to range across British foreign and defence policies, with special reference to superpower relations, over both the Conservative and Labour governments of the period. Candidates are likely to have knowledge of: Britain's close alliance with the United States, which lasts over the period; Britain's involvement in the successful Berlin Airlift (1948–9); Britain's involvement in NATO from 1949; Britain's direct involvement in the Cold War; Britain as a nuclear power from 1952: A-Bomb and, from 1957, H-Bomb; impact of the Suez Crisis – and especially of US refusal to support Anglo-French policy – on the Cold War; British Blue Streak Missile project dropped in favour of US sub-launched Polaris; the Kennedy/Macmillan agreement at Nassau which makes Polaris warheads available to Britain (1962); implications of Labour defence review of 1966 which reduces Britain's involvement in operations outside Europe; further defence cuts and reduction of commitment to SEATO (1968); joint US/British use of Indian Ocean territories for defence purposes; further defence cuts in 1974.

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 a historical judgment about how important Britain's role was in Cold War developments over the period. While candidates can show their knowledge of Cold War developments and, indeed, should have outline knowledge of the nature of superpower conflict, it should be remembered that this is a British history option and so it is reasonable and appropriate to expect concentration on the specifically British contribution. We cannot expect detailed knowledge of the Cold War more generally. Most candidates will argue that Britain's role in the Cold War was never more than supportive of the US position, both in terms of ideology and of defence strategy, and that Britain's contribution reduced over time, and especially after defence reviews (generally under Labour) which affected Britain's commitment outside Europe from the mid-1960s onwards. Nevertheless, it can be argued that Britain retained an important role even in a subordinate capacity. Britain was the US's most 'natural' ally in western Europe. Arguably, too, Britain's prestige in the US remained high for a time – even allowing for the huge, and deleterious, economic impact of fighting World War II – as the only non-occupied major allied power in Europe. Against that, it became ever clearer that Britain neither could nor would adopt the kind of semi-independent position on the Cold War that France and, perhaps, West Germany did. Some might argue that Britain became the US's poodle on defence matters, and there is plenty of evidence that public opinion was uneasy, going on hostile, to a perceived loss of independence, especially over nuclear weapon deployment. Whatever domestic political capital might be made concerning Macmillan's allegedly avuncular relationship with Kennedy in the early 1960s, it is difficult to argue that the UK exercised much leverage on actual US policy (rather than on chummy, but windy, rhetoric about 'special relationships') in respect of Cold War matters. Britain's role in test-ban treaty negotiations and in spasmodic attempts to 'thaw' the Cold War in this period are strictly limited. Candidates might make use of Robert MacNamara's withering Ann Arbor assessment in 1962 about Britain's having lost an empire and not yet found a role. They could develop a more general argument about Britain's lack of significance in the development of the Cold War, because almost nothing which Britain did affected the course of US policy. Against this, however, it could be argued that it was Britain's close links with the US which helped to polarise the Cold War in its early stages. Britain's failure to engage with other western European powers to develop a third force is seen by some as an error with substantial consequences. So, candidates might argue, it was precisely Britain's lack of an independent defence policy which was significant in helping explain the direction which the Cold War took and, perhaps, in ensuring that its focus remained so Euro-centred for a significant part of the period under discussion.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

### 39 How successful were Conservative social and economic policies in the period 1951–1964?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The chronological focus here is precise enough and is restricted to the governments of Churchill, Eden, Macmillan and, briefly, Home. We should expect candidates to concentrate on the specific policies developed in this period. However, some candidates might wish to discuss the success of Conservative policies in the longer term, so at least some comment on how these policies played out after 1964 is acceptable, if the link is explicitly made. Policies in general retain commitment to full employment but emphasise need to secure economic growth. Loosening of economic controls. The key policies likely to be discussed are: initial pledge to build 300,000 homes, with increase of subsidies to local authorities (1951); commitment to denationalisation of iron & steel (1951); road transport denationalised (1953); end of sugar rationing (1953) followed by all food rationing (1954); commitment to formation of independent TV (1954), which begins broadcasting in 1955; ending of restrictions on hire purchase as credit controls loosened (1954); Clean Air Act (1956) as contribution to reducing environmental pollution; abolition of rent controls on housing (1957); great expansion of house building, especially in 2nd half of the decade; new Council on prices, productivity and incomes (1957); Britain does not join Common Market and retains economic links with the Commonwealth (1957) but commitment to European Free Trade Organisation (1960); economic problems produce higher interest rates and a credit squeeze (1957), followed by pay pause (1961); growing balance of payments crisis in late 1950s and early 1960s; abolition of compulsory national service (1958); hire-purchase restrictions lifted (1958); first motorways open (1958–9), leading to increased emphasis on road, as opposed to rail, transport; Robbins Committee (1960) recommends expansion of university education; graduated pension scheme introduced (1961); establishment of National Economic Development Council established (1962); Commonwealth Immigrants Act restricts free access to UK for immigrants (1962).

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 a historical judgment about the success of Conservative social and economic policies. On ‘success’ candidates might argue that, overall, Tory policies were successful because these years witnessed significant improvements in both standards of living and the quality of life, including better housing, higher real wages, vastly expanded consumer choice and substantially greater educational opportunity, at least for a significant minority of those from sectors of society which would have been denied secondary education before 1944. Some might add cultural factors into this. Arguably, society was less confined and, by the end of the period, less conventionally divided as youth culture began to make an impact. Whether a direct link can be traced between Conservative policies and the marketability of popular culture is a moot point as is the extent to which, if so, this represented ‘success’. On the other hand, expansionist policies help create economic difficulties, particularly in balance of payments, necessitating credit squeeze, pay pauses and other effects which antagonise trade unions. Candidates might wish to visit the Labour charge of ‘thirteen wasted years’ and evaluate the extent to which this perspective derived from recent economic difficulties and sexual scandals (particularly the Profumo affair). Many of the Tory policies, on education, housing etc. were building on, albeit often expanding, the new policies of the Labour governments of 1945–51. Candidates must reach an overall judgment and this might involve their evaluation of the nature, and extent, of the problems inherited by the incoming Labour government in 1964. Such an approach would enable them to indicate the extent to which Conservative policies put the economy under strain and also, perhaps, the extent to which the continuation of policies towards unions created labour difficulties in which belts had to be tightened. It is possible also to argue that policies appeared more successful in the earlier part of the period but began to unravel later.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

**40 How far has the success of the premiership of Harold Wilson (1964–70, 1974–6) been underestimated?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The chronological focus here is restricted to Wilson's two periods as prime minister, although it is relevant to move on beyond the two periods if the candidate explicitly wishes to evaluate success which becomes more apparent at a distance. Reputations change. Such discussion apparently 'out of period' is acceptable if the link to longer-term judgment of success is explicitly made. The issues relating to Wilson's character, personality, priorities for government and his relationship with the Labour party are likely to be central in most answers. The key policy issues likely to be discussed in the first period are: Labour economic policy, including the creation of a new Department of Economic Affairs; prices and incomes policy (1965); George Brown's Five Year Economic Plan (1965); Selective Employment Tax (1966), to shift emphasis onto manufacturing industry; economic difficulties leading to devaluation (1967); growing trade gap and need for deflation; on Labour policy, attempts to reach *modus vivendi* with trade unions; In Place of Strife (1969); on health policy, abolition (1965), then reintroduction (1968) of Prescription charges; the beginning of 'The Troubles' in Northern Ireland and sending of British troops to deal with violence. On foreign and imperial policy: links with US, Wilson's relationship with Johnson and, in particular, resisting pressure to send British troops to Vietnam; the problem of Southern Rhodesia (from 1965) and moves towards isolating and destabilising 'the illegal Smith regime'; a further unavailing attempt to join the EEC (1967). The key issues likely to be discussed in the second period are: Settling the Miners' Strike (1974); attempt to deal with continued violence in Northern Ireland, including Prevention of Terrorism Act (1974) after Birmingham bombings; end of internment without trial (1975); continuation of Direct Rule. On economic policy, National Enterprise Board (1975) proposed; Government's Anti-Inflation Policy and Union reaction to it (1975); Referendum on continued membership of EEC won by the Government; Wilson's apparently sudden resignation (March 1976); the Dissolution Honours issue – the 'Lavender List'.

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 a historical judgment about the success of a particular Labour prime minister. On 'success' many candidates may wish to argue that, overall, Wilson's success has been underestimated. Some may argue that his reputation stands higher now than at the end of his prime ministership, as is the case with most political leaders. Those who take this broad view are likely to emphasise: the nature of the difficulties he inherited from the Conservatives, including the problems associated with economic expansion and inflation; while Wilson wrestled with similar problems, he did not have notably less success, despite Devaluation and the 'Pound in your Pocket'; the problems associated with leading a party dependent on economic support from a trade union movement which benefited from Keynesian economic policies and the commitment to low unemployment whenever possible; Wilson's relations with the Unions and his commitment to 'Labour values'. Labour a difficult party to lead, with recent, and damaging, splits between left and right. Wilson kept the two wings largely away from each others' throats. Wilson also proved himself an election winner – narrowly in 1964 and Oct 1974, more comfortably in 1966. By contrast, most Labour leaders of the 50s, 60s and 70s failed to win general elections. On foreign policy, Wilson perhaps put more distance between Britain and the US than Conservative prime ministers, and avoided the Vietnam entanglement. Candidates might argue that Wilson made a real attempt to deal with the apparently intractable problems of Northern Ireland, although he took flak from both sides. Arguably, also, Wilson helped to secure a smooth transition, despite his unexpected retirement. Some candidates might say that Wilson was at his best with a small parliamentary majority and he laid the foundations for a continued Labour government on the basis of a very small, and later absent, majority.

Those who argue the opposite case, that Wilson's premiership was not successful, are likely to concentrate on the brickbats which came his way at the time: Wilson a vacillator and an inveterate suspect of plots, who spent too much time listening to rumour and fighting backstairs battles rather than providing firm or decisive government; the patent failure of some of the more grandiose economic schemes; Devaluation as a justified nemesis, inflation an ever-present threat losing him popular support; need to go cap in hand to the International Monetary Fund in 1975; his over-dependence on the dubious Marcia Williams; snatching defeat from the jaws of victory in June 1970; failure to stop Northern Ireland erupting into violence; failure to get Britain in the EEC; allowing the Trade Unions too much influence – candidates might cite here his caving in to them and to Callaghan, leaving Barbara Castle in the lurch over *In Place of Strife*; continuation of deference to Unions in his second administration, arguably paving the way for Labour defeat in 1979.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

#### 41 What did Margaret Thatcher stand for as Conservative leader and Prime Minister?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The chronological focus here runs from her election as Conservative leader in 1975 to her resignation as prime minister in 1990. We should expect candidates to concentrate on the specific ideas associated with Thatcher and also with the policies developed to put these ideas into practice. The key ideas likely to be discussed are: monetarism and how it changed the face of British economic policy; the need to control money supply; Thatcher's indebtedness to economic thinkers like Friedman, politicians such as Joseph and advisers such as Sherman; individual self-determination, especially giving the working classes incentives to improve (encapsulated perhaps by policy of selling council houses); standard right-wing Tory social policies adopted, including restrictions on immigration, law and order (including support for the police); assault on certain trade union rights and practices; commitment to defence expenditure and increasing Britain's standing in the world; the impact of the controversial Falklands War (1982) in raising British prestige. The key policies which candidates are likely to know about include: budgetary reform aimed at reducing money supply, reducing levels of direct taxation as a disincentive to effort, innovation and risk, and increases in indirect taxation; rises in unemployment (to 3m by 1982); cuts in local council grants and attacks on 'rogue councils' (from 1980); abolition of hire purchase controls (1982); support for National Coal Board policies to rationalise the industry is interpreted as a government attack on trade union rights leading especially to a bitter miners' strike (1984–5); review of welfare provision, including phasing out of state earnings-related pensions (1985); moves towards privatisation, including BT, Gas etc. In foreign policy, strong support for Reagan and a strengthening of the US/UK alliance; conflict with EEC over British contribution; its eventual reduction (1984); suspicion of the 'centrism' of the EU. In later period of her government, collapse of share prices and beginning of economic depression (1987–8); rises in interest rates; disagreements with Nigel Lawson over entry to EU Exchange Rate Mechanism; growing opposition to Thatcher from within her party, particularly over EU policy, apparently continuous disagreements in Cabinet, and radical changes to local government finance – the 'Poll Tax'. The coup against her and her resignation.

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 a historical judgment about the nature of Margaret Thatcher's political ideas and policies. Candidates should identify what they consider to be the defining characteristics of Thatcher and, if they choose to use the term 'Thatcherism'. These characteristics are likely to include: 'firm, decisive government' (although in reality Thatcher was much more temporising with powerful opponents, such as big fish in the EU pond than the image conveyed); increasing Britain's standing in the world; the necessity for markets to be able to operate as freely as possible ('There is No Alternative'); attacks on union restrictive practices; willingness to face down opposition and protest (her period in office witnessed a very large number of disturbances and riots); much greater commitment to 'managerialism' in public life and in the public sector. Management by 'target setting' and cost-conscious initiatives in some of the biggest public-sector spenders, especially the NHS and education. Some might argue that Thatcher was an inveterate opponent of the professions. Some might also argue that she stood for a 'crusade' – against what she saw as consensual values and sloppy thinking and in favour of business and its potential for wealth creation. This crusade also had its 'moral' side, with what opponents considered 'corner-shop simplicities' about the rewards which hard work and self-reliance would bring. It is permissible for candidates to offer a critical assessment of the values and attitudes which Thatcher stood for, but the focus of the question lies in the identification of what the key ideas and policies were. Comment on why they were unpopular or on how, why and to what extent, her ideas and policies divided the nation are secondary.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

## 42 Account for the electoral success of 'New Labour'.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The chronology for this section runs out in 2000. This may present problems for markers of this question since many candidates will know that New Labour survives and, to an extent, flourishes in the first decade of the 21st century. That being so, it is permissible for candidates to take a broader chronological focus. They may thus discuss the electoral successes of 2001 and 2005 as well as that of 1997. Given the specification, however, and also the specimen questions which have been sent out to Centres, we should not penalise students who, in effect, end their answers with the last general election of the twentieth century and turn the answer into a narrowly focused one, largely on the years of Blair's leadership from 1994–97. The key issues likely to be discussed are (up to and including 2000): the abiding unpopularity of the Major government, which was widely believed to have lost its reputation for economic competence after 'Black Wednesday' (1992); also simmering resentment within the party and frequent challenges to Major's authority; Major forced to fight a leadership challenge (1995); Europe remained a divisive force for the Conservatives; unremittingly bleak opinion poll evidence suggested that Conservatives had lost trust of electorate; a steady leeching by defection of MPs from Conservative to Labour. Despite considerable economic recovery, little or no evidence that this improvement helped the Conservatives to claw back support. On the Labour side, the determination to transmute 'Labour' into 'New Labour' by withdrawing those policy issues which the electorate was supposed to dislike or fear. Ditching of Clause 4 and making New Labour into an unequivocally non-socialist, market-driven party. The impact of the so-called 'Third Way' as offering a way out of the old, tired party labels. Tony Blair as a modern, young, unstuffy and personable leader – especially good on Television. A leader for a new, image-driven age? For those who go beyond 2000, the key additional issues are: lack of permanence of Conservative leaders as Hague, Duncan Smith and Howard come and go without much affecting the popularity of the party. The European boil not lanced. A second disastrous general election result in 2001, followed by insufficient recovery in 2005. For New Labour, at last a solution to the Northern Ireland issue with Devolution and its peaceful establishment from 1999 onwards. Labour establishes, and largely sustains, a reputation for economic competence and able to win and maintain the confidence of the City of London.

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 a historical judgment about causation: in this case the reasons for the electoral success of 'New Labour'. The main reasons likely to be adduced are: Conservative weaknesses, lack of trust in leadership, obvious divisions (see above). Labour re-inventing itself as a non-socialist party keeping many of the objectives of Margaret Thatcher, though with more emphasis on social democratic solutions; the importance of 'image'; Labour's use of spin and iron discipline, enabling the leadership to marginalise the 'awkward squad' on the left. New Labour benefits from the purging of the disruptive elements in the party under Neil Kinnock in the later 1980s and early 1990s. Apparent success of Labour's economic policy – which is, in many respects a continuation of that of Major and Clark but in much more propitious political circumstances. Living standards rise, as do property prices, enabling those already on the property ladder to feel better off. Conservative weakness long outlasts the huge election defeat of 1997 (see above for leadership problems). Apart from leadership, Conservatives remain riven by Europe and also uncertain how to capitalise on the legacy of Thatcher without seeming to cling to the past when society was changing rapidly. At least before 2003, Blair's impact on the world stage – his charm and plausibility – may be indicated as plus factors for New Labour. Though they were frequently at daggers drawn, not least over the question of the succession, Blair and Brown were widely seen as a powerful and effective team providing strong government which the opposition could not match. The effective way in which government messages were presented to the public, often after 'spinning'. Presentation may be argued to be at least as important as policy for the fortunes of New Labour.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

**Section 9: Themes, c. 1914–2000**

**43 ‘Immigration into Britain after the Second World War produced unmanageable racial tensions.’ How far do you agree with this view?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of an important theme. The theme here is the impact of immigration on British society. The chronological focus here allows candidates to range over the second half of the twentieth century. We should not be too rigid in the chronological cut-off point. Material on tensions arising from Islamic terrorist activity in the first decade of the 21st century should be regarded as relevant, so long as it is used in the furtherance of historical analysis. The chronological starting point is likely to be the British Nationality Act (1948), whose ‘open door policy’ lasted only until 1962 and the Commonwealth Immigrants’ Act, with further restrictions in 1968. Attempts to enforce racial harmony by law begin with the Race Relations Act (1965). The plethora of race-relations legislation beyond the 1960s may be used but candidates will want to make the link between legislation and racial attitudes, since the focus of the question is on the impact of the latter. The main new immigrant communities came from the West Indies (especially in the 1940s and 1950s), from Asia (India, Pakistan and Bangladesh) and East African Indians, especially in the 1960s and early 1970s. Most candidates will look for evidence of ‘unmanageable racial tensions’ in race riots. Examples include riots in Notting Hill and Nottingham (1958), St Paul’s Bristol (1980) and especially the riots of 1981 in Brixton, Moss Side and Toxteth. Also riots in Birmingham and London in 1985 and in Bradford in 1995. Race rioting becomes a less prominent feature in the later 1980s and 1990s, although candidates might want to draw attention to specific, and high-profile attacks (including murder) which seem to have a racial origin. The Stephen Lawrence murder (1993) is likely to be cited. As evidence of racial tension, candidates may also wish to discuss the work of the National Front (founded in 1967 and transmuting into the British National Party under John Tyndall in 1982. Some will also wish to refer to the Foundation of Universal Coloured Persons’ Association (founded 1967) which embraced ‘black power’ ideas. The Enoch Powell ‘Rivers of Blood’ speech (1968) is likely to be known.

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 making an informed historical judgment about the extent of the impact of widespread immigration. Stronger candidates are likely to concentrate on ‘unmanageable’, which implies that the problems were beyond the scope of the authorities (including the police) to deal with. On this interpretation of ‘unmanageable’, and despite incidents of rioting, it would be difficult to argue that this was the case except for brief periods in some specific areas (see examples under AO1 above). There are other definitions of ‘unmanageable’, however. It is, however, possible to argue that widespread immigration did produce systemic problems which require little in the way of ‘sparks’ in order to ignite significant local tensions which could arise unpredictably and with substantial local consequences. The Rivers of Blood Speech is one such, assertions of racial discrimination in poorer immigrant communities another. Candidates might wish to argue about the effectiveness of legislation concerned with race relations and, in particular, the extent to which it changed attitudes and values. Other evidence which can be adduced in favour of the ‘unmanageable’ argument includes the usually slow and limited extent to which racial integration is apparent in, for example, the composition of either House of Parliament, the extent to which racial minorities are represented in the police force or on the bench of magistrates. Slow progress here has been used by activist groups to argue that society – as well as the Metropolitan Police – might be considered ‘institutionally racist’. Good candidates might wish to make geographical distinctions. There is far less evidence of unmanageable racial tensions where (as in much of the South West and East Anglia) immigrant communities are relatively small. In some London boroughs and in Leicester, Birmingham and Bradford in the early 1990s,

racial minorities comprised between 20 and 40% of the population. In such places, candidates might wish to argue about the extent to which the races integrated rather than living in separate communities. Good answers will go beyond legislation into discussions of the impact of immigration in different places and at different points in the later twentieth 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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

#### 44 How far did the role and status of women change in the period 1914–68?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of an important theme. The theme here is the changing role and importance of women in British society. The chronological focus here allows candidates to range over the period from the outbreak of the First World War to emergence of the movement called by some ‘Women’s Lib’. In terms of status, candidates are likely to mention the two central changes in parliamentary representation, with women over 30 receiving the vote in 1918 and those over 21 doing so in 1928. The first women MPs and even cabinet minister appear but the proportion of women in Parliament remains very low – fewer than 30 by the end of the period covered by the question. They might also know about: the Sex Disqualification (Removal) Act (1919), lifting legal restrictions on entry to professions; raising of the age of consent to 16 (1922); liberalisation of divorce laws – women could gain divorce on grounds of husband’s adultery alone (1923); divorce becomes easier to obtain with Matrimonial Causes Act (1937) and similar legislation in Scotland (1938). Post Second World War, the main legal changes noted affecting women are likely to include Family Allowances (1945), free health care for women under the National Health Service (1946) and Abortion Act (1967) allowing legal termination of pregnancy. Candidates may, however, concentrate more on women’s role more than their legal status (although there should be some comment on both). On the role of women, the dominant likely theme is likely to be the work/home balance. First World War saw many new employment opportunities open up for women, iconically in munitions and also nursing but in many occupations temporarily lacking adult males. At the end of the 1910s and in early 1920s, though, most of these opportunities dwindled. There is an increase in clerical opportunities, especially with expansion of shorthand and typing. By 1939, the proportion of married women in employment has hardly changed since 1911 (about 10%); very slight increase in proportion of single women (just over 70%). The marriage bar, for example in teaching and in the post office, may be seen as an important factor. Opportunities for women increase again during the Second World War. Relevant also to mention problems for working-class employed women because of the decline in opportunities in textile work, as foreign and imperial competition had its impact. The substantial decline in domestic service (about 40% during the inter-war period) is significant. Legislative support was mostly for women in professional occupations. Otherwise, the woman as ‘serial breeder’ is in decline with greater availability and use of condoms. Birth rate declined from 23.9 in 1914 to 15.3 in 1939. After Second World War, the confirmation of smaller families becomes linked with greater availability of labour-saving devices to reduce the amount of ‘drudge work’ which married women had to do. This is matched by a startling increase in the number of married women in the labour force after World War II. About 1m in 1939, when outnumbered more than 4:1 by unmarried women to more than 5m in 1968, when they outnumber unmarried women by about 2:1.

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 the extent to which the role and status of women changed over the selected period. Candidates will be expected to use at least some of the factual framework suggested in order to argue on the extent of change. There should also be a range of themes identified – perhaps work, family, political representation and pressure might be stressed, but there is scope for a range of priorities to be identified. Most candidates are likely to argue that, in terms of direct involvement in the political process, women make few ‘advances’. On the other hand, their involvement both in local government and in national politics, perhaps behind the scenes, perhaps with involvement in organised labour movements is far from trivial. It is also possible to argue that the role and status of women in the middle and, perhaps also, upper classes changed more for the better than did that of working-class women, although this is open to challenge. Many upper-class women neither sought, nor specifically benefited from, formal education. Many retained, and continued to see the personal value of, a static ‘patriarchal’ family and propertied model. On the other hand, very able working-class women could make an important impact.

Perhaps the greatest advances were made by women in the professions, although many candidates will argue that, until the 1960s at least, entry to, say, the medical profession, for men was much easier than for women. Similarly, the ratio of women to men in the ancient universities still stood at about 1:9 in the 1960s. Arguably, the greatest overall impact on women's 'role' occurred because of more effective, and more widely available, means of contraception and the greater availability of labour-saving devices in the home. Some may wish to argue, however, that the main changes derived from broader cultural shifts. Arguments about equality between women and men are more widely heard after 1945. Perhaps also, the decline of manufacturing industry (particularly textiles, heavy metals and mining) contributed to some change in opportunities for women, who benefited from the expansion of the service industries and from the substantial increase in clerical work from the 1930s onwards. Some strong candidates may wish to argue that the *pace* of change in employment, education and in respect of 'the equality agenda' quickened somewhat after 1945, although it is possible to argue much more rapid progress still (underscored by legislation) occurred from the late 1960s onwards and was thus mostly outside the time-frame of the question. Candidates should remember that the focus here is on change and they should resist the temptation to make assertions about the universality of women's 'aspirations'. It is also important that they avoid irrelevance by drifting heedlessly on into the 1970s, or even later. Good candidates will have a secure hold on relevant chronology. Some good candidates might also wish to argue that, overall, there was more change in respect of women's role than of their status, although it is possible to argue the opposite case.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

#### 45 Assess the impact of educational changes in the period 1945–1990.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of an important theme. The theme here is the importance of expanding educational opportunity in the second half of the twentieth century. The chronological focus here allows candidates to range from the period covered by the impact of the Butler Education Act to the early years of the imposition of a National Curriculum in state schools. Candidates should be aware that the question requires knowledge and understanding of changes outside the compulsory sphere of education, so they should know about main developments in further and higher education. Despite the chronology, most candidates will know about the Butler Act (1944) since its impact was substantial – raising the school-leaving age to 15 and providing free secondary education for the first time. The leaving age was raised again to 16 (1973). The other key changes which it is reasonable for candidates to know about are: abolition of the School Certificate and its replacement by the General Certificate of Education (1951) – at two levels, Ordinary and Advanced; founding of the Schools Council (1964) and attendant introduction of Certificate of Secondary Education (1965), intended primarily for those not suited to the relative academic rigour of GCE O-level; through the 1960s, the introduction of Comprehensive Schools in an increasing number of local education authorities with comprehensive education being the dominant form of secondary provision by 1970s; proposals to make comprehensive education compulsory (1976) revoked by Conservative government (1979); Education Act (1980) requires parents to sit on school governing bodies; GCE O-level and CSE superseded by a new General Certificate of Secondary Education (1988); Education Reform Act (1988) introduces a new National Curriculum into state schools with ‘Attainment Targets’ at ‘key stages’. Schools allowed to opt out of local education authority control and apply for grant-maintained status. In higher education, the key developments are: Robbins Committee recommendations (1963) to double number of HE places with founding of new Universities; ‘University of the Air’ announced (1966) and the ‘Open University’ opens (1969). Colleges of Advanced Technology gain university status (1967).

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 the impact of educational change on British society and on individual opportunities. Candidates will be expected to use at least some of the factual framework suggested in order to argue on the extent of the impact of educational changes. They are likely to suggest that compulsory secondary education improved opportunities for children whose parents could not afford to pay for their education. They may also argue that the main beneficiaries were those who passed the 11+, since grammar schools got the bulk of the funding and many of the best teachers. Grammar schools undoubtedly changed opportunities for many; some would say that ‘secondary moderns’ only confirmed self-perception as ‘second’ or ‘third’-class citizens. The impact of the ‘comprehensive revolution’ may be judged even more controversial. On the one hand, the key intended impact was greater equality of opportunity and a lessening importance of family background. On the other, concerns grew that comprehensive schools did not stretch enough of the ablest pupils and that increasing behavioural problems in many comprehensive schools merely transferred one form of privilege for another. Increasingly, the quality of comprehensive schools seemed to link to the geographical location, with higher achievement in ‘more middle-class areas’. Candidates might wish to argue that the performance of comprehensives was not enhanced by their status and performance becoming an element in a political or ideological football. Candidates may argue that the perception that comprehensive schools were not, as a whole, achieving as much as hoped or intended led to greater central direction, especially under the Conservatives, with the emergence of a National Curriculum in the later 1980s. Candidates are likely to judge that a 1990 cut-off makes it difficult to judge the effectiveness of the NC regime, although some may wish to argue that it was obvious at inception that the Curriculum was too crowded and, probably, too prescriptive. The expansion of higher

education had similarly controversial aspects. The expansion of HE places was widely welcomed in many quarters and universities found little initial difficulty in recruiting the numbers Robbins called for. In this respect, the impact was great. Critics, however, saw the expansion as compromising the traditions of academic excellence in universities. Candidates may note two aspects of this if they wish to argue that the impact was not what the promoters of educational expansion intended. They may examine the 'more means worse' argument and they may also (or alternatively) argue that the expansion in the number of subjects compromised educational standards by introducing a number of allegedly 'soft' subjects. That such subjects seemed to be disproportionately attractive to students with lower A-level grades seemed to critics only to confirm that problems associated with expansion. By the end of the period, also, similar reservations were being made about the apparently inexorable rise in 'A' grades at A-level. The switch from norm- to criterion-referencing was a key factor in this expansion and candidates may wish to argue that the beneficial impact of educational expansion was to a degree vitiated by weary, and windy, annual battles over whether 'standards' were declining or not. By comparison, the introduction and development of the Open University attracted little controversy, while offering substantial new opportunities to 'second-chance', mature students. Candidates may argue as they wish, but it is difficult to argue against the proposition that education had a much higher political profile in 1990 than in 1945 and that the period was characterised by expansion of opportunity. How *effective* the performance of schools and universities were in 1990, compared with the situation in 1945, is a much more controversial issue.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

#### 46 Why did the British economy experience so many problems in the period 1951–89?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of an important theme. The theme here is the development of the British economy during a period which it experienced expansion overall but significant challenges especially in respect of the primary and manufacturing sectors. The chronological focus here allows candidates some latitude in discussing the economy because it ranges over the period, firstly when Keynesian demand management was the dominant element in British economic policy, and then (from the later 1970s) when considerations of money supply became ever more significant. Candidates are likely to mention problems in the balance of trade, where ‘visibles’ were in constant, and accelerating, deficit – especially in the later 1980s when manufacturing industry suffered directly as a result of government policies – and when ‘invisible’ exports only partially redressed the balance. Balance-of-payments crises were political as well as economic problems in the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s. Problems over trade deficits often put pressure on the pound, leading to a weakening pound and, in late 1967, devaluation from \$2.80 to \$2.40. The issue of inflation became increasingly important, both economically and politically, in the 1960s and early 1970s with a peak rise in the price index of nearly 27% in 1976. The index of prices increased (1955=100) to 499 by 1979. Put at its simplest, Britain was spending more than it was earning, and not least, perhaps, on wages where the index of real earnings (1955=100) had increased to 169 by 1979. A series of measures (Prices and Incomes policies; pay pauses, expenditure cuts in the public sector etc.) designed to get wages and prices into proper balance, proposed by both major parties, had very limited success. Most of Britain’s staple industries were in decline. Coal production halved over this period and the labour force was about eight times smaller in 1990 than it had been in 1951. Steel production, much increased in the 1960s and 1970s, had fallen back to 1951 levels by 1990. Even British car production showed no increase in 1990 on its 1960 levels, though it had increased in the 1950s. Increasingly, the British were buying foreign cars during the period when car purchase took off. Another key indicator which candidates might use concerns unemployment. Government policy until the later 1970s was geared to minimise unemployment and its impact. When unemployment figures rose above 500,000 in 1963, there was massive discontent. This was the only occasion before 1967 when unemployment was so high. It never fell below this level before 1976 and from 1976 to 1990, it was never below 1.3m, peaking at 3.3m in 1986. Changes in recording meant that the true figure on the earlier base was still higher. There is a significant shift in economic policy from the later 1970s which some date from the beginning of the Thatcher government, and others from the terms of the International Monetary Fund loan (1976) which required major cuts in public expenditure. In the Thatcher years, the key policy points are entry to the European Monetary System – minus the Exchange Rate Mechanism (1979) and a Medium Term Financial Strategy which turned on control of money supply to curb inflation. The Strategy produced high employment, substantial labour unrest and substantially affected the manufacturing sector. In 1987–88, a major slump in share prices and rise in interest rates. UK entered ERM – a move much previously discussed – Oct 1990, slightly after the period ends with sterling at parity DM 2.95.

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 causation since candidates are required to explain why the economy faced a number of significant challenges. Candidates can attribute causes in different ways, drawing on the evidence of economic policy and performance indicated by the material in AO1. Some may be inclined to blame politicians – the ‘years of consensus’ not sufficiently tackling structural imbalances in the economy; the balance between the public and private sectors too heavily weighted towards the former; Thatcher’s economic planning too loaded both with theory and economic advisers and also insufficiently sensitive to regional imbalances etc. There are, of course, more structural issues which meant that politicians of any stripe or ability might struggle. These include: long-term costs of fighting two wars; need for adjustment to loss of empire; an

economy over-balanced by extractive and manufacturing industries ever more vulnerable to world competition and lower prices. Britain might be considered late to realise the potential of a 'service economy' and the need to re-balance its economic portfolio. When the 'rebalancing' came in the 1980s, the adjustment was considered by many to be too hasty, too brutal and too damaging to social cohesion. For some, much blame might be attributed to over-mighty trade union barons, 'holding the country to ransom' etc. For others, the curses of 'gentlemanly capitalism' might be stressed, with far too many 'captains of industry' from public school backgrounds who – so the argument might run – were too 'rounded', too paternalistic or just too 'soft' to succeed in world markets. For some, also, the decision in the 1950s not to join the European Economic Community and to persevere with imperial attachments (which proved, in economic terms, to be a wasting, if not counter-productive, asset) might be given prominence. When Britain did eventually join the EU in 1973, it could be argued, the key elements (including a Common Agricultural Policy fashioned to Gallic specifications) put Britain at a disadvantage. Good candidates might wish to divide their causes into those which were Britain's 'fault' and those which would anyway have been difficult to deal with starting from the perspective of where Britain stood in 1951. It is possible to question the implication of the question by, for example, asking whether Britain's problems were necessarily graver than those of comparable countries or by indicating the value to the economy of the defence industry, or by noting that, once emphasis was placed on the service, leisure and cultural sectors, then Britain could present itself as a world leader. Some such comment is acceptable. The main thrust of responses, however, needs to be concerned with explaining the 'many problems' rather than debating how many there actually were.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

**47 How accurate is the view that the 1960s and 1970s represented a period of ‘massive cultural change’?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of an important theme. The theme here is changes in British society, with particular reference to changes in culture. Culture should be interpreted widely, not being restricted to the conventional understanding of what constituted ‘high culture’. The chronological focus here is quite specific, concentrating on decades conventionally associated with the growing importance of youth culture and of challenges to conventional authority. Candidates must be permitted to define ‘cultural change’ in a number of ways. They might, for example, choose to concentrate on elements of change in popular culture or on the changes in the structure of society, with conventional class barriers breaking down, or on the implications of rapidly rising living standards. One way or another, however, they should identify distinctive features and patterns of behaviour in society or displayed by clearly identifiable groups within that society. Candidates are likely to make reference to some of the following: the increasing number of challenges to authority, especially perhaps with the increasingly irreverent tone espoused both by popular newspapers and in television. Popular newspapers tend to emphasise individuals and, increasingly, ‘celebrities’ over hard news items. Television broadened its focus and also widened its appeal when BBC was challenged by ITV. Under Hugh Carleton Green, also, an increasingly questioning and irreverent style was pioneered which helped to develop a ‘satire boom’. In television, *That was the Week that Was* and in journalism *Private Eye* may be cited as examples. Politicians were also questioned less deferentially and more forensically. Even in the quality papers, there are increasing signs that what might be called ‘lifestyle issues’ were given greater prominence. The first ‘magazine’ in a newspaper was produced in 1962. The 1960s also saw the increasing influence of the United States, particularly in respect of popular music and of film. The voting age was reduced from 21 to 18 (1969). Britain also produced its distinctive contribution to popular music, especially in The Beatles and the Rolling Stones. Along with the growing popularity of ‘pop’ went greater emphasis on individual freedom, expressed (some might say) in terms of behavioural extremes, less self-discipline and greater self-indulgence. In the 1970s, popular music became both louder and associated more with both idiosyncratic and dangerous lifestyles. Developments in television helped to make it an increasingly powerful medium – BBC2 founded in 1964 and colour introduced from 1966. Numbers attending the cinema declined by about 75% from 1960–80 and was especially precipitous among the older, married members of society. Commercial radio, licensed from 1973, was overwhelmingly ‘pop’ and ‘youth’ in its cultural orientation. In terms of social change, candidates might mention the decline in the number of manufacturing jobs and the increase in both clerical and service-sector ones. On one interpretation, this period saw a larger proportion of ‘workers by brain’. Significant social and cultural changes occurred as a result of the gradual breaking-down of gender divisions in many occupations and also in the much larger number of married women working either full- and part-time. The idea that men should be ‘sole breadwinners’ and that women ‘going out to work’ signified family economic difficulty receded into insignificance in many parts of the country. Other indicators of growing prosperity include: the increase in owner-occupation, rises in life expectancy (almost 4 years for both sexes 1961–81), smaller proportions of income being spent on food (the development of supermarkets played a role here), longer and more diverse holidays, including the growing of the ‘package tour’. Other aspects of cultural change which some candidates might wish to mention include the legalisation of abortion (1967) and of homosexuality (1966), the abolition of censorship in the theatre (1969). The wider significance of the failure of the prosecution of Penguin for publishing *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* might also be mentioned.

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 an informed historical judgment about the extent of cultural change in the period specified. Drawing on evidence of the kind identified in AO1 above, candidates

should concentrate their arguments on to what extent these developments represented 'massive cultural change'. Those who believe that these two decades witnessed a substantial decline in deference will probably argue that the change was very substantial. It is also possible to argue that increases in living standards were unprecedentedly rapid, too, and brought substantial cultural changes in their wake. Foreign travel might indeed have broadened the collective mind. The contrast (at least in terms of popular image) between the 'stuffy fifties' and the 'lively, irreverent sixties' is substantial. Some might argue that both sexual liberation and a rising divorce rate in the 1960s and 1970s represented a substantial cultural change. Others might see the decline in formal religious observance in these decades as significant. The cultural influence, particularly of the Established Church, seemed to be in decline in these decades. Candidates are not asked to pass judgment on whether the changes they identify were a 'good' or a 'bad' thing. They must, however, decide how much impact they had and this will lead many into discussing how far-reaching they were. It is possible to argue that economic and social changes were more marked than cultural ones. Arguably, the overall power and influence of an educated elite, often with hereditary wealth, did not decline as far or as fast as emphasis on satire and on the growing popularity of popular music might allow. Despite considerable pressure either to close them or tax them out of existence, the influence of public schools – both in terms of emphasis on 'traditional' education and of disproportionate access to elite universities – remained substantial. On the other hand, educational expansion, particularly in higher education, gave a larger proportion of the public access to, and enjoyment of, what might be called 'elite culture' in art, music and theatre. Those arguing for substantial cultural change might respond to this by indicating that popular culture was treated more seriously than ever before and that the distinctions between elite and popular culture were becoming ever more blurred. Some candidates might wish to make geographical distinctions. Although the influence of television and popular newspapers might have increased a sense of 'national mood' or cultural awareness, it is possible to argue that rural society changed less rapidly in these decades than did urban society and that larger towns experienced more radical change than did smaller ones. Most candidates will probably argue that cultural change was indeed 'massive', though not all changes point in the same direction. The best candidates are likely to find space to discuss at least some continuities in cultural forms and practices as well as the perhaps more obvious, and certainly better publicised, changes.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

**48 'Powerful in the 1960s and 1970s; powerless in the 1980s and 1990s.' Discuss this view of the trade unions.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of an important theme. The theme here is the importance of the trade union movement during a period of significant change. The chronological focus here covers the period when the Unions were widely considered to exercise substantial power and also the period in which it was challenged by state power and by developments in the British economy. Candidates are likely to make reference to some of the following: the size of the trade union movement. Membership was growing throughout the 1960s and 1970s, from 9.8m in 1960 to a peak of 13.5m in 1979. In 1980s and 1990s, numbers decline, though not particularly rapidly until after 1990. Trade union membership was still over 10m in 1989, after a decade of anti-Union policies under Thatcher but declined to 7.8m in the 1990s. The number of Unions also declined by about a third (323 to 226) during the 1990s. Before then, the power of Unions was shown through strike action – characterised by its opponents as ‘holding the country to ransom’. Peak years for stoppages were 1972, 1979 and 1984, in each of which more than 23m working days were lost. Reflection on these dates might suggest to candidates that the miners were either especially ‘powerful’, or especially militant, or both. Perhaps of greater significance is the outcome of strikes. It could be argued that the action of the miners (opposed to Conservative Industrial Relations policy) in 1972–4 helped bring down the Heath government, when Heath miscalculated the political impact of his ‘Who governs Britain?’ appeal. By contrast, the 1984–5 miners’ strike was more bitter, probably had more public support, but was decisively won by the Thatcher government. A subtler form of ‘power’ is discerned by looking at the influence the Unions have over government. In the early 1960s, Conservatives wary of the power of the Unions: National Economic Development Council (1962) had TUC membership. The Labour governments (1964–70 and 1974–79) were so heavily funded by the Unions that Union influence was bound to be strong – swinging party conference votes and directly changing government policy. Engineering workers’ strike against wages policy (1968), their influence in stopping Barbara Castle’s *In Place of Strife* becoming the basis of a more consensual labour relations policy (1969), after Wilson as PM backed down. Incoming Labour government (1974) settled Miners’ Strike on favourable terms to the Union and repealed Tory industrial legislation. Arguably, also, Unions’ action against imposed pay settlements, in bringing about the ‘winter of discontent’ paved the way for the fall of Callaghan’s government and the election of a Conservative government under Thatcher (1978–9). From the 1980s, candidates might argue that Unions win far fewer battles. New government determined to resist collective militant action, and some observers believed it was deliberately picking a fight with the Unions in order to break their power. Steel strike (1980) won a big pay rise but was followed by widespread rationalisation and loss of jobs. Conservative aim was a more efficient workforce in industries which ‘the country could afford’. The 1980s saw massive reductions in the number of industrial workers and also substantially increased productivity. Both suggested that union power was in decline. Industrial productivity was partly the result of the switch of labour into more productive areas but partly the result of successful attacks on ‘restrictive practices’. Candidates may know about how these operated, especially among print workers and about the bitter struggles which ensued to remove them from national and local newspapers (including the non-publication of *The Times* newspaper in 1979 and Rupert Murdoch’s actions in 1986 in sacking striking print workers). Series of pieces of Conservative legislation designed to reduce Union power: Employment Act (1980) restricts picketing to those directly involved in a labour dispute and promotes secret ballots on strike action; Employment Act (1982) bans the ‘closed shop’, unless at least 85% of workers vote for it; Employment Act (1988) gives workers the right to ignore Union ballots in favour of strikes; Employment Act (1990) made it illegal to refuse to employ non-Union workers and also makes all ‘secondary action’ except picketing unlawful. The impact of the 1984–85 Miners’ strike might be seen by many candidates as a turning point. Not only did the NUM lose but the dispute split the miners and divided support among the Union movement as a whole. Much less legislation in the 1990s but it can be argued that Union power continued to seep away since the Conservatives remained in power until 1997.

Of greater importance, at least for some candidates, will be the radical rethinking of the Labour party's position on Unions. Blair (elected in 1994) found the extent of Union influence over Labour policy an embarrassment and forced the repeal of Clause IV through the Labour conference in 1995.

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 about the extent to which trade unions exercised power and influence in British society. Specifically, candidates are asked to debate two propositions: that the Unions were 'powerful' in the 1960s and 1970s but 'powerless in the 1980s and 1990s'. *Prima facie*, and using some of the evidence provided in AO1 above, it is likely that most candidates will agree with both judgements. Unions did affect government policy in the earlier period and some prominent trade unionists claimed, not implausibly, to have brought down governments. In the later period, Union influence was clearly on the wane, judged by almost any criterion: declining membership (though its speed should not be exaggerated); the much lower profile of trade union leaders (apart from the spectacularly unsuccessful Arthur Scargill, whom some candidates might even present as the symbol of Union powerlessness after 1985); legislation restricting Union powers; far less time working with an even superficially supportive government (and the extent to which the Blair government from 1997 was sympathetic to Union goals is highly dubious anyway); the number of Unions decreases. The best candidates might wish, however, to suggest some shades of grey. In the earlier period, the Unions did not directly dictate policy – very few serving trade union leaders ever served in government. Also, they lost strikes as well as winning them. Their 'power' might also have been more superficial than real. They were 'talked up', especially by the popular press, as powerful, self-serving demons but image and reality might well have been at variance. Apart from 1972–4, it might be difficult to point to the Unions' exercise of power, as opposed to wider influence, at the national level. Similarly, in the 1980s and 1990s, despite the obvious indicators of frailty, the Unions might not be so readily dismissed as the Manichean encapsulation of the position in the question's proposition implies. Union membership remains high during the Thatcher period, and substantially higher than in comparable west European countries. Even in the 1990s, the Unions are probably the largest collective 'benefit societies' in the nation, providing very substantial benefits and defences for their members. A loss of upfront 'political power' (and that can be exaggerated in the earlier period anyway) might be argued to be compensated by enduring influence in improving wages, working conditions and 'workers' rights' against exploitative employers. The trade union movement remained influential – albeit on a lesser scale – within the Labour party in 2000. It must be conceded, however, that root-and-branch opposition to the judgments reached in the question will be difficult. Expect most candidates to agree with both propositions and the better ones to make some evidence-based attempt to challenge the 'black/white' distinctions suggested.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/02A**

Paper 2a European History Outlines c. 300–c. 1516

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN PAPER

**2 hours 15 minutes**

---

**READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST**

Answer **three** questions which must be chosen from **at least two** sections of the paper.  
All questions in this paper carry equal marks.

You are reminded of the need for analysis and critical evaluation in your answers to questions. You should also show, where appropriate, an awareness of links and comparisons between different countries and different periods.

---

This document consists of **5** printed pages and **1** blank page.



**Section 1: c. 300–c. 632**

- 1 'The most significant event in his reign.' Discuss this view of Constantine's conversion to Christianity.
- 2 How prosperous was the late Roman economy?
- 3 How much did Gregory the Great contribute to the strengthening of papal authority?
- 4 How convincing is the argument that the Germanic peoples did more to preserve than to destroy the Roman Empire?
- 5 How valid is the judgement that Justinian I did more to weaken than to strengthen the Roman Empire?

**Section 2: c. 632–c. 919**

- 6 How are the Muslim conquests up to 711 best explained?
- 7 To what extent did the Carolingian rulers of Francia before 768 owe their success to military strength?
- 8 What was the significance of Charlemagne's coronation?
- 9 Assess the impact of the Vikings on ninth-century western Christendom. (Your answer should draw its examples specifically from continental Europe.)
- 10 How successful a ruler was Otto I?

**Section 3: c. 919–1099**

- 11 How strong was the German monarchy in the period 983–1039?
- 12 Assess the impact of the Cluniacs in the eleventh century.
- 13 Who won the Investiture Contest?
- 14 Account for the success of the Norman conquests in southern Italy and Sicily in the eleventh century.
- 15 (***Candidates offering Paper 5b: the Crusades should not answer this question.***)  
Why was the First Crusade so successful?

**Section 4: 1085–1250**

- 16 Why was the French monarchy more successful under Louis VI and Louis VII than it had been under their Capetian predecessors?
- 17 How successful were Frederick Barbarossa's policies in Germany?
- 18 How unified was France by the end of the reign of Philip Augustus?
- 19 'Passionately ambitious, prudent and far-sighted.' Discuss this judgement on Innocent III.
- 20 How effective a ruler was Frederick II?

**Section 5: Themes c. 300–c. 1200**

- 21 How accurate is the view that 'the Dark Ages saw many spectacular cultural achievements'?
- 22 How important was long distance trade and commerce to the European economy in the period c. 900–c. 1200?
- 23 Why were towns in decline in the Early Middle Ages?
- 24 ***(Candidates offering Paper 5b: the Crusades should not answer this question.)***  
Explain the survival of the Crusader States in the period 1099–1187.
- 25 How is the growth of heresy in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries best explained?
- 26 How are the origins and development of universities in France and Italy best explained?

**Section 6: 1250–c. 1378**

- 27 'Louis IX's reputation for saintliness shrouds his weaknesses as King.' How accurate is this view?
- 28 What issues were at stake in the conflict between Philip IV of France and Pope Boniface VIII?
- 29 Assess the impact of Mongol expansion on Europe in the period 1250–1378.
- 30 How is the papal residence at Avignon between 1309 and 1377 best explained?
- 31 Why did many of the Italian city states experience so much growth and success in the fourteenth century?

**Section 7: c. 1378–c. 1461**

- 32 Why did the problems posed by the Great Schism prove so difficult to resolve?
- 33 How dangerous were Hus and his followers to the unity of the Church?
- 34 When were the Dukes of Burgundy most powerful in the period 1384–1467?
- 35 How, and how fully, did Charles VII restore royal authority in France?
- 36 Discuss the importance of the fall of Constantinople in 1453.

**Section 8: c. 1461–c. 1516**

- 37 How effective was Louis XI in overcoming both external and internal opposition?
- 38 Assess the importance of religion as an influence upon the policies of Ferdinand and Isabella.
- 39 How far were Ottoman successes and failures in the late-fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries determined by the abilities of their sultans?
- 40 How successful was Maximilian I in furthering the interests of the Habsburgs?
- 41 Why was Italy the focus of international rivalry in the period 1494–1516?

**Section 9: Themes c. 1200–c. 1516**

- 42 Why did population levels increase so much in the period c. 1200–c. 1350?
- 43 How is the appeal of chivalry in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries best explained?
- 44 Assess the impact of the 'Black Death' on **at least two** European states.
- 45 Why, in the fifteenth century, was Portugal the leading European state in undertaking overseas exploration?
- 46 How important was patronage to the flourishing of the Italian Renaissance?
- 47 To what extent were **either** Jews **or** homosexuals **or** lepers treated as outcasts in late-medieval society?

**BLANK PAGE**

---

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

University of Cambridge International Examinations is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/02A**

Paper 2a European History Outlines c. 300–c. 1516

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

**2 hours 15 minutes**

---

**MAXIMUM MARK: 90**

---

This document consists of **49** printed pages and **1** blank page.



**Section 1: c. 300–c. 632****1 'The most significant event in his reign.' Discuss this view of Constantine's conversion to Christianity.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required; a narrative will not answer the question much, if at all. Analysis is required, allied to evaluation.

The focus here is upon assessment of the centrality of the conversion to (perhaps more accurately, the embracing of) Christianity and other action areas, assessing importance and achievement. The embracing of Christianity (Milvian Bridge), the legalisation of Christianity, his support for the Church and involvement in doctrinal matters (especially at Nicaea), the first attacks on paganism, the destruction of the tetrarchy, making himself sole emperor and the style of monarchy espoused, taking further army reforms, the foundation of Constantinople and the promotion of legal reforms are likely to feature, though other areas can be considered. The significance of the event set against other actions should be a key feature of strong answers. It would be possible to consider also the arrangements for the succession and failure to solve some problems, not least the barbarians, as evidence for significance, not least longer-term.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. The formulation 'most significant' invites an attempt to put the event cited in the wider context of the reign and actions and events, arguing as to importance.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

## 2 How prosperous was the late Roman economy?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required; analysis and evaluation, not simple description of features.

There is debate here and candidates may well reflect such as well as consider the differences between East and West in economic activity. Likely areas of assessment include trade routes and volumes, the nature of trade, towns and cities as commercial centres, coinage as exchange, taxation levels and fiscal policies, lifestyles, the balance between rural and urban examples. A focus on Italy will be needed but there also needs to be consideration of other parts of the Empire, both supporting the Italian economy and often acting independently. The Empire in the West had poor productivity (climatic factors were involved as well as issues of the nature and uses of labour), an over-reliance on tribute from Africa and Sicily, coinage debasement, population decline, a drift from cities (the *collegia* were established to remedy this), interrupted corn supplies at times – all affecting prosperity. Of course, it is possible to argue for evidence of economic decline, in part the result of over-taxation as well as these factors, in contrast to a more vibrant picture in the Eastern Empire.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may be relevant. Although the Western part of the Empire had variable prosperity features, the East evidently had much more success. Explanation of the reasons is not a central requirement here, rather evaluation of extent is the key need.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

### 3 How much did Gregory the Great contribute to the strengthening of papal authority?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – an evaluation as to extent and scope. A narrative of Gregory's life and career will not answer the question unless there is clear analysis.

Assessment of Gregory's achievements is required but this needs to be focused upon the issue of how far these contributed to greater and stronger papal authority. A perspective that contrasts short- and long-term may work well here. It is possible to argue that, at the time, there was little that he did that seemed significant and that it was only later, in retrospect, that his work took on significance. Indeed, it is possible to argue that his reputation in Rome was nothing for a long time after his death. In the short term, his relief work, social and charitable works, strong and efficient administration, truces with the Lombards, relations with the Emperors and attempts to get the Frankish Church reformed might be assessed; outcomes were mixed and he rejected the 'authoritarian' papacy stances of the recent past. In the longer-term, the mission to England, his writings and their status, his patrimonial reorganisation and the 'monasticisation' of the papacy might be considered as of real significance.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, it could be argued that Gregory's reputation was far greater much later than at the time; that he was rather subservient to lay rulers at the time, not assertive of papal activity; that he achieved limited goals in his lifetime; that a retrospective view plus focus on some actions and especially writings enhanced reputation and status.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

#### 4 How convincing is the argument that the Germanic peoples did more to preserve than to destroy the Roman Empire?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – analysis and argument are required, not a description of features. The time span is likely to be the fifth and sixth centuries for examples.

There is debate here and argument and counter-argument are expected. The classic view would be that the Germanic tribes overran and destroyed the Western Empire, plunging it into the ‘Dark Ages’. A case can be made for a much more subtle view: preservation of institutions, ideas, practices; absorption within new rulership practices. It is possible to see the problem in the West in two ways: barbarians destroyed Roman civil rule and replaced it with cruder political structures and barbarian leaders respecting imperial rule in Constantinople but assuming practical control in the West themselves. On those terms, they acted as imperial agents, adopting imperial styles (e.g. wearing the imperial purple). But there was then no respect for imperial authority in Rome itself. Stilicho would be an early example; Odovacer and Theodoric were classic examples; Clovis in Gaul had an interesting approach to the adaptability of Roman customs and practices. Both Theodoric and Clovis created amalgams of German traditions and Roman civil laws; they used elements of Roman and Gallo-Roman aristocracies in local rule; they used Christianity; they made play of parts of the Roman cultural heritage.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. The formulation ‘How convincing’ invites an attempt to put the case for and against, to create argument and counter-argument, possibly seeing a mixture of damage and preservation (as above).

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

## 5 How valid is the judgement that Justinian I did more to weaken than to strengthen the Roman Empire?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required; analytical and evaluative approaches rather than a narrative of the reign and its events are essential to a successful answer.

Justinian's Western enterprises will need to be assessed and set against other activity areas, including in the East. Justinian's aims need discussion, with outcomes measured against those. Answers should consider such areas as the enterprises in the West (not least Italy and North Africa) and the allocation of resources and military power to the re-creation of the old Empire, the legal reforms, the administration of his lands, buildings, finances and taxation, the Persians, and the Slavs and the Danube frontier. His high energy levels and activism were important, but it can be argued that, ultimately, he betrayed the true interests of the Empire in pursuit of what were outdated ambitions in the West.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may be relevant. The formula of 'how valid' invites argument and counter-argument, with reasons explained and supported. Although the achievements of Justinian are seen as many, there is plenty of scope for interrogation. Justinian has had a reasonably high reputation, in part the product of contemporary writings, but a retrospective view suggests faultlines in some of his key policy areas. There are arguments over the realism of his aims (outmoded? outdated?) and over whether the concentration on the West was excessive.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**Section 2: c. 632–c. 919****6 How are the Muslim conquests up to 711 best explained?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is explanation based on analysis and evaluation. A narrative of events will not answer the question unless it has analytical elements. The boundary dates are the death of the Prophet Mahomed and the start of the conquest of Spain.

Reference can be made to both the scale and scope of the conquests and to the favourable external circumstances that aided Muslim ambitions, energy and zeal. Some reference to the causes of Muslim expansion would be in order, if linked to an explanation of success: religious zeal as a consequence of the emergence of Islam in the Arabian peninsula, cause of unity of tribes, expansion as a religious duty, perhaps linked to a wish for self-betterment, the poverty of the peninsula. Religious zeal led to passion, a disdain for death (Koranic assurance of salvation), cooperation between tribes. Military superiority (including naval power), leadership, disaffection inside the Byzantine provinces, the weakening of the Empire by Avar and Persian Wars, divided imperial councils, a failure to take the Arabs seriously, sheer pace of expansion and the dynamic that propelled them across into Spain, all can be adduced as factors for assessment.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. The formulation ‘best explained’ invites an attempt to put the relevant factors into some order of relative importance, although candidates should also recognise connections between the issues. Internal Muslim dynamic can be assessed against very favourable external, contextual factors.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**7 To what extent did the Carolingian rulers of Francia before 768 owe their success to military strength?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – explanation from analysis and evaluation, not a simple narrative of events (unless such has causal elements).

The rise of the Carolingians needs to be discussed in the context of the decline of the Merovingians and their eventual supplanting by the Carolingian dynasty. Military prowess, linked to feudal-social developments and strong leadership, will feature in assessments. Issues that can be addressed include the role of the Carolingians as highly effective Mayors of the Palace; Pippin II's victory at Tetry (687), their acceptance as effective defenders of vassals' interests; Charles Martel's victory at Poitiers (732) and their acceptance by the papacy (751). Merovingian weaknesses in administration, the growth of private armies (perhaps encouraged by the Mayors) and the problems of divided inheritance can also be adduced in assessment.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, it could be argued that success and eventual royal status owed all to Carolingian strengths, whether military or other. Then again, it could be said they were superb opportunists, making the most of growing Merovingian frailties.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

## 8 What was the significance of Charlemagne's coronation?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required; analysis of significance; not description of 800 and not a narrative of the reign before and after 800.

The coronation of 800 has excited debate and this may well be reflected in answers. Answers will need to compare the position and powers of Charlemagne before and after 800, with some references likely to the 'decomposition thesis'. Material is plentiful here, of course, and candidates will need to cover some, but not necessarily all, of these issues in their assessments: administration; political control of the regions; campaigning (frequency, level, type and whether offensive before and defensive after); relations with the papacy and with Rome (the coronation having a significant bearing on both); development of the imperial idea; relations with Byzantium and the impact on those of the coronation; 'decomposition' (the state of Charlemagne's authority, control and territories at the time of his death). Analysis of the events of the coronation may be useful (in telling us something about the importance which Charlemagne attached to the ceremony) but more important will be consideration of whether changes occurred after the coronation or whether his ideas were developing in these directions before 800.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may be relevant. Although the coronation of 800 was important, its significance can be over-rated – hence debate as to its centrality and the linkage to (e.g.) the 'decomposition thesis'. There is much scope to consider whether 800 was indeed a turning point or was over-rated subsequently, there being much continuity.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**9 Assess the impact of the Vikings on ninth-century Christendom. (Your answer should draw its examples specifically from continental Europe.)**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – an assessment of factors and issues, not a description or narration of events and acts.

There is plenty of debate here, between an older view of the Vikings as simply highly destructive and a more balanced view wherein their impact is seen as positive and even constructive at times and in places. Destructiveness is itself not in doubt but it can be argued that its extent was greatly exaggerated by contemporary sources and those historians who followed and used them. Viking impact can be measured at a number of levels: Viking raids and their effects (e.g. monasteries and towns sacked or abandoned, killings, payment of geld, political consequences for regions and rulers), with some focus on the economic and assessment of the nature and value of the evidence. The distinction between raids and settlement activities should be a feature as should consideration of beneficial aspects, longer-term (stronger local rule, adaptability to local circumstances, trade routes and generation of further wealth). A range of area examples from Continental Europe is expected.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this instance, there is considerable debate (as above) as to the nature of the source material and its subsequent usage by historians and as to destruction pure and simple set against more creative, positive features.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

## 10 How successful a ruler was Otto I?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The focus will be on the reign of Otto I and will be sharp and persistent. A narrative is unlikely to answer the question much without analytical features. Good analysis and evaluation are required.

Otto I is seen as a highly successful ruler and the best answers will need to deliver a balanced assessment of achievements. The extent to which the monarchy was strengthened across the reign is important. Reference can be made to Otto's (relative) success in dealing with the problems of the duchies; expanding the German monarchy's authority eastwards and into Italy, with a consequent increase in wealth, resources and prestige; defeating the Magyars (significant); establishing an effective hegemony in Western Europe; tying royal fortunes closely to the Church, with a likely increase in the efficiency and reliability of government. Whether the Emperorship represented a strengthening of the monarchy may well be debated.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Candidates will need to address 'How successful...' and argue and assess, possibly counter-argue, as to achievements, levels, extent, impact, importance. Otto I's reputation does stand high and answers are likely to agree, though reasoned counter-arguments would be welcome.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

## Section 3: c. 919–1099

## 11 How strong was the German monarchy in the period 983–1039?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The focus will be on the period from 983 to 1039, the reigns of Otto III, Henry II and Conrad II will be spanned and supporting material will have to be selected given the range of coverage.

Answers will need to compare the position of the monarchy in 983 and in 1039, assessing how far there was steady growth in power and prestige or whether there was unevenness. The reign of Otto III has some special importance, given his status and interests, especially outside Germany; the effect on the monarchy there can be considered. Areas for assessment include political leadership, relations with the duchies, military power and resources, feudal developments, control and patronage of the Church and the uses made of church personnel. Otto III had much focus on Italy but pursued efficiency, control and loyalism inside Germany, to release resources for Italian enterprises. Henry II concentrated on German internal affairs and creating a binding peace via support of the Church; he promoted ecclesiastical reforms, appointing bishops and abbots and links with Cluny. Conrad II, representing a new dynastic family, pushed German expansion to the East, influencing areas of Poland, Bohemia and Slavic peoples; he developed the ministeriales, to consolidate administration and, critically perhaps, he created a feudal base with vassals, suzerainty and lands as a strong base for military and political power.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this instance, a strong focus upon ‘How strong...’ is necessary, with clear evaluation across the 56 years involved here, linked to a focus upon 983 set against 1039. Candidates may well consider change v. continuity here and probe the extent of strengths achieved.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**12 Assess the impact of the Cluniacs in the eleventh century.**

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The focus will be on the period of major Cluniac success and impact. Pure description of the Cluniacs or a narrative of their development will not go very far.

Cluniac popularity, measured by membership, donations and benefactions, admiration, will be assessed. The impact of the Order was significant and answers are likely to consider factors such as the revival and reinvigoration of the Benedictine Rule, centralised organisation, freedom from lay and Episcopal jurisdiction, the emphasis upon *opus Dei*, an emphasis upon grandeur in the service of God, dependence on endowments of cultivated lands, the vigour of heads of the Order e.g. St Odilo and St Hugh, the influence on the Papacy and the developing Papal reform movement and the influence on lay rulers, linked to the attractions to noble families seeking a strong spirituality. It became the dominant (new) order of the period, fostering links with a range of rulers, Norman, French and German.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Candidates need to assess, giving a sense of relative importance, assessing impact areas, levels, features, responses and measurements of such. Areas of debate: did they appear novel, different? Did they simply revive existing ideas and practices?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

### 13 Who won the Investiture Contest?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The focus will be on the period of Gregory VII and Henry IV's conflicts or it could be longer. Analysis is required, not a narrative of actions and events.

This is a question that can be answered in the shorter or longer term perspective: either assessing the outcome at the time of the death of Gregory VII or else at the time of the final compromise of 1122. Answers will need to make some reference to the issues involved: the historic background of a weak papacy and authoritative monarchy; the shifts after c. 1046; the establishment of a reformed papacy and its ideological position; Gregory VII's agenda and the threat he presented to traditional German monarchy, especially in regard to the control of the Church; the circumstances leading up to Canossa and Henry IV's dilemma (mindful that Henry was not genuinely submissive in 1077); the aftermath of entrenched positions. Attempts at compromise failed under Urban II but had some success under Paschal II (e.g. in 1107). Calixtus II eventually settled the great dispute in 1122: the compromise appeared to benefit the papacy but, in reality, much was ceded to local rulers. It may be useful to consider the nature of the eventual settlements achieved.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this instance, there is much debate as to outcome, short- and long-term. For example, it is possible to argue that Canossa has been over-rated and that, by the time of his death, Gregory VII had achieved little, other than creating splits inside the Church. Then again, successors (Urban II, Paschal II) held to the Gregorian reforms and eventually (1106–7 – England, France, 1122 – The Empire) settlements were reached. The issue then is whether secular rulers gained more than ecclesiastical – or whether the *regnum v. sacerdotium* tensions were still evident.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**14 Account for the success of the Norman conquests in southern Italy and Sicily in the eleventh century.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The focus will be on the period of Robert Guiscard and Roger the Great Count (1054 to 1101).

Norman success can be measured by an analysis of both their internal strengths and favourable external factors. Assessment of such factors as the leadership and opportunism of Robert Guiscard and Roger the Great Count; political as well as military leadership should be assessed. The military prowess of the Normans, their tactical adaptability, the confused political state of the areas concerned, the preoccupations of Byzantium elsewhere (e.g. with the Seljuks), papal conflict with Germans and the opportunities these allowed to the Normans, conservative and adaptive policies in political and governmental areas, the ability to mesh together different cultures and ideas, are other factors for assessment and evaluation of the highly successful and relatively fast Norman takeover. Reference may be made to events in 1053–4, 1062, 1071–2 and the extension of a mix of feudal monarchy and political overlordship, making use of an at times harassed papacy.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Candidates need to focus upon ‘Account for...’ and deliver a series of reasons, in context and with a sense of relative importance. Contextual factors may have been as important as anything the Normans did. Then again, they were formidably adept as a political and military force.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

## 15 Why was the First Crusade so successful?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The focus will be on the period from the inception in 1095–6 to 1099 and the success at Jerusalem.

The success of the Crusade can be attributed to a range of factors, all linked. Evaluation will need to assess these and to offer some sense of relative importance. Factors for consideration include: the powerful rhetoric of Pope Urban II; the religious fervour engendered and displayed; the dynamism provided by religion; key religious moments (the Holy Lance, the procession around Jerusalem), military strategy and tactics, including the ability to adapt to a foreign terrain and to develop successful siege techniques; military leadership as offered by a range of princes and nobles; knightly and feudal ties; popular energy (not always well-directed, of course); some (uneven) Byzantine help; the serious divisions amongst Muslim opponents (Sunni and Shi'ite, Aleppo, Damascus, etc.).

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this instance, a persistent focus on 'Why...' is required and there may well be a sense of relative importance as to factors, though candidates should see the connections between factors. Areas of debate: for example, the centrality of religious zeal set against political and military factors or (to some) the fortuitous circumstances of divided Muslims, found in the Holy Land.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**Section 4: 1085–1250****16 Why was the French monarchy more successful under Louis VI and Louis VII than it had been under their Capetian predecessors?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question will be required. Issues likely to be discussed include the military successes of Louis VI against the barons of the Ile de France, the role of Abbot Suger as politician and propagandist, the growth of towns and Capetian links to them, strengthening of feudal ties, improved relations with the papacy, and changing relations with the Normans and Angevins in France and England.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. This is a question with a broad range, and, although candidates will not be expected to be exhaustive in their coverage, reference to both the earlier and the later periods should be made – although there is more material available on the later period, and this is likely to be reflected in the answers. Nevertheless, comparison between the early period and the later, rather than description, is required here. Candidates will need to show an awareness of the feudal structure of France, and an understanding of the relationship between the royal domain and the Kingdom as a whole. The historiography of the period is dominated by the work of the *Annales* school and historians such as Bloch and Duby: discussion of their views would enhance an answer.

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.

**17 How successful were Frederick Barbarossa's policies in Germany?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question will be required. Issues of relevance here are likely to be the Guelf/Ghibelline struggle, Henry the Lion, policy towards the magnates and administration.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. A balanced assessment of his reign will need to take into consideration failures as well as successes in the topics listed under AO1. Some understanding of the concept and nature of Frederick's empire, and the historiographical debate surrounding it, would enhance answers here; although the question requires focus on Germany, discussion of the repercussions of his policies on Italy, in particular his Imperial policy, is perfectly in order.

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.

**18 How unified was France by the end of the reign of Philip Augustus?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Unifying factors include a strong administration, Philip's personal popularity, military successes against the Angevins, and the subduing of many of the barons and princes. On the other hand, the south-west remained a problem despite the Albigensian Crusade, the cultures of the north and south are very different, and, as some answers might point out, bringing the country under closer royal control does not necessarily equate with a greater sense of national unity or French identity.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. An evaluative discussion of the extent of French unity will involve consideration of ways in which it was unified by 1223 as well as ways in which it was not – the arguments of Duby are relevant here. Better answers might also consider the problems associated with evaluating the evidence from the reign, in particular the laudatory chronicle sources.

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.

**19 'Passionately ambitious, prudent and far-sighted.' Discuss this judgement on Innocent III.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates need to address the specific terms of the question. In doing so, they are likely to consider the following topics: Innocent's conception of papal authority (*ratione peccati* and the Plenitude of Power), papal legislation, administration, the Fourth Crusade, the Albigensian Crusade, dealings with Philip Augustus and John, the imperial succession dispute and dealings with other European powers. In doing so, they should assess the extent to which his actions reflect the judgement contained in the question – ways in which they do, and ways in which they do not.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Candidates should show awareness of the nature of Innocent's authority and his conception of it. There is some historiographical debate surrounding this – in particular, over the extent of the claims which Innocent made. Candidates might also show awareness of the Fourth Lateran Council, and the claims which it made of papal authority. Judgements are likely to focus on the extent to which Innocent's claims of papal power matched the reality.

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.

## 20 How effective a ruler was Frederick II?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates need to address the notion of effectiveness, considering both ways in which his rule was effective and ways in which it was not. Consideration of the issues concerned with judging the effectiveness of a medieval ruler would also be relevant here. Issues which are likely to be raised include: his dealings with Italy, Sicily, and the rest of the Mediterranean, his clashes with the papacy, his supposed neglect of Germany, and the culture of his court. Some assessment of the events after his reign would also help to inform an answer to this question – his empire was short-lived after his death.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Candidates are likely to show awareness of the nature of the Empire, Frederick's conception of his authority, and the reasons why it brought him into conflict with both secular rulers and the papacy. Some discussion of the cultures of Germany and the Mediterranean world would be relevant, as would the issue of relations with other religions – Islam and Judaism.

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.

**Section 5: Themes c. 300–c. 1200****21 How accurate is the view that ‘the Dark Ages saw many spectacular cultural achievements’?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Simple description of cultural achievements will not go far to answer the question. Rather analysis and evaluation are required, focused on the accuracy of the statement. Candidates will need to be selective in knowledge. The ‘Dark Ages’ can be said to have lasted from c. 400 to c. 1000 at the latest and some assessment of how ‘Dark’ they were will be offered here, as context to an examination of cultural activities. It is likely that there will be a good focus on the Carolingian Renaissance and its productive output in scholarship, literature, books, writings. This could be said to have been the ultimate demonstration of achievements, no matter how uncertain political conditions. Reference could also be made to pre-Carolingian achievements in, for example, Merovingian Gaul and Visigothic Spain, with cultural achievements in the former set in a context of political weaknesses. Answers can assess areas such as architecture, literature, handwriting forms, book production, liturgical and ecclesiastical art, philosophy and theology, historical recoveries and uses. The cultural achievements were very much founded on monasteries, religious devotion, education and schools, with an emphasis on both the revival and conservation of classical heritage 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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. ‘How accurate ...’ sets up argument and evaluation; ‘spectacular’ will need to be addressed, as to scope and character. It can be argued that cultural achievements emanated from a decidedly unfavourable context of upheaval, change, dislocation, etc. Then again, such may often be the case and there were also periods here when stability was sufficient to enable cultural work to flourish. Patronage and uses of cultural expressions to aid political goals or religious ends might be a feature of evaluation.

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.

**22 How important was long distance trade and commerce to the European economy in the period c. 900 – c. 1200?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Description of trade and commerce will not answer the question, unless there is explanation. Analysis and evaluation will be required; knowledge will have to be selective given the time span; other factors will need to be assessed. The nature of trade and exchange, the growth of towns and markets, the development of new mercantile organisations and a range of financial methods (e.g. *commenda*, *societas maris*), the role of Jews, the importance of links with the Byzantine Empire and the Muslim world, the expansion of trading fleets and the protection afforded to foreign merchants, are some areas for consideration. Pavia, Milan, Amalfi, Pisa, Venice, Genoa may be seen as important Southern centres but examples from Northern Europe can be cited as well (Paris, Bruges, London, for example). Other factors, albeit linked, could include the stimulus provided by changes in fashion and taste, growing wealth and relative urban security, the attitudes of rulers and local élites, the encouragement offered to trade for financial gain, agrarian developments, elementary industrial developments.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. ‘How important...’ invites argument and counter-argument, the assessing in relative importance of factors other than or alongside trade and commerce, with a sense of prioritisation but also awareness of links between factors. Trade clearly was important; there were developments; links developed with towns and markets; new routes were sought, old confirmed. Then again, whether trade preceded other changes or followed such is open to debate; it could have been the stimulus or the response. Changing tastes, needs, fashions, wealth needs, and more relative security for traders, all could be assessed here.

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.

## 23 Why were towns in decline in the Early Middle Ages?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Analysis and explanation are required here; an assessment of a range of factors will be needed. The ‘Early Middle Ages’ may be viewed as a long period running from c. 400 to c. 1000. Examples of urban decay and decline are required, with a suitable geographical span. In the East, in the Byzantine Empire, urban activity remained strong: cities and towns were social, political and economic centres. In the West, political upheavals, strife, disrupted trade routes and activities, falling money circulation had a big impact; populations fell; commerce took a downturn; local markets were often subsumed by local or regional aristocracies, output taken in local taxes and dues; there were many threats to traders and so to urban centres. In Northern France and Britain urban decay was less pronounced. Decline can be measured in contraction, decay, limited economic, financial and commercial activity.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Candidates may well seek to challenge the terms of the question and well reasoned arguments should be rewarded. ‘Why...’ invites explanation and reasons are expected to be set out in some order of relative importance, albeit with awareness of connections between such. Urban decline does need both measurement (size, scale, frequency) and exemplification (uniform, irregular). Focus is likely upon internal and external factors: did towns decline because of inner problems, tensions, unrest, violence, disease, collapse of markets, collapse as centres? Did they decline in response to external economic, political, social changes such as dislocation of trade, collapse of monetary systems, growing seigneurial-feudal-aristocratic power, greater demands for labour on farms and manors?

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.

**24 Explain the survival of the Crusader States in the period 1099–1187.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A narrative of events is not required. Even with explanation along the way, the answer is likely to be weak. Analysis and evaluation are required, with a strong sense of explanation, bounded by the creation of the Kingdom of Jerusalem and the disaster at Hattin. A range of factors can be cited, with selected examples in support: leadership, military and political; sound local-area tactics; an ability to adapt warfare; the avoidance of pitched battles except on very favourable terms or if unavoidable; close disciplined cooperation of cavalry and infantry; the role of castles; local alliances or pacts with Muslim rulers; dependence on Muslim divisions and disunity; application of resources; the role of Military Orders; the arrival of new settlers, periodically; a flow of military expeditions and armed pilgrimages, though not recognised officially as Crusades; resilience, morale, religious strength; relative, if fragile, Christian unity. Of course, the fall of Edessa in 1144 can be cited as an example of the threat that was inherent in the Crusader States' position; so, too, Muslim unity then and later in the 1180s represented serious challenges, opening up fissures and weaknesses within the make-up of the States. The effectiveness of the methods employed to preserve the States is shown by the events of 1187 when the abandonment of the principle of avoiding pitched battles led to disaster.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'Explain...' requires assessment and evaluation of a range of factors, set in the context of a long time span. There may well be a sense of relative importance but candidates should be aware of connections and links. Candidates may well consider the balance or imbalance of internal and external factors: were the states simply lucky? Did they benefit from the prevalence of the disunity of enemies? Did they benefit from periodic wise leadership? Did they adapt well and were they realistic in aims and actions, only faltering when the reverse applied? Was survival ultimately solely dependent upon their neighbours and potential enemies?

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.

## 25 How is the growth of heresy in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Description of heretical activity will not answer the question unless there is good explanation. Analysis and evaluation are required. Given the long time span, selection of factual knowledge to support argument will be necessary. Heresy or heresies can be defined, in the context of the problems experienced by the Church at several levels. Examples that might be used: Waldensians; Humiliati; the preachings of such as Peter of Bruis and Henry the Monk; Cathars – Albigensians. Some were relatively local, some more regional. Certainly, Church authorities were often negligent and tardy in their responses. Some movements emanated from offshoots of the Papal Reform movement of the eleventh century; many sprang from growing lay (and some ecclesiastical) dissatisfaction with the Church, its structure and teachings, with what was seen as an increasingly ‘worldly’ church and papacy. Factors to be considered: a sentiment favouring mere ‘personal’ religion; a stress on poverty, emphasised by urbanisation and visible extremes of wealth; circulation of reform critiques; easier access to and spread of ideas, via trade and towns; a more questioning attitude (possibly engendered by the ‘twelfth-century renaissance’); deliberate missionary activities (especially by the Cathars); the inherent attractiveness of heretical teachings and practices, linked to deliberate flouting of those in authority.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The formulation ‘best explained ...’ invites argument and an ordering of reasons, with some sense of relative importance as well as of connections. Argument and debate are invited as to reasons and the interaction of ideas, personalities and context. There is good scope here for discussion. Heresy, in different forms, was a norm of much of the Church’s history but may have become more potent at this time. Was it the product of real and growing discontent with the existing Church, its structures and teachings? Was it more the product of a spirit of growing enquiry, debate, challenge, in part in the context of educational and social changes? How far was it led by members of the clergy? How far led by inquisitive and dissatisfied lay members? How far was heresy tolerated, even encouraged, by the culture of particular regions (e.g. North Italian cities, the Languedoc region)?

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.

**26 How are the origins and development of universities in France and Italy best explained?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Description of universities and university life is not required. There needs to be analysis, linked to evaluation. No specific dates are given but a focus on the twelfth century is highly likely, with some sense of antecedents. Some continuation into the thirteenth century would be acceptable but the terminal date of c. 1200 needs to be borne in mind. Some comment on the idea of a ‘university’ would be helpful. It has been said that the school followed the teacher, then the teacher followed the school, as universities began to develop around masters and their licences, based in major urban centres. Paris and its theological reputation, Bologna and its legal expertise, can be cited, with a sense of their growing influence. Local and regional factors, royal and aristocratic, secular and ecclesiastical needs – literacy skills, numeracy, administrative and governmental, ideological (local rivalries, Papal-Imperial, Papal-royal) – were important and can be assessed as to relative importance. The particular conditions, needs and expectations in parts of France and Italy should be evaluated. Connections with the ‘twelfth-century Renaissance’ would be in order, provided the thrust of the question here is maintained. The intimate connections of a spirit of enquiry, more literacy, educational awareness, growing interest in philosophy (especially Aristotle), the needs of state and church can be developed.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The formulation ‘best explained ...’ invites argument and a sense of the ordering of factors, linked to relative importance; candidates should be aware of connections between factors. Here, it is possible to focus upon why France and Italy especially, and why different manifestations there. It is possible to argue for accident or for design or a mixture. Universities may have arisen in a potent climate of change, challenge, enquiry or as a result of the needs of secular and ecclesiastical rulers. Context was important, clearly; perhaps it was decisive, perhaps it simply helped shape powerful intellectual surges. In addition, the role of students as against their teachers – masters may be considered here.

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.

## Section 6: 1250–1378

**27 'Louis IX's reputation for saintliness shrouds his weaknesses as King.' How accurate is this view?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A narrative of the reign will not answer the question unless there is explanation. Analysis and evaluation are required, putting Louis IX into context and considering his impact, the strengths and successes set against any weaknesses and failings. His reputation was high, of course; hence the 'St Louis'. Candidates could refer to: the overt concern to deliver good justice; diplomatic activity and successes (especially Corbeil in 1258, Paris in 1259); hostility to Jews, heretics, blasphemers (hence saintliness?); the steady growth of royal administration and financial machinery; royal control over the church; religious foundations (e.g. Royaumont, La Sainte Chapelle); crusading spirit and repute: high personal esteem via personal holiness and related characteristics. The fate of the two crusades merits discussion: humiliating failure in 1250; perceived martyrdom in 1270 when he died on crusade (hence St Louis). His piety is accepted but there were also opportunities seized and there were non-pious motives. The nature of French royal power and authority at the start and end of the reign could be assessed as well as any inherent weaknesses (over-dependence on the person of the King and on effective advisers and administrators, possible tensions with the church, the power of the aristocracy, the continuing reactions to the strength and power of Philip Augustus' unification drive).

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'How accurate...' invites debate and argument and counter-argument. Reputation will need to be addressed – contemporary and later – and linked to the assessment of successes and failures, strengths and weaknesses. It is quite likely that responses will tend to argue for saintliness and religiosity, without much weakness present. Since this is an argument-driven question, this is permissible, provided they make a good case. Then again, underlying weaknesses, personal, structural, in legacy, may feature and be set against successes. Ultimately, this is an assessment of reputation and standing and, perhaps, how far Louis' policies were the product of his own inclinations or the result of key advisers around him. It is possible to argue that his legacy was a mixed one.

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.

## 28 What issues were at stake in the conflict between Philip IV of France and Pope Boniface VIII?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A narrative or description of this famous conflict is not required. Assessment of the issues – in context – is required, based on good levels of analysis and evaluation. It can be argued that ‘traditionalism’, represented by Boniface, clashed with ‘modernism’, espoused by Philip: Boniface stood by traditional, well-rehearsed papal arguments to justify his position in conflicts with lay rulers; Philip used arguments, methods and tactics used by rulers of more modern times, not of kings of the past. The clashes of *sacerdotium* and *regnum* were here; issues of *auctoritas* and *potestas*. Boniface produced in *Unam Sanctam* a succinct overview of papal ideology but never appreciated the unusual, if not unique, approach of Philip. Philip used public opinion, carefully orchestrated, representative assemblies, national feeling (xenophobic), terror, anti-clericalism, all to assert his royal sovereignty. The issue of clerical taxation was a sharp one. Boniface used traditional spiritual weapons and arguments against a king, ruthless and very secular, uninterested in the same universal Christian premises. Boniface did not adjust to an increasingly secular and Aristotelian context of debate, discussion, justification.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question formulation invites overview, assessment and explanation, with clear evaluation of the core issues involved. Candidates need to delineate well those issues, in context, and consider elements of tradition as against novelty. As mentioned above, responses may put the conflict firmly into context, assessing what was old and normal in Papal-royal relations (not least in France) and what was new and different. Some focus on the respective personalities would be useful here. Reward for awareness of, and good discussion of, the ideologies involved should be made. Boniface’s stance, pronouncements and assertions form one level of the answer; Philip’s responses and assertiveness the other. Responses may well highlight the fact that the extreme statements of supreme papal theocratic power in lay and spiritual matters came at a time when rulers such as Philip IV were intent on building strong state systems that required close control of their churches and their temporalities.

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.

**29 Assess the impact of Mongol expansion on Europe in the period 1250–1378.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. This involved a long time-span and candidates will need to be selective of knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, with a good sense of the necessary assessment. The dates are bounded by the start of this period, in the aftermath of the great successes at Kiev and Leignitz, and the break-up of the fragile unity of the four khanates that had emerged c. 1258. The Mongol Empire reached a peak of power under Kublai Khan (1259–94) but that Empire was brittle and open to disunity given its very organisation and nature. It is likely that the degree and nature of Mongol expansion in Central Asia and their incursions into Eastern Europe and the Balkans will be assessed – noting increasing diminution – while pointing out that any impact on Western Europe was slight and indirect, though much fear was generated. Negatives would lie in attacks, destruction, devastation (in the Balkans), plunder and tribute. Positives would be the interest furnished by Mongol expansion over and control of much of Central Asia and China, opportunities for trade, travel, cultural and geographical interchange fostered, linked to a desire for knowledge and investigation.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. ‘Assess...’ invites an ordering of areas and levels of impact, with a sense of relative importance but also an awareness of the connections of such impact levels. Impact can be handled at several levels and an important element here will be an awareness of the geographical range as well as of the sense of impact on imagination and sensibilities. Impact will embrace negatives but also positives. It is arguable that the Mongols’ threat was exaggerated. The very nature of their social and political organisation plus extreme reliance on military power limited them towards Europe. Candidates may look more at fear, trade links, value over time (e.g. against the Turks), arguing that they helped stimulate travel, trade and exchange as well as providing an image that could be put to use in the West, rather as the Arab threat had been in a previous period.

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.

### 30 How is the papal residence at Avignon between 1309 and 1377 best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A description or indeed a narrative of the papal residence will not get very far, unless there is good explanation. Analysis and evaluation are required here. The ‘Avignon papacy’ has attracted much reflection and consideration. There should be coverage of Boniface’s dispute with Philip IV, with the culmination at Anagni; the pontificate of Clement V (French by upbringing and outlook; appeased Philip; acted against Templars; appointed French cardinals to prevent trial of Boniface) and the reasons for staying in the north (sickness, nearness to Vienne, possible mediation between England and France, weak papal authority in Rome after Anagni) and the reasons why a temporary arrangement became long term (Avignon more congenial to popes largely French-born, away from Italian/Rome unrest, etc.). Permanence and stability were acceptable reasons for the stay: Avignon gave independence; free from the pressures of the people and nobility of Rome; also it was outside the French kingdom and far from the centre of Capetian power.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The formulation ‘best explained ...’ invites argument and counter-argument, the ordering of factors in relative importance but with an understanding of connections. Candidates need to assess personal and contextual factors, considering how it was that an apparently temporary stay hardened into one of some longevity. They may refer to and indeed assess the ‘Babylonian captivity (or exile)’ and the issues of location, value (to the papacy) and the anti-papal presence (Clement VII, Benedict XIII), all in the context of ongoing state-church tensions and disputes.

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.

### 31 Why did many of the Italian city states experience so much growth and success in the fourteenth century?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A description of the city states – or some type of narrative (other than causal) – will not get very far here. Good analysis and evaluation are required, with a range of examples drawn in. There is plenty here to consider and examples are likely to be found in (e.g.) Florence, Milan, Venice and Pisa. On one level, there was economic development; on another, there were problems (e.g. the fall of the Peruzzi and Bardi banking houses, the ravages of the Black Death). Political alignments (Guelph, Ghibelline) extended further, inside and between cities. There was at times intense warfare and economic damage inflicted. And the influence over cities of both Pope and emperor was declining. Yet wealth remained, trade routes were resilient, guilds and craftsmen were active. And the Renaissance began during this period, in part fed by wealth, in part by a desire to recover the past and put it to civic and familial uses. Recovery features were present by c. 1400, ahead of a century of further turmoil and achievements.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. ‘Why ...’ invites reasons and a good sense of causal explanation, with some relative importance attached but awareness also of connections. ‘Success’ and ‘growth’ need consideration also. Such should be measured – bearing in mind (as in AO1 above) phases of trouble and disruption – and consideration given to individual city state factors and features as well as to broader, regional factors in explanation. Candidates may well consider political factors (e.g. trends towards familial, oligarchic power) as important as commercial, financial and economic.

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.

**Section 7: c. 1378–c. 1461****32 Why did the problems posed by the Great Schism prove so difficult to resolve?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required involving a set of clear and evaluative explanations. The concentration should be on the period from the end of the Avignon Papacy to the election of Martin V (1378–1417). Some contextual reference to the Avignon Papacy and how the Schism came about will be necessary but a lengthy treatment of the Avignon Papacy as such would not be relevant. A narrative of events in the period 1378–1417 would not be an adequate response but analysis within a narrative framework would be acceptable. There should be a clear focus on ‘problems’, difficulty in dealing with them and thus protractedness, with an exploration of attempted solutions. Candidates may be expected to refer to the following issues: there had been anti-popes before but not on this scale; the complex constitutional issues affecting the papacy; the differing interests and motives of lay rulers; the antagonism between England and France influenced decisions as to which pope to support; the obstinacy of competing popes; differing approaches towards conciliarism.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, it could be argued that the political interests of the more powerful European states were more important factors than religious and ecclesiastical matters. A further opportunity for an evaluative approach would be to set some kind of hierarchy of importance upon the explanations.

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.

### 33 How dangerous were Hus and his followers to the unity of the Church?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required involving a set of clear and evaluative explanations. Candidates should deal with both ‘Hus’ and ‘his followers’ and focus closely upon ‘dangerous’ and ‘unity’. Answers will need to go beyond narrative accounts of the Hussite revolt. Candidates are likely to address two main themes. First, the level of unorthodoxy or heresy preached by Hus. Second, the extent of his following and the potential for schism. The first main themes may include reference to: the influence on Hus of Wycliffe; denial of transubstantiation; stress on the authority of the scriptures; papal authority and Church governance; communion in both kinds for the laity; opposition to the worldliness of the clergy. Hus’s more radical followers (Taborites) rejected all sacraments except baptism and the eucharist. Candidates will need to explain how and why these views were threatening to the Church. In addressing the second main theme candidates may be expected to discuss some of the following: the connection between Hussitism and Czech nationalism; Hus’s death made him a martyr and national hero; the support of Wenceslas of Bohemia; Czech resistance to the Emperor Sigismund; the survival of Hussitism in spite of the suppression of the rebellion.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, candidates may argue that within the Church itself there was disagreement as to whether Hus was a heretic and that this in itself was divisive. Candidates may also wish to explore the surviving and longer term influence of Hus and the Hussites upon, for example, Luther, Anabaptism and the Moravian Brethren. An argued assessment of the extent of the danger should be central to the answer.

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.

**34 When were the Dukes of Burgundy most powerful in the period 1384–1467?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required involving a set of clear and evaluative explanations. The period in question is from the acquisition of Flanders by Philip the Bold to the death of Philip the Good and to include the reign of John the Fearless, although some reference to the earlier part of the reign of Philip the Bold may be helpful. A narrative of events in the period 1384–1467 would not be an adequate response but analysis within a narrative framework would be acceptable. No set answer as to ‘when’ is expected. Some of the likely approaches are as follows: the extent of territory under the Duke at any given time; influence in international affairs; power relative to that of, say, the Kings of France and England; the influence of Burgundian culture and the court; economic power; the quality of the Duke’s government in his lands and their stability. Some possibilities as to ‘when’ are as follows: territorial expansion under Philip the Bold; the addition of Brabant, Holland, Zeeland and Luxembourg by Philip the Good (1430–43); the part played by the Duke in the Burgundian/Armagnac rivalry; the Treaty of Troyes, 1420; the Treaty of Arras, 1435.

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 arriving at a well considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. It might be argued, for example, that territorial expansion, although adding to the Duke’s power, may in the longer term have overstretched his authority. How far can Burgundy be regarded as an ‘artificial’ state? To what extent did the Duke’s power depend on the weaknesses/strengths of France and England? In 1435, for example, did the Duke enhance the potential power of the King of France by deserting the English alliance?

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.

### 35 How, and how fully, did Charles VII restore royal authority in France?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relative historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – the restoration of royal authority, although this would need to be put into context by a survey of the position on the death of Charles VI. A narrative of the reign of Charles VII would not represent an appropriate answer, although analysis within a narrative framework would in good measure meet the demands of the question. A summary of the position in 1422 might include: the extent of territories giving allegiance to Charles VII; depredation caused by the Hundred Years War; the power of the French nobles and rivalries between them; the financial state of the Crown; the lands held by the English, including Paris. Among the achievements of Charles VII in restoring the authority of the Crown, candidates may refer to the following: improvement of financial resources and stability, for example, by raising taxation without the consent of the Estates-General; a permanent, paid and reformed army; not calling the Estates-General after 1428; enhancing control over the French Church by the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges; exploitation of English weaknesses; the sacre at Reims after the battle of Patay, 1429; military victories and the influence of Joan of Arc; diplomacy, in particular the Treaty of Arras, 1435 and the marriage of Margaret of Anjou to Henry VI. Nevertheless, candidates should be aware that France was not easily reunited, much was still left to be done by Charles VII's successors and the nobility remained powerful.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, candidates may be expected to enter into the debate as to 'how fully' royal authority was restored. The English were not easily dislodged and at least held their own, certainly as far as 1435 and even beyond. The nobility remained powerful, especially the Dukes of Burgundy, Brittany and Bourbon and there was still noble dissension at the end of the reign. There were divisions in the royal family itself, with opposition from the King's son, Louis. How far did Charles VII's achievement depend upon the changing fortunes of England: the desertion of England by Burgundy; the death of Bedford; divisions among the English nobility, the kingship of Henry VI; the outbreak of civil strife in England in 1455? Was the price paid to Burgundy at Arras too high? How much depended upon the inspiration of Joan of Arc?

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.

**36 Discuss the importance of the fall of Constantinople in 1453.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is to say, the ‘importance’ of the event and outcomes. Narrative accounts of the siege and fall of Constantinople and events leading up to it would not be relevant. Again, an explanation as to ‘why’ the city fell would represent a blurred focus. Candidates may be expected to deal with the following issues: the strategic and economic importance to the Turks of Constantinople; the city as the Ottoman capital and a base for future Ottoman expansion, for example, into the Balkans; the immediate opportunity to seize Greek, Venetian and Genoese possessions, which soon fell; the significance of the end of the Eastern Roman Empire which had lasted for a thousand years; the fall of the city stimulated an attempt to restart a crusading movement; Muscovy was able to present itself as the heir to Byzantium; the extent of cultural effects upon Western Europe.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, it may be argued that the fall of Constantinople had been on the cards for some time so that the impact was symbolic or psychological rather than actual. The cultural and artistic effects on the West are a matter of some debate. That the attempt to revive the crusading movement failed may demonstrate that the idea itself was finally dead. A further issue to be addressed is the extent to which the Ottoman conquest actually preserved ‘Byzantinism’. A strong case could be made that in large measure it did.

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.

**Section 8: Themes c. 1461–c. 1516****37 How effective was Louis XI in overcoming both external and internal opposition?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. It could certainly be argued that Louis XI made fundamental advances in creating the territorial integrity of France. Candidates may present a short overview of what the problems were at his accession. Candidates might also reflect on his personality and how the rebellions against his father developed him as a ruler, it certainly gave him insights into the nature of political relationships. His overriding aim was to secure France from threats both internal and external and he appears to have been remarkably successful. The securing of Provence and Maine should be mentioned, as should the addition of Roussillon and Cerdagne in 1463. The triumph over Burgundy and the Treaty of Arras might be picked out as a high point. His policy of attempting to neutralise the English at the Treaty of Picquigny in 1475 could also be explored. On the other hand Louis was generally hated despite the sound government he had brought to France and his policies did leave serious problems for his successor.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgment. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Known as ‘the universal spider’ because of his use of political intrigue it is clear that Louis XI arouses great debate both by contemporaries and historians. On the one hand it could be argued that France had a territorial integrity by the end of his reign, apart from Brittany, which allowed her to consolidate her position in the sixteenth century. It can also be argued that France was far better governed under Louis. However, there were real costs in terms of his unpopularity and intrigues, it could be argued that the policy against Burgundy so nearly went disastrously wrong and some historians have questioned the real gains made by this policy. Whatever line is taken by candidates some coverage of both sides of the argument is being sought.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

**38 Assess the importance of religion as an influence upon the policies of Ferdinand and Isabella.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. There are clearly areas where religion may well be seen as very important in determining and driving policy and other areas where it can be shown that it was of little importance. In terms of the initial settling of the kingdoms it may not be seen as very important, although support of the Papacy and more generally the Church may be identified as significant. There is no doubt that Isabella was very pious and that there are areas of policy which were heavily influenced by this, the reconquista and conquest of Granada, the inquisition and reform of the Church. Governmental and administrative policies such as the use of the Hermandades, policies concerning the aristocracy and the treatment of and relationships with the respective Cortes may well be judged as being little influenced by religion, although the influence on justice and possibly the religious orders might have some implicit influence. Financial and economic policies might be considered and it could be argued that the influence of religion might be in conflict with some of these policies, particularly those dealing with the Conversos and Moriscos. In terms of foreign policy little religious influence can be seen in relationships with France but it could be argued that religion was more important in terms of policies towards the Turks. It may also be argued by candidates that religion and religious policy was the only really unifying force within Spain at this time and that it plays a part in the drive for the voyages of discovery.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgment. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The argument will need to centre on measuring religion against other possible motivations in governmental policies, such as the need to settle the kingdoms which it could be argued is of paramount importance in the early years of their reigns. Security of the dynasty through administrative, economic and foreign policies may also be seen as very important. It may well be argued that for Isabella religious motivation is all, but this will need to be tempered by an assessment of the partnership between her and her husband, and by her own political realism. An understanding of the context in which they understood government and its relationship to religious motivation may be present in the better answers. There is no definitive answer here, certainly religion is important but the quality of the argument will depend on the evaluation of extent of the importance of religion.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

**39 How far were Ottoman successes and failures in the late-fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries determined by the abilities of their sultans?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Candidates will probably regard the period from the fall of Constantinople to the accession of Suleiman the Magnificent as a reasonable timescale for this question; in any case it should not be much less than this. It certainly can be argued that this was generally a period of great success. The period covers the reigns of Mohammed II, Bayezid II and Selim I. Mohammed II was successful in eliminating possible Byzantine resurgence and claims to the Byzantine crown, and was successful against the Venetians gaining Albania and the Euphrates. By 1475 he had secured total control of the Black Sea and it was only his death in 1481, which halted his advances, by any measure he was extremely successful. Bayezid II was a consolidator but also made gains in Moldavia and Wallachia as well as strengthening the Navy. But his political intriguing some may argue, left potential weaknesses. He was also unsuccessful against the Mamluks and he failed to deal with religious disunity within the Empire itself leading to his abdication. Selim I was ruthless in pressing his claims and his reign is one of spectacular successes in Syria and Egypt and his control of the Holy Cities in 1517.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgment. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Certainly this is a period with far more success than failure, candidates may reflect that Mohammed II and Selim I were on balance far more successful than Bayezid II, and a comparison of their attributes could be a fruitful line of argument. Most candidates will probably conclude that the personal attributes of the sultans were very important, but these will need to be weighed against the other advantages of the Ottoman Empire including its wealth and trade, the Janissaries, Imperial administration and military organization. On the other hand in a period of personal monarchy, candidates may conclude that it was how individual sultans used these advantages that really mattered.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

**40 How successful was Maximilian I in furthering the interests of the Habsburgs?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Maximilian was clearly involved in furthering the interests of the Habsburgs long before he was elected Emperor, even before he became King of the Romans, indeed it could be argued that he should be seen as one of the greatest dynasts of the period, although much has to do with the foresight of his father Frederick III. His marriage to Mary of Burgundy in 1477 brought the Habsburgs into the orbit of Western Europe, but also brought war with France. On leaving the Netherlands in 1490 he settled in Austria, acquiring the Tyrol and recovering Vienna and Lower Austria from the Hungarians and after the Treaty of Bratislava in 1491 was able to adopt the title of King of Hungary. He had a clear policy of marriage alliances, the most important being the marriage of his son Philip the fair to Juana of Castile and the marriage of his grandchildren into the Jagiello family in order to secure the thrones of Bohemia and Hungary. His own second marriage to Bianca Sforza of Milan in 1493 brought him into the Italian Wars with absolutely no gain in terms of territory or prestige. He was also able to secure the Imperial throne for his grandson Charles V. It could also be argued that administrative reforms in the Empire secured his power there.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgment. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Generally it may be expected that candidates will argue that Maximilian was very successful indeed, at the time of his death the Habsburgs were secure in the East and his grandson ruled the Netherlands and Spain. Indeed it could be argued that his dynastic policies determined the path of European History for centuries and put the Habsburgs firmly at the centre of the European stage. He learned a great deal in the Netherlands which he took to the Habsburg lands and was renowned as a patron of the arts and culture. There are some detractors which might be mentioned, for example his difficult relationship with his father during the time of their joint rule and the needless involvement in the Italian wars, it might even be argued that the policies overstretched his grandson and successor.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

**41 Why was Italy the focus of international rivalry in the period 1494–1516?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. There are a range of factors to be considered here and candidates may well begin with a consideration of the state of Italy in 1494, the seeming stability and prosperity of late fifteenth century Italy, which made it an attractive proposition, coupled with the inherent disunity and instability of the state system. There are several distinct phases, and explanation of the various elements of foreign intervention will be essential for each phase. A consideration of the aims of Charles VIII of France and the resources available to him, his invasion of 1494, which was seemingly successful but at the same time fragile. The Holy League draws in other interested parties in alliance with the Papacy, especially Ferdinand of Aragon, who had his own reasons to become involved. With the succession of Louis XII to the French throne, Milan becomes an important focus and this needs to be explained. The changes experienced in the Papal States adds a new dimension. Candidates will also deal with the League of Cambrai, the Holy League and the motivations of Francis I of France.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgment. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Essentially the argument changes and develops, no one explanation will do for the whole period and candidates may argue that causes change and develop over time and they will be expected to explain these changes. Some candidates may refer to the contemporary view put forward by Guicciardini that the causes had much to do with the selfishness of the Italian states. Others may well give considerable weight to the original motivations of Charles VIII. Some consideration of the motives of the Spanish, the French more generally and how these change and develop, the Empire and the involvement of the Papacy may be given.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

**Section 9: Themes c. 1200–c. 1516****42 Why did population levels increase so much in the period c. 1200–c. 1350?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is, the period identified although some comparisons with the periods preceding and following c. 1200–c. 1350 would be relevant and helpful. The population in Europe in c. 700 was around 27 million, in c. 1000 around 42 million and reached the medieval peak in 1300 at 73 million. Famine in the early- and plague in the mid-fourteenth century reduced the population. Candidates may be expected to explore the following trends and phenomena. In this period there was colonisation of existing areas in Western Christendom, a drive from better to less populated areas and thus resources expanded. Woods and more marginal areas were cleared to a greater extent than in the eleventh and twelfth centuries with resulting new settlements. Further stimulus was given to colonisation and economic expansion by the Cistercians. There was a gradual disappearance in the period of slave gangs with a consequent increase of family units. This affected the birth rate. Conditions in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries favoured a decline in the death rate, that is, improvements in diet and living conditions. An increased intake of beneficial minerals and proteins extended the longevity of women in particular, increased fertility and extended child bearing age. The evidence shows a reversal of the preponderance of males to females. The period was free of plague (in contrast to the end of the period, c. 1350). This was a more settled period in contrast to, say, the later-eighth, ninth and earlier-tenth centuries.

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 arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations may enhance responses (although not required) as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may be expected to address the issue of ‘so’ thus leading to more extended comparisons between the period c. 1200–c. 1350 and those that preceded and succeeded it. They might point out the difficulties of arriving at firm conclusions owing to the nature of the evidence. The relative importance of the factors involved may come in for particular attention. It would be quite legitimate to argue that increased colonisation and increased population went hand in hand, so cause and effect are difficult to disentangle. There is an unevenness too, in the rising levels of population as between, say, Flanders and Tuscany (where some towns saw spectacular increases) and the remoter parts of Spain and Portugal.

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.

### 43 How is the appeal of chivalry in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is, the appeal of chivalry in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, although antecedents will need to be traced. Candidates will need to demonstrate a clear understanding of the concept; a code of manners in love and war and a moral system governing the whole of aristocratic and knightly life. Two large themes will need to be explored: the influence of the Church on the development and flourishing of chivalry; the advancement and formalisation of the status of aristocracy. The concept and practice of chivalry which flowered in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries had deeper origins. In part it lay in the issue of civil peace and social order with a particular concern with the behaviour and values of the nobility. In the eleventh and early-twelfth centuries overlords lacked the necessary military and administrative machinery to achieve such order and the situation was exacerbated by vendetta and feud. The attempt by the Church to impose restrictions on private war and to protect vulnerable groups developed into the Truce of God movement whose sentiments were reinforced by, for example, the influence of St. Bernard of Clairvaux and the military orders. The influence of the ethical views of the Church was already affecting the content of the chansons de geste by the late-twelfth century. Candidates may point out the importance to the development of chivalry of the idea of the three-fold division of society – those who pray, those who fight, those who labour – which conferred responsibilities as well as rights on the nobility. In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, it may be pointed out, there was a growing sense of aristocratic status and exclusivity with a shared sense of values. This was further strengthened by the consolidation of family lines through, for example, preserving the integrity of land by strict interpretation of primogeniture and the fief being seen as patrimony rather than simply the means of endowing an individual. Alongside this there was increased ceremonial: the ceremony of knighthood and dubbing from the late-twelfth century; the elaboration of court ceremonial by kings and nobles; development of heraldry from the late-twelfth century; courtly romances and the influence of Books of Chivalry such as: the work of Gottfried de Strasbourg in the early-thirteenth century; the *Libre de chevalrie* by Geoffrey de Charny (mid fourteenth century); the anonymous *Ordene de chevalrie*, c 1250; Ramon Lull's *Libre del ordre de cavalleria* (later thirteenth century).

AO2 – to 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 arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations may enhance responses (although not required) as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may, for example, place additional stress on the foundations of the twelfth century for the flowering of chivalry in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, for example, the work of Chretien de Troyes. A further line of discussion might be the unevenness of the development of chivalry across Europe and regional differences.

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.

#### 44 Assess the impact of the 'Black Death' on at least two European states.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is, the impact of the Black Death rather than the causes or a narrative account of its course. The focus must be on Europe, although some reference might be made to Britain for comparative purposes. At least two European states must be chosen and where the choice is limited to two a reasonable balance should be achieved with, ideally, some differences being identified. The principal concentration, in terms of impact, is likely to be upon the first onslaught of the plague, 1347–50, but candidates should be aware that the disease became endemic and returned in epidemic proportions. For example, there were nine further serious outbreaks in Italy before the end of the century. Thus the impact was extended and the effects were chronic. In assessing the impact of the Black Death, candidates may be expected to identify general outcomes and exemplify these with examples from specific countries. The following economic and social issues are likely to be raised: the high death rate; scarcity of labour; rise in wages; attempts to fix wages by legislation and other measures; fall in the price of land and rents; an acceleration of the trend of commuting services for cash rents; broadly speaking, an economic improvement for the peasantry. In addition candidates should be aware of the impact upon the Church and religious life as a result of the high mortality rates among the clergy. Mention of the Flagellant movement, beginning in Germany, but spreading all over Europe, would also be relevant.

In terms of specific countries, with reference to France, the plague arrived in Marseille in January 1348 and spread throughout the kingdom. It returned with particular virulence to Paris in 1349 where, at one stage, deaths numbered 800 per day and totalled 50,000. Givry, in Burgundy, a town of 1200–1500 suffered 615 deaths in 14 days. As for religious houses: all the inmates of the Franciscan houses in Carcassonne and Marseille perished; at Montpellier, seven Dominicans survived out of 140; at the papal court in Avignon one third of the cardinals succumbed. Jews were blamed for the plague and there were serious attacks on them in Carcassonne and Perpignan. There were peasant risings, in 1358 for example, which in part can be seen as an outcome of the plague. Italy probably suffered the greatest death toll of any European region. Florence may have lost 60–80% of its population; Siena 50% (here work on the cathedral was halted and never resumed), Milan, Rome, Bologna, Naples and Palermo lost between 35% and 60% of their people. There was a high mortality rate among physicians – in Venice twenty out of twenty-four died. There was flight from the cities (see Boccaccio's account of the plague in Florence in the Decameron).

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 arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations may enhance responses (although not required) as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may, for example, discuss the unevenness of the impact of the plague by region or could attempt to put the plague into perspective by drawing attention to the demographic consequences of climatic change in the early-fourteenth century – a succession of longer, cooler winters and cooler and wetter summers resulting in harvest failure.

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.

**45 Why, in the fifteenth century, was Portugal the leading European state in undertaking overseas exploration?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is, an explanation of Portugal's early lead in overseas exploration. A descriptive account of voyages will not meet the requirements of the question, although a brief outline of the extent and direction of exploration, together with an indication of chronology, would be helpful. The question is not mainly concerned with motives but some indication of what they were would be relevant. Candidates may be expected to discuss the following: the geographical location of Portugal in relation to the Atlantic, the Mediterranean and Africa; the value of Lisbon; the tradition of crusading expeditions to North Africa and remaining ambitions there; the capture of Ceuta and its importance; the work and leadership of Henry the Navigator and John II; a long-standing interest in the African slave trade and slave ownership in Portugal itself; willingness to embrace the revolutionary changes in ship and sail design.

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 arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations may enhance responses (although not required) as will an ability to engage with controversy. For example, candidates may well demonstrate that geographical knowledge and changes in ship design were not a monopoly of Portugal and could point, for example, to the achievements of Castile and its geographical advantages. So, a sharper discussion might follow along the lines of why Portugal and not other states. Was the early lead of Portugal in some way 'bound to happen' or did it benefit from a fortunate combination of circumstances?

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.

#### 46 How important was patronage to the flourishing of the Italian Renaissance?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is, an assessment of the importance of patronage. The concentration is likely to be on the role of individuals both lay and ecclesiastical. Clear examples will need to be provided but simple lists of artists and patrons will not, in themselves, meet the requirements of the question. Answers will need to be related to wider historical perspectives rather than being confined to art history. The importance of the role of patrons in providing work and financial and other forms of support will be central to successful answers. Answers should seek to cover a range, not just painting but sculpture, architecture and the writing of history and political treatises. Patronage by individuals was not a new phenomenon but it flourished with particular vigour in the fifteenth century Italian city states. Part of the argument lies in the rise, and change in the form, of portraiture which was intended to glorify and immortalise the sitter. Moreover, works of art were regarded as the creation of the donor not the artist. The accumulation of wealth, on the part of individuals, from banking, international trade and the monopoly of collecting papal taxation, for example, provided rich resources available for patronage. Patrons were concerned to win social esteem as well as immortality and artists and writers reaped the benefits. Some of the following patron/artist relationships may be used for illustration: Lorenzo de Medici/Michelangelo and Machiavelli; Pope Julius II/Bramante, Raphael, Michelangelo; Leo X/Raphael; Cosimo de Medici/Cellini; Ludovico Sforza/Leonardo da Vinci; the Gonzagas of Mantua/Mantegna; the Este dukes of Ferrara/Ariosto; the Montefeltre dukes of Urbino/Castiglione. This, clearly, is not an exhaustive list and candidates may be expected to use a range of further examples.

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 arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations may enhance responses (although not required) as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may be expected to give their answers a greater sense of perspective and an appreciation of the relative importance of factors by offering a more extended investigation of alternative explanations. For example, the influence of the nature and status of the Italian city states (or their ‘culture’ in the broadest sense) – the values of ‘liberty’, a context of intellectual enquiry, ambitious civic building, the virtues of civic life, their social structures and rivalries with each other, to say nothing of economic wealth and influence.

AO3 [not applicable]

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.

#### 47 To what extent were either Jews or homosexuals or lepers treated as outcasts in late-medieval society?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is, the extent to which members of any one group were treated as outcasts. Entirely descriptive accounts are unlikely. It is probable that the choice of most candidates will be the Jews. Jews had been declared ‘outcasts’ by St. Augustine and were widely regarded as ‘Christ killers’. They were popularly suspected of poisoning wells and of ritual murder. In canon law Jews were tolerated but were liable to prosecution as heretics if they converted to Christianity but later abjured it. Normally, Jews were not allowed to hold landed property or become full citizens and, for the most part, were required to wear distinctive clothing and live in urban ghettos as well as being excluded from crafts and guilds. As a result Jews concentrated on money lending and commerce. They were useful to rulers as money lenders and, up to a point, were protected but were still vulnerable to not being repaid or expulsion. In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the Church further isolated Jews by not allowing them to employ Christian servants, to intermarry or, as doctors, to treat Christian patients. Alongside this the Church afforded some protection in that Jews were not to be condemned without trial, whilst synagogues and cemeteries were not to be profaned. The Jews were expelled from England in 1290 and from France in 1306 and again in 1394. There were pogroms in the Rhineland in the fourteenth century and, at the time of the Black Death, Jews were widely blamed and persecuted. Jews suffered particularly badly in Spain where the Inquisition (founded in 1478) persecuted conversos and all Jews were expelled in 1492. Up to this point Jews in the Spanish kingdoms had lived in relative tranquillity. The chief exceptions to the general rejection of the Jews were the cities of Northern Italy and the Comtat Venaissin.

Evidence for the rejection and persecution of homosexuals is less plentiful than for the Jews, partly because they were less obviously identifiable as a group. Homosexuality came high on the hierarchy of sexual offences as far as the Church was concerned. Only bestiality was worse. The Church was concerned not only about the laity but also monastic institutions and also saw possible problems of solicitation during confession. Detailed rules were drawn up on these matters. Homosexuality was often associated with heresy and devil worship and the Cathars provide an example of such misrepresentation. Clearly there were false accusations and misunderstanding of close friendships which did not involve sexual relationship (over men exchanging kisses and sleeping with each other). In due course, the Inquisition took homosexuality under its administration. The usual punishment was burning alive or, in Spain, castration and stoning to death. In late medieval society, then, homosexuality was regarded as the ultimate crime against morality and was referred as being ‘abominable’ or ‘unspeakable’. Nevertheless the marginalisation of homosexuals was uneven in its impact. Some regions of Europe were more tolerant, for example the cities of Northern Italy, and more highly placed homosexuals seem to have been treated more leniently.

Until the Black Death leprosy was probably the most feared of medical conditions. Although there was some decline in the illness in the fourteenth century, leprosy multiplied in the high and late Middle Ages whilst the growth of towns helped to encourage its spread. Lepers were excluded in that the most practical way of dealing with the problem was to confine them to leper houses. These were a major recipient of charitable bequests, the Church was deeply involved and Franciscans were especially active in the field. If lepers were not confined in hospitals then they sought lonely places and, thus, isolated themselves. Indeed, although lepers often needed to beg, towns throughout Europe excluded them from their limits. Despite fear of contagion there was a good deal of public compassion for lepers except in times of social crisis. For example, during the Pastoreaux rising in France in the 1320s, lepers were alleged to be in league with the Jews, were rounded up and burned in large numbers. Lepers were blamed for the Black Death and suffered persecution throughout Europe.

AO2 – to 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 arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations may enhance responses (although not required) as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates should show a particularly sharp focus on extent and deal with differences and variations in terms of both chronology and region/state.

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.





UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/02B**

Paper 2b European History Outlines c. 1378–c. 1815

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN PAPER

**2 hours 15 minutes**

---

**READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST**

Answer **three** questions which must be chosen from **at least two** sections of the paper.  
All questions in this paper carry equal marks.

You are reminded of the need for analysis and critical evaluation in your answers to questions. You should also show, where appropriate, an awareness of links and comparisons between different countries and different periods.

---

This document consists of **6** printed pages.



**Section 1: c. 1378–c. 1461**

- 1 Why did the problems posed by the Great Schism prove so difficult to resolve?
- 2 How dangerous were Hus and his followers to the unity of the Church?
- 3 When were the Dukes of Burgundy most powerful in the period 1384–1467?
- 4 How, and how fully, did Charles VII restore royal authority in France?
- 5 Discuss the importance of the fall of Constantinople in 1453.

**Section 2: c. 1461–c. 1516**

- 6 How effective was Louis XI in overcoming both external and internal opposition?
- 7 Assess the importance of religion as an influence upon the policies of Ferdinand and Isabella.
- 8 How far were Ottoman successes and failures in the late-fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries determined by the abilities of their sultans?
- 9 How successful was Maximilian I in furthering the interests of the Habsburgs?
- 10 Why was Italy the focus of international rivalry in the period 1494–1516?

**Section 3: c. 1516–c. 1559**

**11** *(Candidates offering Paper 5d: Reformation Europe should not answer this question.)*

How successful was Charles V as Holy Roman Emperor?

**12** *(Candidates offering Paper 5d: Reformation Europe should not answer this question.)*

Why did some Germans embrace and others resist Lutheranism?

**13** How powerful was Francis I's authority within the kingdom of France?

**14** *(Candidates offering Paper 5d: Reformation Europe should not answer this question.)*

'Rather than representing a creed for rebels, Calvin's teachings on lay authority were essentially conservative.' How far do you agree?

**15** How serious a threat did Suleiman the Magnificent present to Western Europe?

**Section 4: c. 1559–c. 1610**

**16** To what extent, and in what ways, did Spain benefit from the rule of Philip II?

**17** How are Catherine de Medici's motives and policies during the French Wars of Religion best explained?

**18** Assess the importance of religious beliefs in causing and sustaining the revolt of the Netherlands.

**19** How important was the contribution of the Jesuits to the Catholic- and Counter-Reformation?

**20** By what means and with what success, did Henry IV and his ministers promote the internal peace and external security of France?

**Section 5: Themes c. 1378–c. 1610**

- 21 Why, in the fifteenth century, was Portugal the leading European state in undertaking overseas exploration?
- 22 How important was patronage to the flourishing of the Italian Renaissance?
- 23 To what extent were **either** Jews **or** homosexuals **or** lepers treated as outcasts in late-medieval society?
- 24 How is the price inflation of the sixteenth century best explained?
- 25 How convincing is the argument that there was a 'military revolution' in the sixteenth century?
- 26 How is the increase in trials for witchcraft in the late-sixteenth and early-seventeenth centuries best explained?

**Section 6: c. 1610–c. 1660**

- 27 Assess the significance of the ministry of Richelieu in the development of the power of the French monarchy.
- 28 Why did the Bohemian revolt of 1618 develop into a European conflict?
- 29 How helpful is the concept of 'decline' in understanding the problems of Spain in the first half of the seventeenth century?
- 30 Account for the predominant position achieved by Sweden in the Baltic in the first half of the seventeenth century.
- 31 Assess the importance of Brandenburg-Prussia in European affairs under the Great Elector.

**Section 7: c. 1660–c. 1715**

- 32 How absolute was the French monarchy under Louis XIV?
- 33 To what extent was the economic power of the Dutch Republic in the later-seventeenth century matched by its influence in international affairs?
- 34 How accurate is the view that Peter the Great's policies were driven by the aim of 'westernising' Russia?
- 35 How damaging was the reign of Charles XII to Sweden's internal strength and external influence?
- 36 'The succession to the Spanish throne was the least important cause of the War of Spanish Succession.' How far do you agree?

**Section 8: c. 1715–c. 1774**

- 37 Assess the legacy of Peter the Great to his successors in the period 1725–62.
- 38 How serious were the problems facing the French monarchy under Louis XV?
- 39 Why was Europe so frequently at war in the period 1733–63?
- 40 In what respect, if any, does Frederick II of Prussia deserve the title 'the Great'?
- 41 'More despotic than enlightened.' How accurate is this judgement on Maria Theresa?

**Section 9: c. 1774–c. 1815**

- 42 How valid is the claim that Catherine the Great's achievements in foreign affairs far outweigh those in domestic affairs?
- 43 Who benefited the most from the partitions of Poland?
- 44 *(Candidates offering Paper 5f: The French Revolution should not answer this question.)*  
How far can the causes of the outbreak of revolution in France in July 1789 be regarded as short-term?
- 45 *(Candidates offering Paper 5f: The French Revolution should not answer this question.)*  
How is the fall of Robespierre in July 1794 best explained?
- 46 How far can it be argued that Napoleon undermined rather than consolidated the domestic achievements of the French Revolution?

**Section 10: Themes c. 1610–c. 1815**

- 47 How valid is the judgement that 'by 1700 there had been scientific advances but no scientific revolution'?
- 48 Assess the importance of patronage to the development of architecture and the arts in seventeenth-century Europe.
- 49 How convincing is the argument that Europeans were more prosperous in 1700 than in 1600? (You should discuss this issue with reference to **at least two** European countries.)
- 50 'The Enlightenment was fuelled by English ideas, expressed by French writers, yet exclusively practised by despots in central and eastern Europe.' Discuss the accuracy of this view.
- 51 To what extent, and why, did European states pursue mercantilist policies in the eighteenth century?
- 52 Assess the importance of women to the economy and society of Europe in the eighteenth century.

---

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

University of Cambridge International Examinations is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/02B**

Paper 2b European History Outlines c. 1378–c. 1815

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

**2 hours 15 minutes**

---

**MAXIMUM MARK: 90**

---

This document consists of **54** printed pages.



**Section 1: c. 1378–c. 1461****1 Why did the problems posed by the Great Schism prove so difficult to resolve?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required involving a set of clear and evaluative explanations. The concentration should be on the period from the end of the Avignon Papacy to the election of Martin V (1378–1417). Some contextual reference to the Avignon Papacy and how the Schism came about will be necessary but a lengthy treatment of the Avignon Papacy as such would not be relevant. A narrative of events in the period 1378–1417 would not be an adequate response but analysis within a narrative framework would be acceptable. There should be a clear focus on ‘problems’, difficulty in dealing with them and thus protractedness, with an exploration of attempted solutions. Candidates may be expected to refer to the following issues: there had been anti-popes before but not on this scale; the complex constitutional issues affecting the papacy; the differing interests and motives of lay rulers; the antagonism between England and France influenced decisions as to which pope to support; the obstinacy of competing popes; differing approaches towards conciliarism.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, it could be argued that the political interests of the more powerful European states were more important factors than religious and ecclesiastical matters. A further opportunity for an evaluative approach would be to set some kind of hierarchy of importance upon the explanations.

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.

## 2 How dangerous were Hus and his followers to the unity of the Church?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required involving a set of clear and evaluative explanations. Candidates should deal with both ‘Hus’ and ‘his followers’ and focus closely upon ‘dangerous’ and ‘unity’. Answers will need to go beyond narrative accounts of the Hussite revolt. Candidates are likely to address two main themes. First, the level of unorthodoxy or heresy preached by Hus. Second, the extent of his following and the potential for schism. The first main themes may include reference to: the influence on Hus of Wycliffe; denial of transubstantiation; stress on the authority of the scriptures; papal authority and Church governance; communion in both kinds for the laity; opposition to the worldliness of the clergy. Hus’s more radical followers (Taborites) rejected all sacraments except baptism and the eucharist. Candidates will need to explain how and why these views were threatening to the Church. In addressing the second main theme candidates may be expected to discuss some of the following: the connection between Hussitism and Czech nationalism; Hus’s death made him a martyr and national hero; the support of Wenceslas of Bohemia; Czech resistance to the Emperor Sigismund; the survival of Hussitism in spite of the suppression of the rebellion.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, candidates may argue that within the Church itself there was disagreement as to whether Hus was a heretic and that this in itself was divisive. Candidates may also wish to explore the surviving and longer term influence of Hus and the Hussites upon, for example, Luther, Anabaptism and the Moravian Brethren. An argued assessment of the extent of the danger should be central to the answer.

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.

### 3 When were the Dukes of Burgundy most powerful in the period 1384–1467?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required involving a set of clear and evaluative explanations. The period in question is from the acquisition of Flanders by Philip the Bold to the death of Philip the Good and to include the reign of John the Fearless, although some reference to the earlier part of the reign of Philip the Bold may be helpful. A narrative of events in the period 1384–1467 would not be an adequate response but analysis within a narrative framework would be acceptable. No set answer as to ‘when’ is expected. Some of the likely approaches are as follows: the extent of territory under the Duke at any given time; influence in international affairs; power relative to that of, say, the Kings of France and England; the influence of Burgundian culture and the court; economic power; the quality of the Duke’s government in his lands and their stability. Some possibilities as to ‘when’ are as follows: territorial expansion under Philip the Bold; the addition of Brabant, Holland, Zeeland and Luxembourg by Philip the Good (1430–43); the part played by the Duke in the Burgundian/Armagnac rivalry; the Treaty of Troyes, 1420; the treaty of Arras, 1435.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. It might be argued, for example, that territorial expansion, although adding to the Duke’s power, may in the longer term have overstretched his authority. How far can Burgundy be regarded as an ‘artificial’ state? To what extent did the Duke’s power depend on the weaknesses/strengths of France and England? In 1435, for example, did the Duke enhance the potential power of the King of France by deserting the English alliance?

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.

#### 4 How, and how fully, did Charles VII restore royal authority in France?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relative historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – the restoration of royal authority, although this would need to be put into context by a survey of the position on the death of Charles VI. A narrative of the reign of Charles VII would not represent an appropriate answer, although analysis within a narrative framework would in good measure meet the demands of the question. A summary of the position in 1422 might include: the extent of territories giving allegiance to Charles VII; depredation caused by the Hundred Years War; the power of the French nobles and rivalries between them; the financial state of the Crown; the lands held by the English, including Paris. Among the achievements of Charles VII in restoring the authority of the Crown, candidates may refer to the following: improvement of financial resources and stability, for example, by raising taxation without the consent of the Estates-General; a permanent, paid and reformed army; not calling the Estates-General after 1428; enhancing control over the French Church by the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges; exploitation of English weaknesses; the sacre at Reims after the battle of Patay, 1429; military victories and the influence of Joan of Arc; diplomacy, in particular the Treaty of Arras, 1435 and the marriage of Margaret of Anjou to Henry VI. Nevertheless, candidates should be aware that France was not easily reunited, much was still left to be done by Charles VII's successors and the nobility remained powerful.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, candidates may be expected to enter into the debate as to 'how fully' royal authority was restored. The English were not easily dislodged and at least held their own, certainly as far as 1435 and even beyond. The nobility remained powerful, especially the Dukes of Burgundy, Brittany and Bourbon and there was still noble dissension at the end of the reign. There were divisions in the royal family itself, with opposition from the King's son, Louis. How far did Charles VII's achievement depend upon the changing fortunes of England: the desertion of England by Burgundy; the death of Bedford; divisions among the English nobility, the kingship of Henry VI; the outbreak of civil strife in England in 1455? Was the price paid to Burgundy at Arras too high? How much depended upon the inspiration of Joan of Arc?

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.

**5 Discuss the importance of the fall of Constantinople in 1453.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is to say, the ‘importance’ of the event and outcomes. Narrative accounts of the siege and fall of Constantinople and events leading up to it would not be relevant. Again, an explanation as to ‘why’ the city fell would represent a blurred focus. Candidates may be expected to deal with the following issues: the strategic and economic importance to the Turks of Constantinople; the city as the Ottoman capital and a base for future Ottoman expansion, for example, into the Balkans; the immediate opportunity to seize Greek, Venetian and Genoese possessions, which soon fell; the significance of the end of the Eastern Roman Empire which had lasted for a thousand years; the fall of the city stimulated an attempt to restart a crusading movement; Muscovy was able to present itself as the heir to Byzantium; the extent of cultural effects upon Western Europe.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, it may be argued that the fall of Constantinople had been on the cards for some time so that the impact was symbolic or psychological rather than actual. The cultural and artistic effects on the West are a matter of some debate. That the attempt to revive the crusading movement failed may demonstrate that the idea itself was finally dead. A further issue to be addressed is the extent to which the Ottoman conquest actually preserved ‘Byzantinism’. A strong case could be made that in large measure it did.

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.

**Section 2: c. 1461–c. 1516****6 How effective was Louis XI in overcoming both external and internal opposition?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. It could certainly be argued that Louis XI made fundamental advances in creating the territorial integrity of France. Candidates may present a short overview of what the problems were at his accession. Candidates might also reflect on his personality and how the rebellions against his father developed him as a ruler, it certainly gave him insights into the nature of political relationships. His overriding aim was to secure France from threats both internal and external and he appears to have been remarkably successful. The securing of Provence and Maine should be mentioned, as should the addition of Roussillon and Cerdagne in 1463. The triumph over Burgundy and the Treaty of Arras might be picked out as a high point. His policy of attempting to neutralise the English at the Treaty of Picquigny in 1475 could also be explored. On the other hand Louis was generally hated despite the sound government he had brought to France and his policies did leave serious problems for his successor.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgment. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Known as ‘the universal spider’ because of his use of political intrigue it is clear that Louis XI arouses great debate both by contemporaries and historians. On the one hand it could be argued that France had a territorial integrity by the end of his reign, apart from Brittany, which allowed her to consolidate her position in the sixteenth century. It can also be argued that France was far better governed under Louis. However, there were real costs in terms of his unpopularity and intrigues, it could be argued that the policy against Burgundy so nearly went disastrously wrong and some historians have questioned the real gains made by this policy. Whatever line is taken by candidates some coverage of both sides of the argument is being sought.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

## 7 Assess the importance of religion as an influence upon the policies of Ferdinand and Isabella.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. There are clearly areas where religion may well be seen as very important in determining and driving policy and other areas where it can be shown that it was of little importance. In terms of the initial settling of the kingdoms it may not be seen as very important, although support of the Papacy and more generally the Church may be identified as significant. There is no doubt that Isabella was very pious and that there are areas of policy which were heavily influenced by this, the reconquista and conquest of Granada, the inquisition and reform of the Church. Governmental and administrative policies such as the use of the Hermandades, policies concerning the aristocracy and the treatment of and relationships with the respective Cortes may well be judged as being little influenced by religion, although the influence on justice and possibly the religious orders might have some implicit influence. Financial and economic policies might be considered and it could be argued that the influence of religion might be in conflict with some of these policies, particularly those dealing with the Conversos and Moriscos. In terms of foreign policy little religious influence can be seen in relationships with France but it could be argued that religion was more important in terms of policies towards the Turks. It may also be argued by candidates that religion and religious policy was the only really unifying force within Spain at this time and that it plays a part in the drive for the voyages of discovery.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgment. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The argument will need to centre on measuring religion against other possible motivations in governmental policies, such as the need to settle the kingdoms which it could be argued is of paramount importance in the early years of their reigns. Security of the dynasty through administrative, economic and foreign policies may also be seen as very important. It may well be argued that for Isabella religious motivation is all, but this will need to be tempered by an assessment of the partnership between her and her husband, and by her own political realism. An understanding of the context in which they understood government and its relationship to religious motivation may be present in the better answers. There is no definitive answer here, certainly religion is important but the quality of the argument will depend on the evaluation of extent of the importance of religion.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

**8 How far were Ottoman successes and failures in the late-fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries determined by the abilities of their sultans?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Candidates will probably regard the period from the fall of Constantinople to the accession of Suleiman the Magnificent as a reasonable timescale for this question; in any case it should not be much less than this. It certainly can be argued that this was generally a period of great success. The period covers the reigns of Mohammed II, Bayezid II and Selim I. Mohammed II was successful in eliminating possible Byzantine resurgence and claims to the Byzantine crown, and was successful against the Venetians gaining Albania and the Euphrates. By 1475 he had secured total control of the Black Sea and it was only his death in 1481, which halted his advances, by any measure he was extremely successful. Bayezid II was a consolidator but also made gains in Moldavia and Wallachia as well as strengthening the Navy. But his political intriguing some may argue, left potential weaknesses. He was also unsuccessful against the Mamluks and he failed to deal with religious disunity within the Empire itself leading to his abdication. Selim I was ruthless in pressing his claims and his reign is one of spectacular successes in Syria and Egypt and his control of the Holy Cities in 1517.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgment. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Certainly this is a period with far more success than failure, candidates may reflect that Mohammed II and Selim I were on balance far more successful than Bayezid II, and a comparison of their attributes could be a fruitful line of argument. Most candidates will probably conclude that the personal attributes of the sultans were very important, but these will need to be weighed against the other advantages of the Ottoman Empire including its wealth and trade, the Janissaries, Imperial administration and military organization. On the other hand in a period of personal monarchy, candidates may conclude that it was how individual sultans used these advantages that really mattered.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

## 9 How successful was Maximilian I in furthering the interests of the Habsburgs?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Maximilian was clearly involved in furthering the interests of the Habsburgs long before he was elected Emperor, even before he became King of the Romans, indeed it could be argued that he should be seen as one of the greatest dynasts of the period, although much has to do with the foresight of his father Frederick III. His marriage to Mary of Burgundy in 1477 brought the Habsburgs into the orbit of Western Europe, but also brought war with France. On leaving the Netherlands in 1490 he settled in Austria, acquiring the Tyrol and recovering Vienna and Lower Austria from the Hungarians and after the Treaty of Bratislava in 1491 was able to adopt the title of King of Hungary. He had a clear policy of marriage alliances, the most important being the marriage of his son Philip the fair to Juana of Castile and the marriage of his grandchildren into the Jagiello family in order to secure the thrones of Bohemia and Hungary. His own second marriage to Bianca Sforza of Milan in 1493 brought him into the Italian Wars with absolutely no gain in terms of territory or prestige. He was also able to secure the Imperial throne for his grandson Charles V. It could also be argued that administrative reforms in the Empire secured his power there.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgment. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Generally it may be expected that candidates will argue that Maximilian was very successful indeed, at the time of his death the Habsburgs were secure in the East and his grandson ruled the Netherlands and Spain. Indeed it could be argued that his dynastic policies determined the path of European History for centuries and put the Habsburgs firmly at the centre of the European stage. He learned a great deal in the Netherlands which he took to the Habsburg lands and was renowned as a patron of the arts and culture. There are some detractors which might be mentioned, for example his difficult relationship with his father during the time of their joint rule and the needless involvement in the Italian wars, it might even be argued that the policies overstretched his grandson and successor.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

**10 Why was Italy the focus of international rivalry in the period 1494–1516?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. There are a range of factors to be considered here and candidates may well begin with a consideration of the state of Italy in 1494, the seeming stability and prosperity of late fifteenth century Italy, which made it an attractive proposition, coupled with the inherent disunity and instability of the state system. There are several distinct phases, and explanation of the various elements of foreign intervention will be essential for each phase. A consideration of the aims of Charles VIII of France and the resources available to him, his invasion of 1494, which was seemingly successful but at the same time fragile. The Holy League draws in other interested parties in alliance with the Papacy, especially Ferdinand of Aragon, who had his own reasons to become involved. With the succession of Louis XII to the French throne, Milan becomes an important focus and this needs to be explained. The changes experienced in the Papal States adds a new dimension. Candidates will also deal with the League of Cambrai, the Holy League and the motivations of Francis I of France.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgment. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Essentially the argument changes and develops, no one explanation will do for the whole period and candidates may argue that causes change and develop over time and they will be expected to explain these changes. Some candidates may refer to the contemporary view put forward by Guicciardini that the causes had much to do with the selfishness of the Italian states. Others may well give considerable weight to the original motivations of Charles VIII. Some consideration of the motives of the Spanish, the French more generally and how these change and develop, the Empire and the involvement of the Papacy may be given.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

**Section 3: c. 1516–c. 1559****11 How successful was Charles V as Holy Roman Emperor?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The focus of answers must be on Charles as Holy Roman Emperor, although candidates will almost certainly make reference to the fact that his effectiveness may have been hampered by the fact that he was also the ruler of Spain, the Spanish Empire and the Netherlands. Key issues that candidates may well address include the nature of the Empire as a large, fragmented and diverse entity with grave problems for Imperial jurisdiction. Candidates may consider the starting point to be the capitulation, or at the Diet of Worms where Charles made clear an intention to rule firmly and decisions made there which appeared to contradict this. Candidates may be expected to refer to use of the Regency Council, Ferdinand, the use of the Swabian League and weakness of the Imperial Diets. Economic problems associated with inflation and warfare. The Reformation and continual efforts to solve the problems set against Charles' constant absences. Rebellions and uprisings and the nature of his abdication and the Treaty of Augsburg. It may well be appropriate to consider the type of ruler Charles was, his personality and priorities.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgment. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. It may well be tempting to contend that Charles V was not at all successful as Holy Roman Emperor, especially given his own assessment at his abdication. It could also be argued that in terms of his own aims to rule strongly and to avert religious divide, he was a failure. However this line of argument could be tempered by the view that these aims coupled with his other responsibilities were always too much to discharge effectively and that given those circumstances there were successes. It could be argued that there were moments of success, for example in 1547, but these were essentially short lived. An additional line of argument that could be followed is the view that Charles's methods were essentially anachronistic and so ultimately doomed, however some caution needs to be adopted given that it may well be that any real reformist policies were very unlikely to succeed in the Empire.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

## 12 Why did some Germans embrace and others resist Lutheranism?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. This question requires clear understanding of Lutheranism as a movement as opposed to the theological arguments except where these support arguments to embrace or to reject Lutheranism. Some of the areas to be covered include the difference between personal and political decisions. A consideration of personal motivations being the challenges to Church abuses and clerical greed, issues of personal salvation and local movements to reform Church practices. Areas where this was undertaken with the support of local rulers and where they were powerless to stop it. The issue of larger scale events also need to be considered, for example what happened in Wittenberg, the role of Frederick of Saxony, Karlstadt 1522, the Knights' War 1522, the Peasants' War 1525 and Luther's pronouncements on this, Philip of Hesse, League of Dessau, Speyer 1526, League of Torgau, Speyer 1529, Augsburg 1530, Schmalkaldic League 1531, Regensburg 1541, Augsburg 1555. Where Lutheranism is rejected the issues of personal piety, political links to the Church and political considerations also need to be brought to bear. The actions of Charles V and other traditionalist leaders. There will need to be some understanding of the context of the Empire and political structure which mitigates in favour of such movements.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgment. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Several lines of argument can be taken here but the most successful will almost certainly adopt a structure which builds on the links between these factors. There are the personal issues of faith set against variable levels of anticlericalism, the role of Luther himself and political and social factors brought to bear on the situation. These are set in the context of a disparate and diverse Empire, ruled by a largely absentee Emperor with all the factors of political rivalries and traditional particularisms. There are certainly turning points which may well be considered, as outlined above and the efforts of Charles and other groups and leaders to find a solution cannot be underestimated. The focus must clearly be on causation rather than narrative of events or resolution.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

### 13 How powerful was Francis I's authority within the kingdom of France?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The question is very clearly based on the authority within France so that it is not expected that candidates will discuss the foreign policy of Francis I, however it is crucial to understand the impact his almost continual wars had on royal finances and times when it directly impacted upon royal government and authority, such as the immediate aftermath of the battle of Pavia. Methods to extend and bolster the authority of the crown can be linked to the increasing need to bolster the royal finances, additional taxes, venality, Commission de la tour Carrée. The growth of a professional bureaucracy and centralised administration. The limitations which might include the parlements, relationships with the nobility and the Church and the growth of reformist movements. Candidates might make reference to the growth of the Renaissance in France and how it could be used as a propagandist tool for the Monarchy.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgment. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Candidates may well argue that Francis' authority was fairly strong during his reign, the important issue here is to assess extent, both over time and in regard to specific areas of interest. Central to this argument is the issue of whether the French crown really does become more centralised and that this results in real increase in the power of the monarchy. Traditional approaches have seen a 'New Monarchy' or even a move towards absolutism; whilst these approaches have been largely superseded they can be a useful tool in evaluating the power and authority of Francis I. A discussion of Francis himself, his personality and approaches to personal monarchy may also be useful here. Candidates may well conclude that his authority was robust but may link this to the fact that as a robust, active King he was able to make the system work for him.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

**14 'Rather than representing a creed for rebels, Calvin's teachings on lay authority were essentially conservative.' How far do you agree?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. It might be expected that candidates will draw heavily on the Institutes, but they will also need to be able to demonstrate how these were put into practice, especially in Geneva, answers which largely bypass this and focus either on France or the Netherlands will be regarded as unbalanced. Candidates will need to show an understanding of how Calvin linked religious, political and social issues together, of his essentially traditional approach to matters of social status and his biblical interpretations of the responsibilities of the servant to the master. They may also wish to set Calvin in a political context of the ruling classes' fear of rebellion. The key to answering the question lies in the way in which Calvin changed his views to incorporate events and how his ideas were manipulated by followers, for example in 1560 in France. Candidates might also refer to his views on how individuals might live their lives, but a lengthy description of Puritan morals would be off target. Candidates may also refer to events after Calvin's death in 1564 to illustrate how his views were manipulated after he was no longer a force to temper more revolutionary views.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgment. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. This is clearly the central issue when evaluating Calvin's teachings on lay authority, and his teachings and reactions to unfolding events must be central rather than attempting to extrapolate his views from events. Candidates should also be aware that Calvin's teachings changed and developed so that by the late 1550s he seems to be arguing that resistance to lay authority is permissible but that armed resistance is not permissible. Candidates may well take the line that Calvinism and indeed Calvin himself is manipulated, this could well be a very productive line of argument and they may well point out that Calvin was not always clear in correcting what he saw as deviations from his views and that after his death this was to cause real problems. Candidates may well conclude that there is a real paradox to be found here in that Calvin presided over dramatic changes in daily life in Geneva but that he was in essence a social reactionary supporting traditional social structures to the extent that he would argue they were God given.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

## 15 How serious a threat did Suleiman the Magnificent present to Western Europe?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Answers should focus firmly on the military achievements of Suleiman rather than his activities within his own Empire with regards to his reputation for magnificence and as a lawgiver. They do however need to be set in the context of Western European problems and preoccupations, primarily the Hapsburg-Valois Wars and the rise of Protestantism. Candidates will need to make reference to a wide range of Ottoman military activity, however a narrative approach to retelling these events does not centre on the theme of evaluating the extent of threat, candidates will be expected to identify high water marks of the extent of threat. Candidates might deal with issues chronologically or by region, either approach is acceptable. It could be argued that the low point for Western Europe in the Mediterranean is the capture of Rhodes in 1522, with less worrying activities in the western Mediterranean until the Ottoman defeat in Malta in 1565. In central Europe candidates can be expected to refer to the capture of Belgrade in 1521 and the Battle of Mohacs in 1526 which draws in Archduke Ferdinand of Austria. Arguably the low point for Western Europe comes in 1529 with the attack on Vienna. After this candidates may well argue that the threat here continues especially with the disputed succession to the throne of Hungary but that the Ottomans are never so successful again, by which point the tide has begun to turn with the Treaty of Cateau Cambresis bringing an effective end to the Hapsburg-Valois Wars.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgment. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Clearly two issues should predominate, firstly the question of change in seriousness of threat and secondly the issue of seriousness in the various theatres of conflict. An interesting issue that candidates may well deal with is how this conflict fits in to the events in Western Europe, the advantages of the continual Hapsburg-Valois Wars and the links made between the French and the Ottomans after the Battle of Pavia in 1525, the anti-Hapsburg stance taken by the Ottomans in links with France, the German Protestants, the Moriscos and the Moorish Corsairs. Candidates may well evaluate the question in terms of the impact the Ottomans have on the course of the Hapsburg-Valois rivalry and the Protestant Reformation.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

**Section 4: c. 1559–c. 1610****16 To what extent, and in what ways, did Spain benefit from the rule of Philip II?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Many candidates may conclude that very little of benefit was gained by Spain from the reign of Philip II. On the deficit side of the argument it could be said that the benefits to Spain given continued war and financial crisis were small indeed, the re-export of bullion meant that the economy did not benefit from capital investment and a weapons industry which might have benefited was sidelined. The revolt of the Moriscos and the revolt of Aragon might be used as examples of unrest and poor decisions. On the other hand it could be argued that administration was improved and a permanent capital in Madrid established, although the systems of Councils were open to abuse and administration could be inefficient due to the sheer size of Philip's monarchia and his inability to make decisions. However Philip did have a genuine love of justice and was determined to maintain religious orthodoxy, which saved Spain from the religious violence that affected so many other parts of Europe in the sixteenth century. On the other hand, the Inquisition might have been too high a price to pay and the fact that Spain did not benefit from cultural developments of the sixteenth century, as other parts of Europe did.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. It is essential that the focus of the answer is Spain, candidates may well reflect that his preoccupations elsewhere prevented him from giving his whole attention to Spain and was detrimental to the Spanish economy. They might also identify the acquisition of Portugal as a turning point in the fortunes of Spain. The traditional interpretation sees little of benefit in Philip's reign, but a more balanced view can be taken, and candidates will be expected to understand both sides of the argument. Certainly there was a settled government, which is far from the case in other parts of Europe at the time and administration is developed, although not as well as it could have been. No particular answer is being sought, but the quality of the evaluative argument will be paramount.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

**17 How are Catherine de Medici's motives and policies during the French Wars of Religion best explained?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The focus here should be on Catherine de Medici rather than a more general assessment of the Wars of Religion. Candidates may wish to take a chronological view perhaps focusing on important areas and turning points in which Catherine de Medici was involved; or they may opt for a more thematic approach, considering particular areas of policy. Either approach is acceptable. Content might include: a consideration of her role in the outbreak of the First War, her fear of the Guise faction and her appointment as Regent and the line taken on heresy and toleration and the discussions at Poissy. Her role in the Edict of Pacification of Amboise and her attempts to enforce it and her dealings with Philip II. Her decision to side with the Guise faction in 1567 and the outbreak of the Second War. Her decision to abandon her previous policy of toleration and her role in the outbreak of the Third War and her return to limited toleration in an effort to bring the Third War to an end. Candidates may well focus considerable attention on the Massacre of Saint Bartholomew's day and its aftermath. Candidates may well then consider the much smaller role played by Catherine once Henry III had ascended the throne and may well reflect on what this demonstrates about the success or otherwise of her previous policies. They may reflect on the fact that eventually her policy to maintain the Valois dynasty lay in tatters.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. There is considerable debate here, Catherine having been frequently criticised by her contemporaries and by subsequent historians. She is often portrayed as fickle and feckless, unable to control the forces at work in France and with no real sense of policy, at worst she is described as having given rise to a 'black legend'. To take this line however will not be sufficient in evaluating her motivations. Other arguments centre on the view that she was essentially a conservative who recognised the dangers of the religious divide, foreign intervention and the threat of over mighty subjects and ultimately the disintegration of France. In short she was a mother bent on maintaining the patrimony of France, in tact, for her sons. Her policies might therefore be seen as an attempt to maintain a status quo unwilling for any group, save the monarchy itself to get the upper hand, and in attempting to do this she might be seen as vacillating between groups and policies.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

**18 Assess the importance of religious beliefs in causing and sustaining the revolt of the Netherlands?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. It is important to see the issue of Calvinism in the context of other religious issues and more widely to evaluate its importance against other possible factors responsible for the outbreak and continuation of the Dutch Revolt. It is important that candidates look at both the outbreak and continuation of the Revolt and candidates may well conclude that different factors were at work at the outset than were at work to continue the revolt. The range of factors includes Calvinism, which it might be argued, was not so important to start with. A consideration of the role of the Grandees in starting the conflict and the specific policies and attitudes of Philip II that they found unacceptable may well be present. Religion more generally has a part to play in the motivation of Philip and gradually is adopted, as a method of protest against him, when this becomes critical to the continuation of the wars is a point of debate which certainly should be raised. Regionalism is clearly an issue, candidates may find links to religion here but they should also understand the context of particularism in the Netherlands. The actions of Philip II and the inspiration and leadership of men such as William of Orange may well also be considered. Taxation and constitutional issues may well also be considered.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. There are a number of lines of argument that could be taken, but it is the quality of that argument that is to be assessed. Many candidates may well take the line that the revolt was not the result of any particular grievance but the result of the confluence of many issues, it is the interplay of these and the relative importance of religion that is at issue. Generally there is little evidence that religion was the chief motivation for the start of the revolt, but there are times when it does become dominant and the better answers may well consider the particular instances where this is the case.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

## 19 How important was the contribution of the Jesuits to the Catholic- and Counter-Reformation?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Most candidates may well contest that the Jesuits were very important to the revival of the Catholic Church although there is considerable debate here. The thrust of the question is an evaluation of the Jesuits rather than a comparative evaluation, however candidates may well evaluate the importance of the Jesuits in conjunction with other engines for change. In terms of the Jesuits themselves, candidates may mention their training and privileges and the vision of Ignatius Loyola himself and the ‘Spiritual Exercises’ and the focus it placed on their mission, their devotion and linkage to the Papacy, their role at Trent, their missionary role may be considered. Candidates may well consider how their methods changed and developed, the early belief that accommodation could be made and the harder line taken by the late 1540s. Consideration of various ‘theatres’ of operation may be made, but this cannot be expected to be exhaustive. The weaknesses in the organisation, in particular the differences between various areas of Jesuit operation may be considered. This could be set against the work of the Popes, the Council of Trent and the context in which the Jesuits themselves were working.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The Jesuits were unquestionably the most controversial product of the Counter-Reformation and candidates might be expected to argue in any number of ways, it is the quality of the argument that is being judged, but some balance might be expected. The main area for discussion is whether the Jesuits were able to really turn decisions of the Popes and the decisions made at the Council of Trent into practical reality, in this sense the Jesuits work alongside and in combination with the other aspects of Catholic renewal. The debate is fraught with prejudiced judgements and some of the better answers may well mention this in their evaluation. On the one hand there are explanations, which seek to overlay the role of the Jesuits in order to explain the slowing in growth of Protestantism. Others which may well emphasise the militant activities of the Jesuits in order to discredit them as a religious movement and still others that might down play their significance in order to give greater weight to the activities of more mainstream agents for change.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

**20 By what means and with what success, did Henry IV and his ministers promote the internal peace and external security of France?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Candidates may well undertake a survey of the situation at the start of Henry's reign, with the Catholic League in possession of much of Eastern France and a huge financial crisis and compare this to peace, solvency and prosperity at the end of the reign and conclude that Henry was very successful indeed. Areas that might be included are the religious issues, Henry's adoption of Catholicism, the Edict of Nantes and the continued loyalty of most of the Protestants and perhaps a more general evaluation of a cautious religious policy. Finance will be very important and the role of Sully may well be explored. Policies to be explored may well include the success of taxes such as the *taille*, *gabelle* and *paulette* and economic policies such as the Council of Commerce. Relations with the nobility may be considered, relations with the parlements, how effectively the regions were governed, effectiveness of the administration and how effectively Henry restored the authority of the crown. In terms of foreign policy it could be argued that there are limits due to financial constraints, but successes against Philip II and the successful alliances thereafter will certainly be used as examples of success, the Julich-Cleves crisis on the other hand was far less successful.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. It is generally held that Henry IV was successful in being able to heal and settle a kingdom split by civil war; others may argue that these problems were never far from the surface and that since he was assassinated his rule could not have been that effective. There has been no major revision of this view but candidates might temper the argument of overwhelming success by referring to the role played by Sully in particular, that in comparison to the previous monarchs he had little to live up to and criticisms of the Edict of Nantes can also be made. Henry's legacy has to an extent been helped by the fact that he was assassinated and that during his lifetime his own propaganda painted him in an enviable light. Candidates who evaluate the success of parts of his policy against other areas of policy, perhaps concluding that financial policy was the most successful are to be credited, but this line of argument is not essential.

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 judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

**Section 5: Themes c. 1378–c. 1610****21 Why, in the fifteenth century, was Portugal the leading European state in undertaking overseas exploration?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is, an explanation of Portugal's early lead in overseas exploration. A descriptive account of voyages will not meet the requirements of the question, although a brief outline of the extent and direction of exploration, together with an indication of chronology, would be helpful. The question is not mainly concerned with motives but some indication of what they were would be relevant. Candidates may be expected to discuss the following: the geographical location of Portugal in relation to the Atlantic, the Mediterranean and Africa; the value of Lisbon; the tradition of crusading expeditions to North Africa and remaining ambitions there; the capture of Ceuta and its importance; the work and leadership of Henry the Navigator and John II; a long-standing interest in the African slave trade and slave ownership in Portugal itself; willingness to embrace the revolutionary changes in ship and sail design.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations may enhance responses (although not required) as will an ability to engage with controversy. For example, candidates may well demonstrate that geographical knowledge and changes in ship design were not a monopoly of Portugal and could point, for example, to the achievements of Castile and its geographical advantages. So, a sharper discussion might follow along the lines of why Portugal and not other states. Was the early lead of Portugal in some way 'bound to happen' or did it benefit from a fortunate combination of circumstances?

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.

## 22 How important was patronage to the flourishing of the Italian Renaissance?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is, an assessment of the importance of patronage. The concentration is likely to be on the role of individuals both lay and ecclesiastical. Clear examples will need to be provided but simple lists of artists and patrons will not, in themselves, meet the requirements of the question. Answers will need to be related to wider historical perspectives rather than being confined to art history. The importance of the role of patrons in providing work and financial and other forms of support will be central to successful answers. Answers should seek to cover a range, not just painting but sculpture, architecture and the writing of history and political treatises. Patronage by individuals was not a new phenomenon but it flourished with particular vigour in the fifteenth century Italian city states. Part of the argument lies in the rise, and change in the form, of portraiture which was intended to glorify and immortalise the sitter. Moreover, works of art were regarded as the creation of the donor not the artist. The accumulation of wealth, on the part of individuals, from banking, international trade and the monopoly of collecting papal taxation, for example, provided rich resources available for patronage. Patrons were concerned to win social esteem as well as immortality and artists and writers reaped the benefits. Some of the following patron/artist relationships may be used for illustration: Lorenzo de Medici/Michelangelo and Machiavelli; Pope Julius II/Bramante, Raphael, Michelangelo; Leo X/Raphael; Cosimo de Medici/Cellini; Ludovico Sforza/Leonardo da Vinci; the Gonzagas of Mantua/Mantegna; the Este dukes of Ferrara/Ariosto; the Montefeltre dukes of Urbino/Castiglione. This, clearly, is not an exhaustive list and candidates may be expected to use a range of further examples.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations may enhance responses (although not required) as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may be expected to give their answers a greater sense of perspective and an appreciation of the relative importance of factors by offering a more extended investigation of alternative explanations. For example, the influence of the nature and status of the Italian city states (or their ‘culture’ in the broadest sense) – the values of ‘liberty’, a context of intellectual enquiry, ambitious civic building, the virtues of civic life, their social structures and rivalries with each other, to say nothing of economic wealth and influence.

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.

### 23 To what extent were either Jews or homosexuals or lepers treated as outcasts in late-medieval society?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is, the extent to which members of any one group were treated as outcasts. Entirely descriptive accounts are unlikely. It is probable that the choice of most candidates will be the Jews. Jews had been declared ‘outcasts’ by St. Augustine and were widely regarded as ‘Christ killers’. They were popularly suspected of poisoning wells and of ritual murder. In canon law Jews were tolerated but were liable to prosecution as heretics if they converted to Christianity but later abjured it. Normally, Jews were not allowed to hold landed property or become full citizens and, for the most part, were required to wear distinctive clothing and live in urban ghettos as well as being excluded from crafts and guilds. As a result Jews concentrated on money lending and commerce. They were useful to rulers as money lenders and, up to a point, were protected but were still vulnerable to not being repaid or expulsion. In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the Church further isolated Jews by not allowing them to employ Christian servants, to intermarry or, as doctors, to treat Christian patients. Alongside this the Church afforded some protection in that Jews were not to be condemned without trial, whilst synagogues and cemeteries were not to be profaned. The Jews were expelled from England in 1290 and from France in 1306 and again in 1394. There were pogroms in the Rhineland in the fourteenth century and, at the time of the Black Death, Jews were widely blamed and persecuted. Jews suffered particularly badly in Spain where the Inquisition (founded in 1478) persecuted conversos and all Jews were expelled in 1492. Up to this point Jews in the Spanish kingdoms had lived in relative tranquillity. The chief exceptions to the general rejection of the Jews were the cities of Northern Italy and the Comtat Venaissin.

Evidence for the rejection and persecution of homosexuals is less plentiful than for the Jews, partly because they were less obviously identifiable as a group. Homosexuality came high on the hierarchy of sexual offences as far as the Church was concerned. Only bestiality was worse. The Church was concerned not only about the laity but also monastic institutions and also saw possible problems of solicitation during confession. Detailed rules were drawn up on these matters. Homosexuality was often associated with heresy and devil worship and the Cathars provide an example of such misrepresentation. Clearly there were false accusations and misunderstanding of close friendships which did not involve sexual relationship (over men exchanging kisses and sleeping with each other). In due course, the Inquisition took homosexuality under its administration. The usual punishment was burning alive or, in Spain, castration and stoning to death. In late medieval society, then, homosexuality was regarded as the ultimate crime against morality and was referred as being ‘abominable’ or ‘unspeakable’. Nevertheless the marginalisation of homosexuals was uneven in its impact. Some regions of Europe were more tolerant, for example the cities of Northern Italy, and more highly placed homosexuals seen to have been treated more leniently.

Until the Black Death leprosy was probably the most feared of medical conditions. Although there was some decline in the illness in the fourteenth century, leprosy multiplied in the high and late Middle Ages whilst the growth of towns helped to encourage its spread. Lepers were excluded in that the most practical way of dealing with the problem was to confine them to leper houses. These were a major recipient of charitable bequests, the Church was deeply involved and Franciscans were especially active in the field. If lepers were not confined in hospitals then they sought lonely places and, thus, isolated themselves. Indeed, although lepers often needed to beg, towns throughout Europe excluded them from their limits. Despite fear of contagion there was a good deal of public compassion for lepers except in times of social crisis. For example, during the Pastoreaux rising in France in the 1320s, lepers were alleged to be in league with the Jews, were rounded up and burned in large numbers. Lepers were blamed for the Black Death and suffered persecution throughout Europe.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts enabling them present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations may enhance responses (although not required) as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates should show a particularly sharp focus on extent and deal with differences and variations in terms of both chronology and region/state.

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.

## 24 How is the price inflation of the sixteenth century best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required in terms of chronology and explaining the causes of inflation rather than, say, the outcomes. Candidates should recognise the broad differences between ‘bullion’ explanations and ‘real’ explanations, and should deal with both, although there may be differing uses of the terminology. They should be acquainted, too, with the upward trend of prices over most of the century with clear evidence of the rise in food prices, especially grain. Candidates may be expected to deal with the increase in population in the period and the especially dramatic expansion in many towns and to explain how this led to a greater demand for food especially, as well as other goods. This led in turn to increased pressure on land, an expansion of farming for the market, a rise in food prices and rents and a fall in real wages. Such developments should be set alongside the relative failure to improve agricultural productivity (compared, say, to the eighteenth century). A further set of explanations may be connected to the influx of bullion from the New World and south-eastern Europe. Bullion imports were significant (there was an estimated 37,400 tons of silver and 3,500 tons of gold in Europe by 1500 whilst over the next century 181 tons of gold and 16,886 tons of silver were added) but not all-important. Answers might also refer to the debasement of currency by governments and conspicuous expenditure by states on such projects as 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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here there are good opportunities for assessing the relative importance of the factors concerned and to evaluate which interpretations are the more convincing. Candidates may also be expected to take into account contemporary explanations, values and mindsets. For example, the value of a coin was judged by its intrinsic value (bullion content). So, when the value of silver depreciated because of increased supplies of bullion then silver coins were regarded as having less value. Similarly, the face value of coins was held to have depreciated when debasement was implemented. It had always been recognised that bad harvests pushed up prices (scarcity meant dearth or dearness). Thus, candidates might recognise that the general upward trend of prices could be concealed or skewed by temporary or seasonal fluctuations in the quality of the harvest. The better answers might show an awareness of the theories of contemporaries such as the *Sieur de Malestroit*, *Martin de Azpilcueto Navarro*, *Jean Bodin* and the operation of *Gresham’s Law*.

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.

## 25 How convincing is the argument that there was a 'military revolution' in the sixteenth century?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required in terms of the bounds of chronology (although it will be important to make some references to the periods either side of the sixteenth century and an absolute definition of 'sixteenth century' should not be insisted upon) and an understanding of the concept of 'military revolution'. Among the issues to be explored are: an increase in firepower in terms of small arms; tactical changes and the relative decline of cavalry as compared with infantry; changes in the ratio of pikes and muskets; improvements in artillery, including horse-drawn artillery; the development of more effective fortifications and, in turn, of siege methods. Closely connected developments were: strategic changes with war being fought on a much larger scale and with wider political and dynastic objectives; the recruiting and assembling of larger armies, for example: the French army invading Italy in 1494 was 34,500 whilst in 1555 it numbered 50,000 and 150,000 in 1635 with similar increases for Habsburg armies.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations may enhance responses as will an ability to deal with controversy. There are a number of important questions for candidates to address and interpretations to evaluate. What was really new about the military developments of the sixteenth century? Were they a matter of scale rather than innovation? Does the term 'revolution' apply more aptly to the fifteenth century and/or the seventeenth? Was there a continuum? How reliable is the evidence of statistics in, say, drawing conclusions about the size of armies? When rulers made extensive use of foreign troops led by experienced commanders, how convincing is the thesis of 'national armies'? How adequate were financial and administrative machineries to fight ambitious and protracted wars?

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.

**26 How is the increase in trials for witchcraft in the late-sixteenth and early-seventeenth centuries best explained?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, although some flexibility as to the chronology may be allowed. A series of explanations is required with an assessment of how convincing they are. Entirely descriptive approaches are unlikely but if they occur the rewards should be limited. Among the explanations to be offered are the following: persecution as a response to natural disasters; confessional conflict in the post-Reformation period as Catholics and Protestants found it useful to accuse religious opponents in order to quell religious opposition; persecution as a means of wider social control; functional explanations, for example, dealing with misfits in society; misogyny. Some sense of context of attitudes towards witchcraft will help answers. The conventional views were expressed in the *Malleus Maleficarum* (first published in 1486), for example, ‘all witchcraft comes from carnal lust, which in women is insatiable’ and ‘it is common to all witches to practice carnal copulation with the Devil’. The *Malleus* remained influential. For example, between 1574 and 1669 it was revised in sixteen republished editions. All over Europe, but unevenly, there were increased numbers of trials for witchcraft and attitudes were clearly hardening. There is good evidence for persecution as a response to a whole range of natural disasters – floods, storms, plague and other diseases, harvest failure. How far was there an economic and demographic crisis arising out of say, inflation and population pressures? There was a rejection of people seen as social misfits such as widows, spinsters, the physically and mentally disabled, but perhaps there always had been. Most victims were women which certainly adds credence to the misogyny thesis. Any large-scale persecution needed the support of the ruling classes and local elites and, to an extent, the state itself. Meanwhile changes in legal procedures in some countries and regions led to an increase in convictions. Such considerations support the idea of persecution as a means of social control. Religious strife certainly seems to have been an influence, for example, the crisis following the Massacre of St. Bartholomew’s Day was accompanied by a sharp increase in witchcraft trials in France.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations may enhance responses (although not required) as will an ability to engage with controversy. There are good opportunities for investigating and evaluating the historiography. Candidates might also draw attention to mixed motives and how and why attitudes and practice varied from region to region and country to country, and care should be taken not to exaggerate the scale of persecution across Europe as a whole. Lorraine should provide a familiar example where, between 1580 and 1630, there were 3000 trials with 90% convictions. Meanwhile within the jurisdiction of the Paris Parlement, there were 450 executions in the period 1565–1640. At much the same time Geneva saw a 30% conviction rate.

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 affect judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

## Section 6: c. 1610–c. 1660

**27 Assess the significance of the ministry of Richelieu in the development of the power of the French monarchy.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of Richelieu’s ministry. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is, Richelieu’s work in developing the power of the French monarchy. Explanation and description of policies should always be accompanied by argument, analysis and assessment. The following should represent the main issues to be considered. The political power and privileges of the Huguenots was seen as a challenge to the power of the monarchy and a limitation upon its ability to undertake foreign ventures. Candidates may be expected to know about Richelieu’s handling of the Rohan revolt, the siege of La Rochelle and the settlement represented by the Grace of Arles. Steps were taken to weaken the authority of the Parlement of Paris. The problem of particularism and provincial autonomy was addressed by the reduction of the privileged position of the pays d’élection and in some provinces the Provincial Estates ceased to meet. There was an increased use of Intendants as agents of royal control in the provinces; provincial military governors were reappointed and their influence reduced. Private fortresses were slighted. Taxation was increased to meet the cost of war. An initially cautious approach to foreign policy became more ambitious and successful, especially as greater internal order was established. French influence was secured in Mantua; Pinerolo was gained. Alliance with Sweden enabled indirect intervention in the Thirty Years War; the tide had turned against the Habsburgs by 1642; Roussillon and Perpignan were regained. A royal navy was created.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations may enhance responses as will an ability to engage closely with the dimension of significance in evaluating success and assessing longer-term importance. It might be argued, for example, that the ‘final solution’ to the Huguenot problem was left to Louis XIV. The Parlements remained potentially powerful and influential, depending upon circumstances, up to the end of the ancient regime. Some pays d’élection, such as Languedoc, retained considerable independence whilst the nobility remained far from ‘tamed’. There were anti-tax revolts, some of which were very serious. The alliance with Sweden was less productive than Richelieu hoped since Gustavus Adolphus was too independent, although influence over the German princes increased after 1632. However, French weaknesses remained and although Corbie (1636) was a victory, the Spaniards had invaded Picardy. How far did Richelieu’s foreign policy lead to the later triumphs at the treaties of Westphalia and the Pyrenees and the replacement of Habsburg by Bourbon hegemony? How far did Richelieu commit France to a long period of ambitious but ruinously expensive foreign adventures?

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.

## 28 Why did the Bohemian revolt of 1618 develop into a European conflict?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is, an explanation of the part played by the Bohemian revolt in the wider conflict that followed. A narrative of events would not be an appropriate response. Candidates should be aware of the background of tensions in Europe including: French fears of Habsburg encirclement; continuing religious strains in Germany; the impending expiry of the Twelve Years Truce between Spain and the Dutch; challenges to Habsburg authority in the Empire; the importance to Spain of the Spanish Road. In Bohemia itself there were the linked issues of toleration for Protestants, local rights, independence and privileges, the authority of the Habsburgs. The Bohemian revolt and the resulting acceptance of the crown by Frederick, Elector Palatine (Calvinist) raised serious and wider issues: the loss of an electorate by the Habsburgs; the decision of the Spanish Habsburgs to support the imperial family branch; the strategic significance of the new king of Bohemia's Palatine territory, resulting in turn in the invasion of the Palatinate by Spinola from Flanders (to secure the Spanish Road). Other relevant events to be considered are: the support of the Habsburgs by Maximilian of Bavaria and the Catholic League; the invasion of Bohemia by Tilly; the collapse of Bohemian resistance which led the Dutch to increase their efforts against Spain. The United provinces became the centre of anti-Habsburg coalitions involving Denmark (1625), Sweden (1630), France (1635).

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 the relevant and relative factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates would be free to challenge the terms of the question by arguing that the Bohemian revolt was not, in fact, a cause of the European conflict but, perhaps, a symptom of wider tensions or, at most, a spark or trigger. Other crises, for example, the Julich-Creves affair demonstrated issues of tension in the same way as the Bohemian crisis. There are positions between the extremes. The Bohemian revolt did not immediately lead to a full scale European conflict. Initially, the Dutch acted with caution and England, despite the marriage alliance with the Palatinate, stayed out. France was not involved at this stage.

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.

**29 How helpful is the concept of ‘decline’ in understanding the problems of Spain in the first half of the seventeenth century?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required: the concept of ‘decline’; Spain’s problems; the chronological dimension of the first half of the seventeenth century (although there are good reasons why the problems might be traced back to the sixteenth century). Answers which give entirely descriptive treatments of Spain’s problems will meet with limited success. Decline might be approached from a number of directions: the quality of rulers – Charles V and Philip II compared with Philip III and Philip IV; internal decay in terms of economic and social problems; the possible breaking down of the union of the Spanish kingdoms as developed in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; the loss of international influence and, perhaps, hegemony; a fall in standards of public life. There is a strong argument that there was a decline in the quality of rulers. Economic problems were serious – debasement of the currency, national bankruptcy, heavy taxation, falling population, a sharp fall in volume of imported bullion. Attempts at reform largely failed even in the case of Olivares. There were revolts in Catalonia and Portugal. Spain faced increasing competition on the international scene from England, the Dutch Republic and France. How far did Rocroi represent the end of Spanish military power? Spain was forced to recognise the independence of the Dutch Republic in 1648.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focussed and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. This question offers some very good opportunities to engage with the historiography but, nevertheless, the very highest level of marks can be achieved without doing so. It might be argued that Spain faced a crisis or series of crises rather than a decline. Again, if there was a degree of decline how serious and how permanent was it? Spain was able to sustain a military commitment to the Thirty Years War and, indeed, a continuation of war against France until the Peace of the Pyrenees (1659). Meanwhile, art and literature flourished. How far were the problems inherited from the sixteenth century and how far did economic ills such as bankruptcy, debasement and inflation differ in terms of severity? In historiographical terms, for example, how far does the seventeenth century suffer in comparison with the ‘golden age’ of Ferdinand and Isabella or to what extent was the decline that of Castile rather than Spain?

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.

**30 Account for the predominant position achieved by Sweden in the Baltic in the first half of the seventeenth century.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is, an explanation of how Sweden came to predominance (and not, for example, how that predominance came to be challenged and overthrown). The concentration should be on the Baltic, although references to Sweden's wider influence will be relevant. Candidates should have a clear idea of the chronological scope. Finishing points in, say, 1648, 1654 or 1660 are all possible. Narratives of events, of Swedish military campaigns, for example, will not meet the requirements of the question. In explaining Sweden's predominance candidates may refer to the following: the quality of leadership, for example, Gustavus Adolphus and Oxenstierna; the great asset of mineral wealth allied to Dutch expertise and investment; eventual triumph over Denmark with a focus, perhaps, on the Treaty of Bromsebro (1645) with its territorial, economic and commercial gains; relative weakness of other powers such as Poland and Russia; successful intervention in the Thirty Years War and the gains made at Westphalia, especially on the north German coast; naval resources; the overhaul of central and local government by Oxenstierna and internal stability.

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 relative and relevant factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. For example, candidates might challenge the terms of the question and argue that Sweden's predominance was incomplete or that it was not as secure as it seemed. In support they could suggest: that Sweden was overstretched, say, after 1632; that Sweden's resources (for example, population) were slender; that by the later 1630s and 1640s, certainly, much depended on Sweden's relationship with France; that too much depended upon able leadership; that even by 1660 Sweden had not achieved complete economic domination of the Baltic and that, in the end, it failed to control the Sound.

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.

**31 Assess the importance of Brandenburg-Prussia in European affairs under the Great Elector.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is Brandenburg-Prussia's influence on European affairs rather than the development of internal affairs or territorial gains made by Brandenburg-Prussia (although such gains could be used to illustrate the extent of international influence). The chronological focus is 1640–88 although, in order to assess importance, some reference might be made to the influence of Brandenburg-Prussia under, say, the Great Elector's immediate predecessor and successor. Influence was exerted in two main forms – diplomatic and military. A descriptive account of Brandenburg-Prussia's participation in the wars of the period would not be an appropriate response but a framework based on wars, as long as the diplomacy is also assessed, should work perfectly well. Brandenburg-Prussia's ambitions and aims, territorial and otherwise, should be set alongside what was achieved by diplomacy and war. Some relatively brief reference might be made to internal reforms, the creation of a new bureaucracy and centralised absolutism as well as feelings of patriotism, which provided the stable foundation for intervention abroad. In the last phase of the Thirty Years War the Great Elector showed diplomatic skill in extricating himself from the fighting, emerging as the leader of the Protestant cause and making gains at Westphalia, whilst championing the rights of Calvinists. Participation in the Northern War (1655–60) involved first an alliance with Sweden and then with Poland. The Great Elector, it might be argued, was sufficiently influential to be able to obtain the sovereignty of East Prussia by the Treaty of Oliva. In the period 1660–88, with reference to the wars of Louis XIV, the Great Elector followed a policy of changing alliances and gaining foreign subsidies. Although his normal orientation was towards England, the Dutch and the Emperor he was prepared to change sides to suit his own purposes. For example, he supported the Dutch in 1672, and allied with France in 1667, made an anti-French treaty with the Dutch in 1672, reverted to a French alliance in 1679 only to join the League of Augsburg in 1686. The existence of a strong and well trained army of 30,000 under the Great Elector's command accounts for much of the influence of Brandenburg-Prussia in the period and its victory at Fehrbellin (1675) sealed its reputation. The extent of Brandenburg-Prussia's influence in international affairs might be argued by reference to factors such as its value in alliance systems, its ability to gain subsidies from all sides, the quality of its army and the territorial gains made.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may be expected to take an especially sharp and critical approach to the matter of Brandenburg-Prussia's 'importance' in European affairs. How much did the Great Elector's influence depend on the relevant strength of other powers? Was he not, for example, forced to accept the supremacy of France for much of the period? How did this affect his rivalry with Sweden? At the same time Frederick William was a bold, effective and astute opportunist, was adept at changing alliances, with a good sense of timing, as well as commanding a formidable army.

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.

## Section 7: c. 1660–c. 1715

**32. How absolute was the French monarchy under Louis XIV?**

Candidates should:

AO1 present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the monarchy of Louis XIV. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is, the extent of absolutism in the reign of Louis XIV. Candidates will need to have a clear understanding of the concept of absolutism in the context of the late seventeenth century, briefly, a hereditary monarchy, not answerable to earthly authority and thus untrammelled by intermediate or subordinate bodies, responsible to God alone but with a moral obligation to govern according to Christian principles. In support of the view that absolutism was extensive and extended under Louis XIV, candidates may cite the following: the nobility were no longer a serious threat (contrast the Fronde period) although at a price; Louis took personal control of his government in 1661; provincial autonomy was reduced; the power of the law courts was curbed; control over the Church was tightened; religious minorities were crushed; the Estates-General remained in abeyance; large amounts of taxation were raised; there was a series of ambitious wars at the King's will; there was effective visual propaganda e.g. Versailles. On the other hand, it might be argued: privilege for the nobility, clergy and some towns and provinces remained; internal customs duties and tolls, different weights and measures and limits to communications stood in the way of economic absolutism; venal offices remained; heavy taxation was resisted and the Crown incurred large debts. Nevertheless, it is fair to argue that the monarchy was more powerful and France more united in 1715 than in 1661.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may well take the opportunity of further investigation of definitions of absolutism and link this to the historiography. Among contemporaries, Thomas Hobbes and Bishop Bossuet regarded the concept very differently. 'Absolutism' was not used as a political term in France until after 1789 and in Britain not until after 1830. The term 'absolute monarchy' was used in the seventeenth century; Bossuet defined royal authority as 'absolute' but not 'arbitrary' (in contrast to Hobbes). The question might be posed, given the limitations, as to whether Louis XIV's monarchy was absolute at all. There is no 'right answer'; it is the quality of argument that should be rewarded. Was it possible, for example, for one man to oversee everything? Did ministers enhance or restrict the power of the King? Compared with the modern authoritarian states, resources, bureaucracies, communications and propaganda were all very limited.

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.

**33 To what extent was the economic power of the Dutch Republic in the later-seventeenth century matched by its influence in international affairs?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required; on the chronology of the later-seventeenth century (some flexibility can be allowed including an extension into early-eighteenth century) and upon a comparison between economic power and international influence. Candidates will need to go beyond description of Dutch economic power and a narrative of war and diplomacy. In economic and cultural terms, the period may be seen as a ‘golden age’ for the Dutch Republic. At the end of the seventeenth century, and into the eighteenth, the Dutch still dominated the trade artery from the Baltic via the North Sea to the Iberian Peninsula; they dominated the Baltic trade itself; the East India Company still flourished. However, England was fast catching up, manufacturing was still important in some Dutch towns, although textile and shipbuilding showed a relative decline by the end of the century. Nevertheless, Dutch economic decline was not evident until the mid-eighteenth century. The Treaty of Utrecht marked a decline of Dutch political power and influence (not matched by their continuing economic power). However, in the course of the later-seventeenth century, it could be argued that the Dutch were active in diplomacy and war and with much success (although fortunes were not unmixed). In dealing with this aspect of the question candidates may be expected to deal with some of the following (noting the outcomes and commenting upon and analysing the extent of Dutch success and influence): the war with the English Republic; successful intervention in the Baltic and the Treaty of Oliva, 1660; the Anglo-Dutch War, 1665; role in the Triple Alliance, 1668; the Franco-Dutch War 1672–9; William of Orange’s successful intervention in England in 1688 and his success in building an anti-French coalition; the War of the League of Augsburg 1689–97 and the successful outcome of the Treaty of Ryswick; and, possibly, the diplomacy preceding the War of Spanish Succession and the war itself. Although the Treaty of Utrecht may mark the decline of Dutch international power and influence (and the Dutch did not share in Britain’s commercial gains) the French had been prevented from overrunning the Dutch Republic and the Dutch retained the barrier fortresses.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations may enhance responses (although they are not required) as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates should make sharp comparisons between the two elements of the question and have a clear awareness of the connections between them. The Dutch fleet, for example, was used to protect commerce as well as an instrument of policy in war; the economic resources enabled the Dutch Republic to defend itself, to engage in active diplomacy and to build coalitions; tariffs were a major cause of war in 1672. In this period, it might be argued, the Dutch faced serious competition, both economic and political, from both England and France. France was an expansionist near neighbour as well as having ambitious economic objectives. England was a maritime, commercial and colonial rival (Pepys wrote that ‘the trade of the world is too little for us two, therefore one must go down’). William of Orange devoted his career to resisting France but how far did his success in gaining the crown of England result in the sacrifice of Dutch interests? As allies of the English the Dutch, perhaps, paid the price of sacrificing their supremacy in overseas trade whilst losing their status as a first-class power.

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.

**34 How accurate is the view that Peter the Great's policies were driven by the aim of 'westernising' Russia?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is, examining the accuracy of a particular view of Peter the Great's policies. What motivated Peter the Great? Some possibilities are: the aim of bringing Russia into Europe; 'westernising' for its own sake; adopting European methods in order to win the wars which occupied so much of his reign. Policies which might be explored include: industrialisation, very largely State promoted and owned (to provide military resources?); more efficient administration, based on European models (to collect taxation for war, exploit resources and organise conscription?); the creation of the Senate and colleges to make, supervise and implement policy (to some extent staffed by foreigners); centralising policy strengthened by the appointment of a Procurator-General; establishment of schools on European models (to train military engineers, artillerymen, medical officers); creation of a navy (recruiting shipbuilders from Europe); the building of St. Petersburg (a naval base as well as a 'window on the West'); introduction of a Table of Ranks (a structure for military and political service); permanent diplomatic missions in the major European cities; his own travels in Europe.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations may enhance responses (although not required) as will an ability to engage with controversy. A particularly sharp evaluation of the view forming the proposition contained in the title is to be expected. How far, for example, was the Great Northern War the key to change? To what extent was there a conscious copying and borrowing of European attitudes as distinct from techniques and methods? Certainly the reforms for imitating European social conduct, manners and attitudes were superficial and limited in their success. The social structure, it might be argued, was largely preserved and this obstructed plans for reform. How far were Peter's policies of reform and centralisation designed simply to strengthen autocracy rather than to 'westernise'? Further, it could be argued, the adoption of European ways was not new – cultural, economic and political contacts with Europe were of long standing.

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.

### 35 How damaging was the reign of Charles XII to Sweden's internal strength and external influence?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the reign of Charles XII of Sweden. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is, an assessment of how damaging Charles XII's reign was, a balanced treatment of internal strength and external influence, the connections between these themes and a concentration upon the period 1697–1718 (although some reference should be made to the position of Sweden under Charles XI and that obtaining under Charles XII's successor). A description of the Great Northern War is not what is required although a narrative framework with argument, analysis and assessment could work well. Although Charles XII died in 1718 some reference to the Peace of Nystadt will be necessary. Candidates might initiate the argument by surveying the strengths and weaknesses of Sweden in 1697: the reforms of Charles XI; the strength of the army and navy; Dutch support against Denmark; the extended and stretched nature of the Swedish Baltic empire; the emergence of powerful rivals. Charles XII's career was totally absorbed by the Great Northern War; there was initial success but Poltava (1709) was clearly a turning point. Sweden was badly defeated. The immediate consequences of a long war were very damaging – heavy taxation, economic damage and perhaps 30% of the male population killed in war. However, important natural resources (timber, iron and copper) still remained and the quality of internal administration survived. But, on the international front, it could be argued that Sweden fell to the rank of a third-rate power. At the end of the Great Northern War much of the Swedish empire had been lost: Denmark reclaimed the right to tax Swedish shipping and gained Holstein-Gottorp; to Hanover were ceded Bremen and Verden and to Prussia, Stettin and most of Pomerania; Russia gained Estonia, Latvia, Ingria part of Finland and Viborg. Nevertheless, Sweden retained Scania, Bleking and Halland which it had not held a century before.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an 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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations may enhance responses (although not required) as will an ability to engage with controversy. It might be argued, for example, that the Swedish empire was an artificial creation which could not last and that the reign of Charles XII simply accelerated its disintegration. On the other hand a comparison with the reign of Charles XI – the avoidance of foreign entanglement as far as possible, the pursuit of a neutral foreign policy, internal reform – offered Sweden the chance of surviving as a power of the second rank. However, could Sweden have resisted the challenge of powerful and ambitious rivals such as Brandenburg-Prussia and Russia or the revanchism of Denmark?

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.

**36 'The succession to the Spanish throne was the least important cause of the War of Spanish Succession.' How far do you agree?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, the origins of the War of Spanish Succession, not its course and outcome. A narrative account of the diplomacy leading up to the outbreak of war would meet the demands of the question to only a limited extent. An argued and analytical use of the material is required. No set answer is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument that should be rewarded. The succession to the Spanish throne clearly played its part but is this too simple an explanation? Charles II of Spain died on 1 November 1700, war was declared 15 May 1702. What events occurred in the interim and how significant were they? Longer term issues will also need to be considered: Bourbon/Habsburg rivalry was still a potent force; French expansionism had already been clearly demonstrated in previous wars; there was Anglo-French and Franco-Dutch rivalry arising out of conflicting commercial and, increasingly, colonial interests. Was the War more about the European balance of power rather than the Spanish Succession as such? The Partition Treaties might have preserved peace but were not signed by the Emperor Leopold I and were later abandoned by Louis XIV and William III. How important was the role of William III who had spent his career opposing Louis XIV and combined English and Dutch interests? Once Charles II had willed the Spanish throne to Philip of Anjou, Louis XIV could not really have refused it (the Spaniards would not accept partition and Leopold I would have accepted the throne had Louis XIV not done so on behalf of his grandson). Could war even then have been avoided had Louis XIV not acted provocatively? The following actions on Louis XIV's part should be explored: he safeguarded Philip of Anjou's right to the French throne (December 1700); occupied the barrier fortresses (February 1701); gained the Asiento for France (August 1701); recognised the Old Pretender as James III (September 1701). It might be argued that these actions guaranteed an anti-French coalition without which the War could not have been fought.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations may enhance responses (although not required) as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates are offered some good opportunities for challenging the terms of the proposition forming the question and evaluating the relative importance of longer and shorter term factors.

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 – 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.

**Section 8: c. 1715–c. 1774****37 Assess the legacy of Peter the Great to his successors in the period 1725–1762.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp assessment of the demands of the question is required and, clearly, coverage of the whole period 1725–1762 is necessary. A narrative survey would be a limited response to the demands of the question. Peter the Great's legacy to his successors could be discussed in the following areas namely: foreign policy, war and relations with other leading powers; attitudes towards the nobility; attitudes towards the power of the autocracy and its personal nature under Peter; relations with the Church; the debate over eastern versus western orientation; administrative and bureaucratic policy; economic and social legacies including attitudes towards the peasantry.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations, may enhance answers, as will the ability to engage with controversy. Candidates will need to cover a broad spectrum in terms of time and discuss the particular legacy of Peter to each of his predecessors in a variety of policy areas perhaps concluding that in some aspects his successors exhibited continuity rather than change whilst in other aspects they distanced themselves from the Petrine period.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense 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.

**38 How serious were the problems facing the French monarchy under Louis XV?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required with an understanding of the problems faced by Louis XV and the extent of their severity, possibly in a hierarchy of importance. Candidates may be expected to deal with the following problems: economic mismanagement and bankruptcy; lack of trustworthy and competent ministers; the problems brought to France by continuous war; the revival and threat of Jansenism; the survival and resistance of Huguenotism; the unpopularity of the crown and court excess; the role of regionalism in undermining the monarchy; administrative weakness and the power of the Parlements and Intendants; the weakness/indifference of Louis XV's personal kingship in comparison to more illustrious predecessors.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations, may enhance answers, as will the ability to engage with controversy. A possible approach may be to cover a range of problems identified above and evaluate their severity. Candidates might conclude that some such as regionalism were less serious than the cost of fighting continuous wars in this period.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense 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.

**39 Why was Europe so frequently at war in the period 1733–1763?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, especially a clear set of explanations and a balanced coverage of ‘so frequently at war’. Straight chronological narratives should be avoided but argument, analysis and explanation within a chronological framework would certainly be acceptable. Candidates may point to the following factors in answering the question. War was so frequent for European countries in this period 1733–1763 because of political and dynastic rivalry; quelling or supporting internal social unrest; the scramble for economic resources; religious division; colonial rivalry and territorial disputes; differences over the succession; the breakdown of alliances; Machiavellian power politics and rivalry and possibly the brutality of the age. War was diplomacy by other means and was expected by an eager civilian population as Catherine the Great stated ‘he who gains nothing loses’.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations, may enhance answers, as will the ability to engage with controversy. A possible approach may be that candidates might use the above criteria and apply it to the frequent wars that occurred during this period such as the War of Austrian Succession and the Seven Years War, possibly concluding that some factors were more frequent than others in leading to a general conflagration.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense 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.

**40 In what respect, if any, does Frederick II of Prussia deserve the title ‘the Great’?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required and, clearly, a balanced coverage in both domestic and foreign policy of the whole reign 1740–1786 is necessary. A narrative survey would be a limited response to the demands of the question. In agreement with the title candidates could point to the success he enjoyed in war and foreign policy such as the capture of Silesia in 1740; his stamina and resilience during the Seven Years War; his involvement in the partition of Poland and the clever hand he played in the war of Bavarian succession in 1778. Domestically, his greatness was revealed in religious tolerance; his self-styled role as Prussia’s premier domestique; his rationalisation of Prussian bureaucracy; his creation of Prussia’s first legal code; his systematic economic planning and the influence of the Physiocrats on his economic policy and possibly his patronage of music, art and literature. One should however be aware that candidates need to see the other side of the story and greatness may be compromised by his limitations as a diplomat; his over reliance on war; his inability to control his nobility and his failure to enact significant social changes.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of the 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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses, as will the ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may wish to consider the overall impact of his reign and if the epithet ‘the Great’ is appropriate in a wide variety of areas. Candidates will probably conclude that it was justified and may include more on the military and foreign policy elements of his reign than the domestic aspect.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense 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.

**41 'More despotic than enlightened.' How accurate is this judgement on Maria Theresa?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required with a balanced coverage of the concepts of both the enlightened and despotic traits of Maria Theresa's career by perhaps identifying them initially in the opening passages of the essay. Candidates may be expected to deal with the following issues: on the enlightened side of her reforming programme her reform of central government, especially the state council; her forward looking judicial reforms; the co-operation with enlightened ministers such as Haugwitz and Kaunitz need to be stressed as would elements of her positive policy towards serfdom. On the despotic side one could consider her centralising tendencies in local government; her censorship and cultural myopia; a mercantilist economic policy and possibly her religious intolerance, especially her anti-Semitic tendencies. Her unwillingness to dilute her own imperial power might also be discussed.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses, as will the ability to engage with controversy. A sharp sense of evaluation is to be expected in dealing with 'how accurate is the view that'. Candidates will need to give a balanced assessment of her internal policies and reach some reasoned judgements as to whether she was merely playing lip service to current enlightened ideas or genuinely engaged in positive governance in a variety of areas.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

## Section 9: c. 1774–c. 1815

**42 How valid is the claim that Catherine the Great's achievements in foreign affairs far outweigh those in domestic affairs?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Entirely narrative accounts of policies will have a limited reward and 'lists' should be avoided. Explanation of policies with comment and analysis together with comparisons and argument should be the aim. No set response is to be looked for; it is the quality of argument that should be rewarded. A sound balance between the two aspects of the question is essential for the higher mark bands. In terms of domestic policies candidates may be expected to explain the following: Catherine's own hard work and personal style; the reform of Peter I's 'college' system and of local government; law reform, Nakaz and the Legislative Commission; judicial reform; economic policies including the end of some state monopolies, commercial treaties and the expansion of foreign trade (by almost five times); the continuation of Peter I's policy of subordinating Church to State; attempts at educational reform; patronage of the arts; the crushing of Pugachev's rebellion. Among the criticisms of the domestic policies, the following may be offered: the nobility were left in control of local administration and, more broadly, the dependence on the nobility was a limiting factor in domestic reform; the privileges of the nobility were confirmed by the Charter of the Nobility; although there was some success in higher education, advances in primary education were confined to the towns; there is a large body of agreement on the part of contemporaries that the legal reforms were largely window-dressing; there was no serious attempt to reform serfdom; it might be argued that although Pugachev's rebellion was put down it was provoked by Catherine's policies. Foreign policy was very much concerned with territorial expansion and 220,000 square miles were added to the Russian Empire. Candidates are likely to deal with the following: the withdrawal from the Seven Years War and initial alliance with Prussia; the partitions of Poland in 1772, 1793 and 1795; war with Turkey after 1768, the successes gained and the negotiation of the Treaty of Kuchuk-Kainarji, 1774; the alliance with Austria (1781) and the joint war against Turkey (1788) and the further gains made; the annexation of the Crimea (1784); reaction to the French Revolution.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here there should be an especially sharp evaluation of whether foreign achievements 'far outweighed' domestic. How strong is the argument that foreign policy had a priority over domestic considerations? To what extent were domestic policies subordinated to foreign ambitions, for example, economic policies being concerned to provide resources for successful war? Again, how far did foreign aggrandisement actually undermine reform at home?

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.

### 43 Who benefited the most from the partitions of Poland?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set answer is to be expected; it is the quality of argument and analysis that should be rewarded. A balanced treatment is required of the three Partitions (1772, 1793 and 1795) and of the gains made by Russia, Prussia and Austria. Purely descriptive accounts of the diplomacy and provisions of the three treaties will meet the demands of the question to only a limited extent. Although the focus should be on an assessment of the respective gains some context of the state of Poland and the motives of the three powers would be helpful, for example, Frederick II's concern to prevent Russia and Austria from outbidding each other in the Balkans at the time of the first Partition. In terms of the quantity of territory shared out, in total, Russia gained 181,000 square miles and 6 million inhabitants, Austria 45,000 and 3 million and Prussia 57,000 and 2.5 million. However, candidates will need to go beyond this to argue a case for the value and significance of these territorial gains. Russia's interest before 1772 had lain in a docile Poland and the right to intervene on behalf of Orthodox Christians. By the first two Partitions, Russia regained lands which had been largely Russian. By 1795 Russia had taken huge strides westwards with consequently increased prestige and influence. The third Partition increased Russia's Baltic shoreline with the acquisition of Kurland. Prussia's gains were of great strategic and economic importance, perhaps out of proportion to the extent of the territory; the rest of West Prussia (1772) thus joining Pomerania to East Prussia; Danzig was gained in 1793 together with Posen, Thorn and control of the Upper Vistula; Warsaw followed in 1795. Apart from not being left out of the partitions Austria gained the valuable saltmines of Galicia.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. It might be argued that all three powers gained the benefit of avoiding war with each other. All had had to act together to bring the Partitions about. Russia and Austria were later able to pursue their ambitions at the expense of the Ottoman Empire with territorial and strategic gains for both. However, the Partitions made the three great powers next-door neighbours – there was no buffer state. Although the Partitions had provided peaceful solutions to eighteenth-century disputes, new problems were created for resolution in the nineteenth. Russia, in particular, earned the permanent hostility of the Poles. Frederick II wrote 'so far from ending the jealousy between the Powers [the First Partition] gave it something to feed on. Russia wanted to expand towards Europe, Prussia wanted to consolidate, Austria to swell out so as not to be stifled'.

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.

#### 44 How far can the causes of the outbreak of revolution in France in July 1789 be regarded as short-term?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – explanation and analysis of the causes of the French Revolution of 1789. An entirely narrative account of events is unlikely but such an approach could not be well rewarded. No set response is expected, but there should be a balanced consideration of both longer- and shorter-term factors. Some flexibility may be allowed in the definition of short-term: the beginning of an acute period of political and financial crisis in 1785 is a possibility; or events after the fall of Calonne in April 1787; or, possibly, the developing tensions and volatility stimulated by the calling of the Estates-General in August 1788. It might even be argued that it was only after the meeting of the Estates-General in May 1789 that revolution became likely or unavoidable. In addressing short-term causes candidates may be expected to attempt an analysis, in some detail, of the developing crisis after 1785: the efforts of Calonne to deal with France's financial problems and to reform taxation; his dismissal; the effective failure of Brienne; the obstructionism of the Parlement and the Assembly of Notables; the revolt of the nobility and unrest in the provinces. Further detail might be provided of the further crisis which unfolded after the decision to call the Estates-General taken in August 1788 with particular focus, perhaps, on the role of the King and the Court: the decision to double the representation of the Third Estate (December 1788); the opening of the Estates-General (May 1789); the assumption of the title of National Assembly by the Third Estate (17 June); the Tennis Court Oath (20 June); the Séance Royale (23 June); the dismissal of Necker (11 July). Meanwhile candidates should be aware of the problem of food shortages and high prices, arising from the bad harvest of 1788, and the increasing restiveness of Paris. In terms of longer-term causes candidates may be expected to consider the following: the political, economic and social structure of the ancien regime; the long-standing problem of the Crown's finances; hindrances in the way of economic progress and the economic downturn of the second half of the eighteenth century; the consequences of the maintenance of the privileges of the nobility and clergy; the survival of provincial particularism; the continuing influence of the Parlement (which had experienced a resurgence in the reign of Louis XV and again in the 1780s); the influence of the Enlightenment; the question as to whether the personal, absolutist Bourbon monarchy could any longer cope with the problems facing it.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may well argue as to the interrelationship between longer- and shorter-term causes and could interpret the final crisis as simply a manifestation of underlying problems in a more acute form. There are good opportunities for exploring and evaluating historical interpretations, particularly perhaps, the Marxist/Socialist view of class conflict arising from the economic and social structures of the ancien regime and the idea of a 'bourgeois revolution'.

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.

#### 45 How is the fall of Robespierre in July 1794 best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required; an explanation of the causes of the fall of Robespierre. Unadorned narrative of events is unlikely, and should not be well rewarded, but analysis, argument and explanation within a broadly narrative framework would be acceptable and could score highly. To a large extent both Robespierre's power and his fall can be explained by his relationship with Paris, the sans culottes and the radicals in the Sections. In summer 1794 this relationship between these Parisian elements and the leading Montagnards broke down. The government was not able, in the end, to operate the Law of the Maximum efficiently and the attempt to limit wages was deeply unpopular. At the same time there was growing opposition to the extremes of the Terror whilst the military victory at Fleurus (20 June 1794) reduced the sense of national danger and, therefore, made the Terror seem less justifiable. The Law of Prairial (22 June) seemed to threaten a new purge and Deputies of the Convention were no longer protected from the jurisdiction of the Revolutionary Tribunal. In the weeks after the passing of the Law of Prairial executions were carried out on an unprecedented scale. The difficulties of the government were intensified by the rivalry between the Committee of Public Safety (CPS) and the Committee of General Security and by tensions within the CPS itself. In other words there were clear signs of a disunited government which was lacking in public support. For a month before his fall, Robespierre had been absent from the CPS and the Convention (both of which he had dominated) and was showing symptoms of ill health and strain. Robespierre's speech in the Convention (26 July) raising alarm about new conspiracies brought about an alliance of those who feared for their own survival and a coup was carried out. At the last the sans culottes and the armed forces of the Sections stood aside and failed to save Robespierre from the guillotine.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may be expected to take a particularly sharp line of argument as to the relative importance of the factors at work in Robespierre's fall and the phrase 'best explained' may stimulate some discussion of competing interpretations. An interesting line to be pursued might be the extent to which the fall of Robespierre lay chiefly in his own personality and particular sense of idealism.

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.

**46 How far can it be argued that Napoleon undermined rather than consolidated the domestic achievements of the French Revolution?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required; the period of the first Consulship and the Empire (1799–1815) and domestic policies. Plain descriptions of domestic policies should not be highly rewarded, comparison, analysis, assessment and argument are necessary for the higher mark bands. Candidates are likely to deal with the liberal reforms of the period under the National and Legislative Assemblies. It might be argued that the principles underlying the Declaration of Rights and the abolition of feudal rights and privileges and of the rank of nobility were maintained and preserved by Napoleon. The principle of careers open to talent was continued by Napoleon. However, candidates may well draw attention to the Legion of Honour and the creation of noble and princely titles for generals, for example, and for members of Napoleon's family. Moreover Napoleon made himself Emperor and conferred thrones on two of his brothers. Napoleon's education reforms and Codes of Law in large part not only consolidated the achievements of the Revolution but extended them. Equality under the law and personal freedom were proclaimed under the Consulship but the principles and characteristics of government were stated to be the spirit of order, justice and moderation which demonstrate a different emphasis when compared with liberty, equality and fraternity. The structure of local government was retained (the departmental system) but the appointment of prefects by Napoleon strikes a centralising and authoritarian note. The nationalisation of Church property and the Civil Constitution of the Clergy were major planks of the revolutionary platform. These policies were to an extent retained by Napoleon, the clergy were paid by the State, for example, and all faiths were tolerated, but Napoleon's Concordat with the Papacy, it might be argued, betrayed the revolutionary stance.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may well challenge the assumption that the question refers to the revolutionary achievements of 1789–92. There were, after all, two further revolutions (August 1792 and June 1793). August 1792 overthrew the monarchy but, it might be argued, Napoleon restored it. Napoleon's personal dominance (dictatorship even) might be compared with Robespierre's (although it was of a different kind). How far can it be argued that military dictatorship was the inevitable outcome of the revolutionary period, once foreign war had been declared. Wasn't Napoleon one of a number of possible 'man on a white horse' figures? Candidates might also compare Napoleon's policies with those of the Jacobin dictatorship concerning police methods and terror, propaganda; censorship; economic controls; centralisation.

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.

**Section 10: Themes c. 1610–c. 1815****47 How valid is the judgement that ‘by 1700 there had been scientific advances but no scientific revolution’?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A description of scientific ideas, changes, and developments will not answer the question, unless there is some explanation. Analysis and evaluation are required, using such knowledge to illustrate arguments. Candidates will need to identify and comment on a range of scientific ideas and need to consider the concept of a ‘scientific revolution’, itself a debated theme. Candidates might refer to areas such as the work of such as Galileo, Brahe, Kepler, Harvey (to cite but four possible examples) and their discoveries and advances and so evaluation given of the concept of scientific advances set against the concept of a revolution of thinking and practices. A sense of impact and so of change and outcome will be important here and links can be made to scientific methods of observation and reasoning, deduction (etc.) and the links to sciences such as mathematics and the technology of the telescope. Wider impact areas (economic, social, intellectual) could be used for reference as well. It is expected that advances will be assessed as to quantity, type and scope and the overall importance of such. Reference to the context of Church and State and to the founding of various scientific societies would be appropriate as well.

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. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question formulation invites argument and debate, likely to focus on whether there was indeed a ‘scientific revolution’; if so, its dates and core features. ‘How valid...’ reinforces this and seeks evaluation of a judgement. Many would argue there was such; but some say there were changes, advances, developments but not of such substance as to equate with revolutionary change.

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.

**48 Assess the importance of patronage to the development of architecture and the arts in seventeenth-century Europe.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Descriptive forms here will not go far unless there is explanation. Analysis and evaluation, based around topic knowledge, are required. Candidates will need to assess the role of patronage, private and public (state governments, rulers) against other factors. Reference to the Baroque is likely; the idea of the ornate and display of elaboration. Its links to religious areas, including a propaganda mode, may be considered; so, too, the range of expressive forms in Protestant and Catholic or neo-Catholic countries. Several examples will be needed from across the period and across states; selected knowledge will be used to illustrate. Patronage is likely to be seen as very important: expressions of authority, power, betterment, status symbols, even control (etc.). But candidates may well consider individuals and their contributions, independent of high levels of patronage input, simple competitiveness and rivalry, general artistic progression and focus areas in a range from architecture to various arts, including music and painting. Some range of examples will be needed across the arts.

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. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'Assess...' invites a sense of relative importance and ordering of factors but with appreciation of links and connections. Argument and counter-argument are possible, setting patronage against several other factors and putting all into the broad social-political context. For example, it is possible to argue that political needs drive many patronage activities; or else, religious needs and powers were of great importance.

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.

**49 How convincing is the argument that Europeans were more prosperous in 1700 than in 1600? (You should discuss this issue with reference to at least two European countries.)**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A description is unlikely here; nor a narrative of events (etc.). Analysis and evaluation around a sense of comparison (1700:1600) will deliver a good outcome. Knowledge will be selected from across the period and several countries by way of illustration. It is possible to measure change by reference to GNPs, per capita income, standards of living, levels of wages and prices. Reference to industries and to farming would help and there may be contrasts across Europe: e.g. the United Provinces; areas of France and Italy; areas of Eastern Europe. Prosperity in terms of wealth and its attributes can be set against manifest poverty, subsistence levels, diseases, starvation (etc.). Levels of commercial and industrial activity, banking, patronage powers, building scale, other manifestations of wealth may be assessed; so, too, a contemporary belief that the century did bring progress and more prosperity (wealth of nations, etc.). That said, population growth and related areas, wars and their impact (including costs), the fiscal ‘take’ of governments might be considered in evaluation.

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. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. ‘How convincing ...’ invites argument and counter-argument, based around good evaluation levels. It is possible to claim that parts of Europe at least were indeed more prosperous by 1700, but candidates may point to time and place, the nature of examples, the prevalence of wars and their effects, the marked disparities across and within societies. Some may argue that, relatively, Europe saw little meaningful economic progress.

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.

**50 'The Enlightenment was fuelled by English ideas, expressed by French writers, yet exclusively practised by despots in Central and Eastern Europe.' Discuss the accuracy of this view.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge and which has a sharp and persistent focus on the demands of the question, creating analysis and evaluation. A narrative of the Enlightenment or description of its features will not answer the question unless there is at least some analysis. There are three parts here: English ideas, French writers; the practice of despots. These parts all need treatment, albeit not in equal measure. Candidates will have to be selective in knowledge, given the wide span. There will need to be some (brief) definition and explanation of the Enlightenment (e.g. reason, progress, utility, empirical approaches to law and behaviour) and examination of a genesis in English ideas (e.g. Locke, Newton) and of French written expressions (e.g. Voltaire, Montesquieu, Rousseau). Then the apparent imbalance in practice – little take-up in Western Europe, much elsewhere – will need assessment. Examples of 'enlightened despots' (e.g. Joseph II, Catherine the Great) will be required as will some examples of the practical applications of ideas (e.g. in relation to social reforms, education, religion, political power and its application, laws, the role of the state, economic reforms).

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Candidates can argue and counter-argue the formulation, adducing views and offering debate. They may agree or disagree according to taste, though arguments must be supported. For example, here it can be said that 'exclusively practised' requires examination as to why and whether this is an accurate view; that the 'enlightened despots' applied those ideas they saw as of practical benefit; that ideas may well have a wider currency.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**51 To what extent, and why, did European states pursue mercantilist policies in the eighteenth century?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The focus will be on the period as a whole, with selected examples across the time-span and a number of states. Too narrow a focus will not deliver the response required. Description of mercantilism will not suffice, analysis and evaluation are required. There are two parts to the question – ‘to what extent, and why’ and these must be covered, if not in equal measure. Selectivity of examples will be required, given wide span of the century. Mercantilism meant the importance of population policy and state regulation; aggressive colonial tariffs to secure markets and resources by exclusion; the linkage with state political and military power; stress on production and consumption problems; ideas about bullion; favourable trade balances. Candidates may well question the utility of the term, downplaying such policies in practice, stressing that few saw its applicability to the European economy as a whole (or indeed the developing global economy), preferring to stress its use in furthering particular economic interests where a distorting influence may be felt. Answers will need to examine some of: main patterns of international trade (with the Americas, especially the slave trade and in commodities; with India and the Far East; within Europe, North/South, East/West); how far mercantilism affected more the extra-European colonial trades (Britain, France, Spain) and the companies involved there (West and East Indian, etc.), less so intra-European trade, despite regulations and limitations there.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, it could be argued that mercantilist policies were prevalent, very much the product of contemporary thinking and context yet there were criticisms (e.g. Adam Smith and the commercial critique, French Physiocrats and the agrarian Anglo-French and Spanish and Dutch conflicts issues). Differences of practice can be adduced, as above. Much criticism came from Western Europe but Central and Eastern states were keen practitioners. The prevailing militant and military-naval conflict context can be assessed, with the inevitable links to economic issues and needs. Of course, there has been much past debate on the concept and its real relevance, not least as an historical tool.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**52 Assess the importance of women to the economy and society of Europe in the eighteenth century.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A description of roles will not suffice; analysis and explanation, leading to evaluation, are required. Candidates will need to select knowledge from several countries across the century. The key issue will be whether women played a greater role by the end of the period. Economic and social activities are likely to be combined. Areas that could be covered: family lives; the effects of single and married status; rural and urban work; lower and upper class status and so limited or wider scope of influence; labour levels; possible influences on thinking about social issues.

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. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. ‘Assess ...’ invites a sense of relative importance, the ordering of factors and issues, but with a sense of connections. Awareness of gender history and its impact on historical thinking would be useful: has the role of women been under-valued? Is it possible to reconstruct the lives and place of ordinary women set against those at the top end of society? How integral were women to contemporary economic activity? Were they able to shape any areas of thinking and action? Was their place simply at home as child-bearers, or did they have some independence of status?

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.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/02C**

Paper 2c European History Outlines c. 1715–2000

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN PAPER

**2 hours 15 minutes**

---

**READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST**

Answer **three** questions, which must be chosen from **at least two** sections of the paper.

All questions in this paper carry equal marks.

You are reminded of the need for analysis and critical evaluation in your answers to questions. You should also show, where appropriate, an awareness of links and comparisons between different countries and different periods.

---

This document consists of **6** printed pages.



**Section 1: c. 1715–c. 1774**

- 1 Assess the legacy of Peter the Great to his successors in the period 1725–1762.
- 2 How serious were the problems facing the French monarchy under Louis XV?
- 3 Why was Europe so frequently at war in the period 1733–1763?
- 4 In what respect, if any, does Frederick II of Prussia deserve the title ‘the Great’?
- 5 ‘More despotic than enlightened.’ How accurate is this judgement on Maria Theresa?

**Section 2: c. 1774–1815**

- 6 How valid is the claim that Catherine the Great’s achievements in foreign affairs far outweigh those in domestic affairs?
- 7 Who benefited the most from the partitions of Poland?
- 8 ***(Candidates offering Paper 5f: The French Revolution should not answer this question.)***  
How far can the causes of the outbreak of revolution in France in July 1789 be regarded as short-term?
- 9 ***(Candidates offering Paper 5f: The French Revolution should not answer this question.)***  
How is the fall of Robespierre best explained?
- 10 How far can it be argued that Napoleon undermined rather than consolidated the domestic achievements of the French Revolution?

**Section 3: Themes c. 1715–c. 1815**

- 11 'The Enlightenment was fuelled by English ideas, expressed by French writers, yet exclusively practised by despots in central and eastern Europe.' Discuss the accuracy of this view.
- 12 To what extent, and why, did European states pursue mercantilist policies in the eighteenth century?
- 13 Assess the importance of women in the development of thinking and writing on political and social ideas in eighteenth-century Europe.
- 14 How accurate is the view that the eighteenth century witnessed 'an extraordinary flourishing in the arts and culture'.
- 15 Assess the impact on the European economy in the period c. 1715–c. 1815 of population increases. You should refer to **at least two** European states.
- 16 Why was the contest for overseas Empire between Britain and France in the eighteenth century eventually decided largely in Britain's favour?

**Section 4: 1815–1862**

- 17 How much attention did the Congress of Vienna pay to the principles of nationalism?
- 18 'They satisfied the main social and political groups in France and fell only by accident.' Discuss this verdict on the restored Bourbon and Orleanist regimes.
- 19 'Conservatism, rather than nationalism and liberalism, proved to be the most powerful force in the revolutions of 1848–1849.' Discuss with reference to at least two revolutions.
- 20 Consider the view that the pursuit of Italian unification in the period 1849–1870 was more about curbing revolutionary nationalism than promoting it.
- 21 How far does a desire to satisfy all interests in France explain Napoleon III's domestic policies?

**Section 5: 1862–1914**

- 22 'The attempted reforms of Alexander II's reign disappointed more than they satisfied.' How valid is this judgement?
- 23 How successful was Bismarck in establishing a balance between the forces of conservatism and change in the German Empire in the period 1871–1890?
- 24 How stable was the French Republic in the years from 1871 to 1914?
- 25 How successful were Wilhelm II's ministers in balancing social and political interests in the years 1890 to 1914?
- 26 How convincing is the argument that the causes of the First World War were largely confined to 1914 itself?

**Section 6: Themes c. 1815–1914**

- 27 To what extent was Romanticism a reaction to the Enlightenment?
- 28 Why was the issue of nationalism an increasingly important influence upon European diplomacy in the nineteenth century? You should answer with reference to **at least two** national groups.
- 29 How important was the state in promoting economic growth in any **two** European states between 1870 and 1914?
- 30 Why did Paris and Vienna dominate European cultural life between 1880 and 1914?
- 31 Assess the impact of industrialisation on **at least two** European states in the period 1870–1914.
- 32 How great was the impact of developments in transport and communications on **at least two** European states in the period 1850–1914?

**Section 7: 1914–1945**

- 33 Assess the importance of the role of sea-power in Germany's defeat in the First World War.
- 34 *(Candidates offering Paper 5j: Russia in Revolution, should not answer this question).*  
'Without Lenin, there would have been no October Revolution.' Discuss.
- 35 Why did the League of Nations succeed with some issues and fail with others?
- 36 *(Candidates offering Paper 5l: Germany should not answer this question).*  
How accurate is the view that the key weakness of the Weimar Republic was that it was 'a democracy without democrats'?
- 37 How revolutionary was Mussolini's Fascist regime?
- 38 Assess the significance of Germany's invasion of the USSR to the final outcome of the Second World War.

**Section 8: 1945–2000**

- 39 To what extent can the origins and development of the Cold War up to 1949 be explained in terms of Soviet policy in Eastern Europe?
- 40 How is the growth in the prosperity and influence of the German Federal Republic after 1949 best explained?
- 41 'The saviour of the French Republic.' How accurate is this verdict on Charles de Gaulle?
- 42 How justified is the view that Gorbachev was 'a failure'?
- 43 How successfully did Eastern European states adapt to the post-Communist world in the 1990s?

**Section 9: Themes c. 1914–2000**

- 44** How far did the role and status of women change in the period c. 1914–1980? You should illustrate your answer by reference to **at least two** European states.
- 45** To what extent do economic factors explain the decolonisation of European overseas possessions between 1945 and c. 1976? Your answer should refer to **at least two** European colonial empires.
- 46** Assess the significance of the Treaty of Rome (1957) in changing the relationship between the states of Western Europe.
- 47** ‘Cultural achievements are often at their greatest amidst political upheavals.’ Discuss this view with reference to **either** 1918–1939 **or** the 1960s and 1970s and **at least two** European states.
- 48** Assess the impact of industrialisation and technological changes on **at least two** European states either in the period 1918–39 or 1945–80.
- 49** ‘Developments in the mass media resulted in massive changes to the nature of politics in the period 1945–1990.’ Discuss this view with reference to **at least two** European states.

---

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

University of Cambridge International Examinations is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/02C**

Paper 2c European History Outlines c. 1715–2000

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

**2 hours 15 minutes**

---

**MAXIMUM MARK: 90**

---

This document consists of **50** printed pages.



**Section 1: c. 1715–c. 1774****1 Assess the legacy of Peter the Great to his successors in the period 1725–1762.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp assessment of the demands of the question is required and, clearly, coverage of the whole period 1725–1762 is necessary. A narrative survey would be a limited response to the demands of the question. Peter the Great's legacy to his successors could be discussed in the following areas namely: foreign policy, war and relations with other leading powers; attitudes towards the nobility; attitudes towards the power of the autocracy and its personal nature under Peter; relations with the Church; the debate over eastern versus western orientation; administrative and bureaucratic policy; economic and social legacies including attitudes towards the peasantry.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations, may enhance answers, as will the ability to engage with controversy. Candidates will need to cover a broad spectrum in terms of time and discuss the particular legacy of Peter to each of his predecessors in a variety of policy areas perhaps concluding that in some aspects his successors exhibited continuity rather than change whilst in other aspects they distanced themselves from the Petrine period.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense 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.

## 2 How serious were the problems facing the French monarchy under Louis XV?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required with an understanding of the problems faced by Louis XV and the extent of their severity, possibly in a hierarchy of importance. Candidates may be expected to deal with the following problems: economic mismanagement and bankruptcy; lack of trustworthy and competent ministers; the problems brought to France by continuous war; the revival and threat of Jansenism; the survival and resistance of Huguenotism; the unpopularity of the crown and court excess; the role of regionalism in undermining the monarchy; administrative weakness and the power of the Parlements and Intendants; the weakness/indifference of Louis XV's personal kingship in comparison to more illustrious predecessors.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations, may enhance answers, as will the ability to engage with controversy. A possible approach may be to cover a range of problems identified above and evaluate their severity. Candidates might conclude that some such as regionalism were less serious than the cost of fighting continuous wars in this period.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense 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.

### 3 Why was Europe so frequently at war in the period 1733–1763?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, especially a clear set of explanations and a balanced coverage of ‘so frequently at war’. Straight chronological narratives should be avoided but argument, analysis and explanation within a chronological framework would certainly be acceptable. Candidates may point to the following factors in answering the question. War was so frequent for European countries in this period 1733–1763 because of political and dynastic rivalry; quelling or supporting internal social unrest; the scramble for economic resources; religious division; colonial rivalry and territorial disputes; differences over the succession; the breakdown of alliances; Machiavellian power politics and rivalry and possibly the brutality of the age. War was diplomacy by other means and was expected by an eager civilian population as Catherine the Great stated ‘he who gains nothing loses’.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations, may enhance answers, as will the ability to engage with controversy. A possible approach may be that candidates might use the above criteria and apply it to the frequent wars that occurred during this period such as the War of Austrian Succession and the Seven Years War, possibly concluding that some factors were more frequent than others in leading to a general conflagration.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense 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.

#### 4 In what respect, if any, does Frederick II of Prussia deserve the title ‘the Great’?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required and, clearly, a balanced coverage in both domestic and foreign policy of the whole reign 1740–1786 is necessary. A narrative survey would be a limited response to the demands of the question. In agreement with the title candidates could point to the success he enjoyed in war and foreign policy such as the capture of Silesia in 1740; his stamina and resilience during the Seven Years War; his involvement in the partition of Poland and the clever hand he played in the war of Bavarian succession in 1778. Domestically, his greatness was revealed in religious tolerance; his self styled role as Prussia’s premier domestique; his rationalisation of Prussian bureaucracy; his creation of Prussia’s first legal code; his systematic economic planning and the influence of the Physiocrats on his economic policy and possibly his patronage of music, art and literature. One should however be aware that candidates need to see the other side of the story and greatness may be compromised by his limitations as a diplomat; his over reliance on war; his inability to control his nobility and his failure to enact significant social changes.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of the 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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing historical interpretations may enhance responses, as will the ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may wish to consider the overall impact of his reign and if the epithet ‘the Great’ is appropriate in a wide variety of areas. Candidates will probably conclude that it was justified and may include more on the military and foreign policy elements of his reign than the domestic aspect.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense 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.

**5 'More despotic than enlightened.' How accurate is this judgement on Maria Theresa?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required with a balanced coverage of the concepts of both the enlightened and despotic traits of Maria Theresa's career by perhaps identifying them initially in the opening passages of the essay. Candidates may be expected to deal with the following issues: on the enlightened side of her reforming programme her reform of central government, especially the state council; her forward looking judicial reforms; the co-operation with enlightened ministers such as Haugwitz and Kaunitz need to be stressed as would elements of her positive policy towards serfdom. On the despotic side one could consider her centralising tendencies in local government; her censorship and cultural myopia; a mercantilist economic policy and possibly her religious intolerance, especially her anti-Semitic tendencies. Her unwillingness to dilute her own imperial power might also be discussed.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses, as will the ability to engage with controversy. A sharp sense of evaluation is to be expected in dealing with 'how accurate is the view that'. Candidates will need to give a balanced assessment of her internal policies and reach some reasoned judgements as to whether she was merely playing lip service to current enlightened ideas or genuinely engaged in positive governance in a variety of areas.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**Section 2: c. 1774–c. 1815**

**6 How valid is the claim that Catherine the Great's achievements in foreign affairs far outweigh those in domestic affairs?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Entirely narrative accounts of policies will have a limited reward and 'lists' should be avoided. Explanation of policies with comment and analysis together with comparisons and argument should be the aim. No set response is to be looked for; it is the quality of argument that should be rewarded. A sound balance between the two aspects of the question is essential for the higher mark bands. In terms of domestic policies candidates may be expected to explain the following: Catherine's own hard work and personal style; the reform of Peter I's 'college' system and of local government; law reform, Nakaz and the Legislative Commission; judicial reform; economic policies including the end of some state monopolies, commercial treaties and the expansion of foreign trade (by almost five times); the continuation of Peter I's policy of subordinating Church to State; attempts at educational reform; patronage of the arts; the crushing of Pugachev's rebellion. Among the criticisms of the domestic policies, the following may be offered: the nobility were left in control of local administration and, more broadly, the dependence on the nobility was a limiting factor in domestic reform; the privileges of the nobility were confirmed by the Charter of the Nobility; although there was some success in higher education, advances in primary education were confined to the towns; there is a large body of agreement on the part of contemporaries that the legal reforms were largely window-dressing; there was no serious attempt to reform serfdom; it might be argued that although Pugachev's rebellion was put down it was provoked by Catherine's policies. Foreign policy was very much concerned with territorial expansion and 220,000 square miles were added to the Russian Empire. Candidates are likely to deal with the following: the withdrawal from the Seven Years War and initial alliance with Prussia; the partitions of Poland in 1772, 1793 and 1795; war with Turkey after 1768, the successes gained and the negotiation of the Treaty of Kuchuk-Kainarji, 1774; the alliance with Austria (1781) and the joint war against Turkey (1788) and the further gains made; the annexation of the Crimea (1784); reaction to the French Revolution.

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 arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here there should be an especially sharp evaluation of whether foreign achievements 'far outweighed' domestic. How strong is the argument that foreign policy had a priority over domestic considerations? To what extent were domestic policies subordinated to foreign ambitions, for example, economic policies being concerned to provide resources for successful war? Again, how far did foreign aggrandisement actually undermine reform at home?

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.

## 7 Who benefited the most from the partitions of Poland?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set answer is to be expected; it is the quality of argument and analysis that should be rewarded. A balanced treatment is required of the three Partitions (1772, 1793 and 1795) and of the gains made by Russia, Prussia and Austria. Purely descriptive accounts of the diplomacy and provisions of the three treaties will meet the demands of the question to only a limited extent. Although the focus should be on an assessment of the respective gains some context of the state of Poland and the motives of the three powers would be helpful, for example, Frederick II's concern to prevent Russia and Austria from outbidding each other in the Balkans at the time of the first Partition. In terms of the quantity of territory shared out, in total, Russia gained 181,000 square miles and 6 million inhabitants, Austria 45,000 and 3 million and Prussia 57,000 and 2.5 million. However, candidates will need to go beyond this to argue a case for the value and significance of these territorial gains. Russia's interest before 1772 had lain in a docile Poland and the right to intervene on behalf of Orthodox Christians. By the first two Partitions, Russia regained lands which had been largely Russian. By 1795 Russia had taken huge strides westwards with consequently increased prestige and influence. The third Partition increased Russia's Baltic shoreline with the acquisition of Kurland. Prussia's gains were of great strategic and economic importance, perhaps out of proportion to the extent of the territory; the rest of West Prussia (1772) thus joining Pomerania to East Prussia; Danzig was gained in 1793 together with Posen, Thorn and control of the Upper Vistula; Warsaw followed in 1795. Apart from not being left out of the partitions Austria gained the valuable saltmines of Galicia.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. It might be argued that all three powers gained the benefit of avoiding war with each other. All had had to act together to bring the Partitions about. Russia and Austria were later able to pursue their ambitions at the expense of the Ottoman Empire with territorial and strategic gains for both. However, the Partitions made the three great powers next-door neighbours – there was no buffer state. Although the Partitions had provided peaceful solutions to eighteenth-century disputes, new problems were created for resolution in the nineteenth. Russia, in particular, earned the permanent hostility of the Poles. Frederick II wrote 'so far from ending the jealousy between the Powers [the First Partition] gave it something to feed on. Russia wanted to expand towards Europe, Prussia wanted to consolidate, Austria to swell out so as not to be stifled'.

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.

**8 How far can the causes of the outbreak of revolution in France in July 1789 be regarded as short-term?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – explanation and analysis of the causes of the French Revolution of 1789. An entirely narrative account of events is unlikely but such an approach could not be well rewarded. No set response is expected, but there should be a balanced consideration of both longer- and shorter-term factors. Some flexibility may be allowed in the definition of short-term: the beginning of an acute period of political and financial crisis in 1785 is a possibility; or events after the fall of Calonne in April 1787; or, possibly, the developing tensions and volatility stimulated by the calling of the Estates-General in August 1788. It might even be argued that it was only after the meeting of the Estates-General in May 1789 that revolution became likely or unavoidable. In addressing short-term causes candidates may be expected to attempt an analysis, in some detail, of the developing crisis after 1785: the efforts of Calonne to deal with France's financial problems and to reform taxation; his dismissal; the effective failure of Brienne; the obstructionism of the Parlement and the Assembly of Notables; the revolt of the nobility and unrest in the provinces. Further detail might be provided of the further crisis which unfolded after the decision to call the Estates-General taken in August 1788 with particular focus, perhaps, on the role of the King and the Court: the decision to double the representation of the Third Estate (December 1788); the opening of the Estates-General (May 1789); the assumption of the title of National Assembly by the Third Estate (17 June); the Tennis Court Oath (20 June); the Séance Royale (23 June); the dismissal of Necker (11 July). Meanwhile candidates should be aware of the problem of food shortages and high prices, arising from the bad harvest of 1788, and the increasing restiveness of Paris. In terms of longer-term causes candidates may be expected to consider the following: the political, economic and social structure of the ancien regime; the long-standing problem of the Crown's finances; hindrances in the way of economic progress and the economic downturn of the second half of the eighteenth century; the consequences of the maintenance of the privileges of the nobility and clergy; the survival of provincial particularism; the continuing influence of the Parlement (which had experienced a resurgence in the reign of Louis XV and again in the 1780s); the influence of the Enlightenment; the question as to whether the personal, absolutist Bourbon monarchy could any longer cope with the problems facing it.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may well argue as to the interrelationship between longer- and shorter-term causes and could interpret the final crisis as simply a manifestation of underlying problems in a more acute form. There are good opportunities for exploring and evaluating historical interpretations, particularly perhaps, the Marxist/Socialist view of class conflict arising from the economic and social structures of the ancien regime and the idea of a 'bourgeois revolution'.

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.

## 9 How is the fall of Robespierre in July 1794 best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required; an explanation of the causes of the fall of Robespierre. Unadorned narrative of events is unlikely, and should not be well rewarded, but analysis, argument and explanation within a broadly narrative framework would be acceptable and could score highly. To a large extent both Robespierre's power and his fall can be explained by his relationship with Paris, the sans culottes and the radicals in the Sections. In summer 1794 this relationship between these Parisian elements and the leading Montagnards broke down. The government was not able, in the end, to operate the Law of the Maximum efficiently and the attempt to limit wages was deeply unpopular. At the same time there was growing opposition to the extremes of the Terror whilst the military victory at Fleurus (20 June 1794) reduced the sense of national danger and, therefore, made the Terror seem less justifiable. The Law of Prairial (22 June) seemed to threaten a new purge and Deputies of the Convention were no longer protected from the jurisdiction of the Revolutionary Tribunal. In the weeks after the passing of the Law of Prairial executions were carried out on an unprecedented scale. The difficulties of the government were intensified by the rivalry between the Committee of Public Safety (CPS) and the Committee of General Security and by tensions within the CPS itself. In other words there were clear signs of a disunited government which was lacking in public support. For a month before his fall, Robespierre had been absent from the CPS and the Convention (both of which he had dominated) and was showing symptoms of ill health and strain. Robespierre's speech in the Convention (26 July) raising alarm about new conspiracies brought about an alliance of those who feared for their own survival and a coup was carried out. At the last the sans culottes and the armed forces of the Sections stood aside and failed to save Robespierre from the guillotine.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may be expected to take a particularly sharp line of argument as to the relative importance of the factors at work in Robespierre's fall and the phrase 'best explained' may stimulate some discussion of competing interpretations. An interesting line to be pursued might be the extent to which the fall of Robespierre lay chiefly in his own personality and particular sense of idealism.

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.

**10 How far can it be argued that Napoleon undermined rather than consolidated the domestic achievements of the French Revolution?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required; the period of the first Consulship and the Empire (1799–1815) and domestic policies. Plain descriptions of domestic policies should not be highly rewarded, comparison, analysis, assessment and argument are necessary for the higher mark bands. Candidates are likely to deal with the liberal reforms of the period under the National and Legislative Assemblies. It might be argued that the principles underlying the Declaration of Rights and the abolition of feudal rights and privileges and of the rank of nobility were maintained and preserved by Napoleon. The principle of careers open to talent was continued by Napoleon. However, candidates may well draw attention to the Legion of Honour and the creation of noble and princely titles for generals, for example, and for members of Napoleon's family. Moreover Napoleon made himself Emperor and conferred thrones on two of his brothers. Napoleon's education reforms and Codes of Law in large part not only consolidated the achievements of the Revolution but extended them. Equality under the law and personal freedom were proclaimed under the Consulship but the principles and characteristics of government were stated to be the spirit of order, justice and moderation which demonstrate a different emphasis when compared with liberty, equality and fraternity. The structure of local government was retained (the departmental system) but the appointment of prefects by Napoleon strikes a centralising and authoritarian note. The nationalisation of Church property and the Civil Constitution of the Clergy were major planks of the revolutionary platform. These policies were to an extent retained by Napoleon, the clergy were paid by the State, for example, and all faiths were tolerated, but Napoleon's Concordat with the Papacy, it might be argued, betrayed the revolutionary stance.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may well challenge the assumption that the question refers to the revolutionary achievements of 1789–92. There were, after all, two further revolutions (August 1792 and June 1793). August 1792 overthrew the monarchy but, it might be argued, Napoleon restored it. Napoleon's personal dominance (dictatorship even) might be compared with Robespierre's (although it was of a different kind). How far can it be argued that military dictatorship was the inevitable outcome of the revolutionary period, once foreign war had been declared. Wasn't Napoleon one of a number of possible 'man on a white horse' figures? Candidates might also compare Napoleon's policies with those of the Jacobin dictatorship concerning police methods and terror, propaganda; censorship; economic controls; centralisation.

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.

**Section 3: Themes, c. 1715–c. 1815**

- 11 'The Enlightenment was fuelled by English ideas, expressed by French writers, yet exclusively practised by despots in Central and Eastern Europe.' Discuss the accuracy of this view.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge and which has a sharp and persistent focus on the demands of the question, creating analysis and evaluation. A narrative of the Enlightenment or description of its features will not answer the question unless there is at least some analysis. There are three parts here: English ideas, French writers; the practice of despots. These parts all need treatment, albeit not in equal measure. Candidates will have to be selective in knowledge, given the wide span. There will need to be some (brief) definition and explanation of the Enlightenment (e.g. reason, progress, utility, empirical approaches to law and behaviour) and examination of a genesis in English ideas (e.g. Locke, Newton) and of French written expressions (e.g. Voltaire, Montesquieu, Rousseau). Then the apparent imbalance in practice – little take-up in Western Europe, much elsewhere – will need assessment. Examples of 'enlightened despots' (e.g. Joseph II, Catherine the Great) will be required as will some examples of the practical applications of ideas (e.g. in relation to social reforms, education, religion, political power and its application, laws, the role of the state, economic reforms).

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Candidates can argue and counter-argue the formulation, adducing views and offering debate. They may agree or disagree according to taste, though arguments must be supported. For example, here it can be said that 'exclusively practised' requires examination as to why and whether this is an accurate view; that the 'enlightened despots' applied those ideas they saw as of practical benefit; that ideas may well have a wider currency.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

## 12 To what extent, and why, did European states pursue mercantilist policies in the eighteenth century?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The focus will be on the period as a whole, with selected examples across the time-span and a number of states. Too narrow a focus will not deliver the response required. Description of mercantilism will not suffice, analysis and evaluation are required. There are two parts to the question – ‘to what extent, and why’ and these must be covered, if not in equal measure. Selectivity of examples will be required, given wide span of the century. Mercantilism meant the importance of population policy and state regulation; aggressive colonial tariffs to secure markets and resources by exclusion; the linkage with state political and military power; stress on production and consumption problems; ideas about bullion; favourable trade balances. Candidates may well question the utility of the term, downplaying such policies in practice, stressing that few saw its applicability to the European economy as a whole (or indeed the developing global economy), preferring to stress its use in furthering particular economic interests where a distorting influence may be felt. Answers will need to examine some of: main patterns of international trade (with the Americas, especially the slave trade and in commodities; with India and the Far East; within Europe, North/South, East/West); how far mercantilism affected more the extra-European colonial trades (Britain, France, Spain) and the companies involved there (West and East Indian, etc.), less so intra-European trade, despite regulations and limitations there.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, it could be argued that mercantilist policies were prevalent, very much the product of contemporary thinking and context yet there were criticisms (e.g. Adam Smith and the commercial critique, French Physiocrats and the agrarian Anglo-French and Spanish and Dutch conflicts issues). Differences of practice can be adduced, as above. Much criticism came from Western Europe but Central and Eastern states were keen practitioners. The prevailing militant and military-naval conflict context can be assessed, with the inevitable links to economic issues and needs. Of course, there has been much past debate on the concept and its real relevance, not least as an historical tool.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**13 Assess the importance of women in the development of thinking and writing on political and social ideas in eighteenth-century Europe.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Analysis and assessment, involving evaluation, are required. It is unlikely that a form of narrative or description will do much to answer the question. Knowledge will need to be used selectively, given the period span. As in AO2 below, there are several parts to the question and ‘importance’ needs good focus. Identification of some of the ideas will be necessary; so, too, assessment of the roles of individuals and groups. Names such as Mme de Geoffrin and de Pompadour may occur. Female novelists and essayists might be considered: such as Mme de Staël. A natural area for assessment would be the salons and literary clubs, not least in France (such as Mme Roland, Mme Recamier). It could also be argued that the role of female rulers (obvious examples being Maria Theresa or Catherine the Great) should be considered: their influence was such as to help shape opinions and policy areas. Focus on development of thinking and writing in political and social areas will be needed.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. The formulation ‘Assess’ invites an attempt to put the factors and issues into some sort of order of relative importance, while seeing the connections. Here, equal treatment of ‘development of thinking and writing’, ‘political and social ideas’ is not a necessity, though all parts require focus and development.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**14 How accurate is the view that the eighteenth century witnessed an ‘extraordinary flourishing in the arts and culture’?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – analytical and evaluation, not description of the arts, culture (etc.) or a form of narrative based on examples. Knowledge needs to be selected and applied, given the broad time-span here. There should be a reasonable range of examples – from (e.g.) music, art and painting, architecture, literature, with an acknowledgement that patronage and public needs played their role. Examples can come from a few states or from a broader perspective and it is not to be expected that all aspects of the arts and culture will be covered here. The links with the Enlightenment may be explored as might the prevailing and developing culture of reason and feeling plus the trend towards secularisation of the arts. There is a very good range of individual examples to hand here: Mozart, Handel, Haydn, Stamitz, Sammartini, Schiller, Goethe, Boucher, Greuze and David, for instance.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may be relevant. The question formulation ‘How accurate...’ and the use of ‘extraordinary’ invite argument and assessment, possibly counter-argument. Although the achievements of the arts and culture in this period of rule may seem extensive, it could be argued that they were not necessarily ‘extraordinary’. A sense of context and so of factors conducive to such a flourishing would aid evaluation. Patronage, public and private; the uses of arts and culture for personal and public ends; the sheer sense of exuberance, power expressions, the formative educative and intellectual climates, all contributed.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**15 Assess the impact on the European economy in the period c. 1715–c. 1815 of population increases. You should refer to at last two European states.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – an analytical assessment, with selected knowledge given the time-span but drawn from at least two states. Description will not suffice here and a form of narrative is unlikely to aid the answer. A sense of population increases in at least two states is needed; some explanation would be in order, though the thrust is upon the impact, with clear divergences and differences. Urban as well as regional and national examples are needed. Overall, population rose from 110m to 190m and Britain, France, Italy, Germany and Russia all saw significant increases. The impact upon agriculture and upon industries, upon towns and cities, upon markets should be assessed. Population increases did stimulate attempts to develop more efficient farming methods and the production of more raw materials – but such were uneven (apart from Britain, The Netherlands showed important changes and developments). Of course, there were inherent problems in attempts at agricultural development (soil, climate, techniques, lack of fertilisers, etc.). There were effects on the labour market and skills. Industrial developments were limited: enterprises remained small-scale and geared to a narrow level of social-political tastes.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this instance, ‘Assess....’ invites some ordering of factors in relative importance, possibly prioritising, but with an awareness of connections. There is scope for a range of assessment levels (e.g. impact on agriculture as against industry, extent of variations, even or uneven impact levels, possible links of population pressures to attempts at agrarian and industrial changes).

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**16 Why was the contest for overseas Empire between Britain and France in the eighteenth century eventually decided largely in Britain's favour?**

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The focus will be on the period as a whole, with, given time-span, selectivity of knowledge required. Analysis and evaluation are needed; a narrative of conflict will not suffice unless it is causal narrative. The sense of time and change is conveyed in the question wording. Reference to geographical areas (e.g. Canada, India) will be needed as it will to selected events and possible or actual turning points. Factors that can be assessed: political and military leadership; strategy and tactics; the nature of commanders; the use of resources, especially at distance; local factors; contingencies, including the impact of rivalry and events elsewhere plus the benefits or otherwise of local allies (for example, France more involved inside Europe, Britain less so). Given that the Question falls here, in the European Paper, an emphasis upon France and failings or mistakes and errors is to be expected. Reference to the wars of the period (e.g. 1740–8, 1756–63) is expected, with a mixture of broader, global examples and issues and more area-based (e.g. North America, India).

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Candidates need to focus on 'Why ...' and so on causes, offering some sense of relative importance but also being aware of connections here. There is scope for debate here, argument and counter-argument (were French mistakes and weaknesses the key? Was there over-stretch? Was luck a key factor?).

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

### Section 4: 1815–1862

#### 17 How much attention did the Congress of Vienna pay to the principles of nationalism?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A description of the events at the Congress is not required; rather good analysis and evaluation of aims, outcomes and context will be required.

Candidates should consider: whether this was a triumph of reaction, defined in the context of the previous major upheavals; the needs of stability; practical options available; power politics; the need to set up a post-Napoleonic political system re-creating and defining borders and diplomatic structures, re-drawing the map of Europe; the return of the Bourbons to France, the restored Habsburg supremacy via the Germanic Confederation but the failure to restore the old Holy Roman Empire; the fears of incipient nationalism, to be confined by (e.g.) the control of Austria over Italy; the examples of developments in the Low Countries, Poland, German and Italian States as shaped by the Settlement. Nationalism was seen as linked to revolutionary changes and was treated with caution; the Congress sought to confine it rather than encourage it. There would be scope to look ahead and consider (e.g.) the problems that lay ahead in Spain and Italy. That said, a good sense of the containment, if not suppression, of nationalism is required here. German territories might be used as an example. And it would be possible to demonstrate the lack of attention (etc.) by reference to future problems.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may be relevant.

The formulation used invites discussion of the scope of attention given to nationalism as against other factors and issues. A strong focus upon the principles of nationalism will be needed as will assessment of whether the Congress (deliberately?) ignored those, or tried to dampen and control them. It is possible to argue that this was indeed a key aim of the Congress; or else it can be said to have been more incidental. Linkage to the ideas aired and the decisions made at the Congress will be important.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**18 'They satisfied the main social and political groups in France and fell only by accident.'  
Discuss this verdict on the restored Bourbon and Orleanist regimes.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A narrative of events will not secure much reward. Good analysis and evaluation are required here, with a sense of both the aims of the regimes and the outcomes, linked to eventual failure and fall. The formulation emphasises 'satisfied', 'by accident', and these words need assessment. Internal policies will feature strongly but references to foreign policies will be useful also. The implication here is that the regimes, no matter their outward efforts to appeal to important groups, failed to secure wide enough support. A sequential approach to each regime will work less well than a comparative one; indeed, close comparison, based on key themes, should work very well here.

Consideration should be given to: how far the Bourbons commanded the loyalties of Frenchmen, politically, socially, patriotically (an imposed regime?) and/or religiously, possibly using the nature of the political system to assess the shallowness of appeal and support at key stages. That shallowness could have led to failure in 1830; then again other factors may have been decisive (e.g. the personality and policy of Charles X; the press; law and order mistakes; economic crisis; the role of Paris and the middle classes plus the crowd; parliamentary miscalculations and ministerial choice). Arguably policies (those of reaction?) alienated the increasingly powerful middle classes.

Similar issues may well be considered for the Orleans regime: liberal intentions, a feature of 1830 with Louis Philippe, fell away; issues of the constitution and the franchise became important; conservative tendencies and the influence of Guizot lost support; radicalism and socialism, led by such as Blanc, were on the rise and hardened resistance; a moderate style of living tended to discredit Louis Philippe.

In both cases and especially Louis Philippe, some references to foreign policy and domestic impact would be acceptable, though the thrust of answers should lie with domestic issues.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may be relevant.

The formulation (as above) requires good focus on the key words and the ideas behind them. Aims, objectives and impact upon social and political groups will be assessed, all in the context of a period of uncertainty and change (not least economically and externally in foreign policy). As stated above in AO1, comparison will help: what was similar, what different, in and between the regimes? Were causes of fall similar or different? How important were franchisal issues and the politics of the franchise? How important were the personalities of the rulers?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**19 'Conservatism, rather than nationalism and liberalism, proved to be the most powerful force in the revolutions of 1848–9.' Discuss with reference to at least two revolutions.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Narrative and description of the two examples chosen will not work, unless there are analytical features. Analysis and evaluation are required and comparison and contrast would add to the quality of assessment, rather than a purely sequential approach to the two examples. There is plenty here to build analytical themes around: conservatism; nationalism; liberalism.

Candidates may well assess factors such as: the aims of revolutionaries according to time and place; common and shared aims or dissimilar aims; the sense of nationalism, often linked to liberalism; the power of conservatism; expressions of all such; responses in actions and words.

1848–9 revealed the limitations of nationalism if not liberalism: limited intellectual awareness, little social support (students, intellectuals), lack of educative structures, rural indifference, dynastic loyalties, non-national motives in 1848, linguistic and transport difficulties and practical examples of failure; it had some strengths but also weaknesses. Leaders like Mazzini made promises; the Frankfurt Parliament and the strength of aristocratic nationalism in the Czech lands and Hungary might be examined. More local forms of nationalism (e.g. Prussian, Piedmontese) might be cited. Liberalism was often linked here and its aspirations in political-social terms (constitutions, languages, general freedoms, representation, a voice in affairs) might be assessed via examples. Conservatism can be interpreted at several levels: retention of existing institutions; avoidance of major radical challenges; recourse to existing ruling bodies and élites; refusal to create truly revolutionary ideas.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may be relevant.

The formulation allows for discussion and debate. The two examples will need to throw up good material on the key ideas within the title. Focus upon 'most powerful force' will be important here. Answers need to balance the key descriptors and to assess the validity of the statement, using examples (above). Were the revolutions of 1848–9 really that revolutionary? Indeed what was revolutionary about them? Why is the term so readily used? (Contemporary views, etc.)

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**20 Consider the view that the pursuit of Italian unification in the period 1849–70 was more about curbing revolutionary nationalism than promoting it.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. The question is bounded by the end of the Revolutions of 1848–9 and the creation of an outwardly united Italy, including Rome, in 1870. A narrative is unlikely to deliver an answer, though analytical elements would help. Good analysis and evaluation, based around the key ideas in the title, should work very well here. Italian unification needs to be the context to the issues of curbing as opposed to promoting revolutionary nationalism; the latter will need some definition.

Factors to be considered: Austrian influence and control after 1849, inhibiting forms of nationalism; the relative weaknesses of nationalism; the extent of its links to revolutionary ideas and fervour; the aims and actions of Cavour; the intervention of Napoleon III (genuinely pro-nationalist or not?); the actions of a minority in the North and Centre and the uses of plebiscites; the intervention of Garibaldi and his apparent goals; the reaction of Cavour and the unification of North and South; the events after 1861; the position of nationalism then and the problems of unification, 1861–70, related to the question parameters.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may be relevant.

The formulation invites consideration, reflection and argument, going to the very heart of the character of Italian unification. Was it the work of a minority amongst the educated elites? Was it the creature of foreign intervention? Did both internal and external unifiers want to control the dangers of socialism, radicalism, upheaval and violence? Was nationalism manipulated by both (via forms of propaganda and the plebiscites, for example)? Was Garibaldi ultimately as much a conservative as Cavour in 1860–1? Was Garibaldi seen as potentially dangerous in 1863 and 1867, hence opposition to his activities then?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

## 21 How far does a desire to satisfy all interests in France explain Napoleon III's domestic policies?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A persistent focus upon the question is needed and upon domestic (not foreign) policy areas. A narrative of the reign or a description of policies would need good analytical elements to succeed. Persistent analysis and evaluation should work well. Importantly, there needs to be a clear linkage between the policies and the idea of pleasing all social and political interests inside France. There is certainly plenty of evidence for populist policies. There might well be contrasts made between the policies of the 1852–c. 1860 period and the subsequent decade.

One route might be to examine his modernisation policies in extent and effect: free trade; urban renewal ideas; opening up the Orleanist banking structure; creating a constitutional political system to guarantee civil liberties; non-clerical education; free institutions. Napoleon seemed intent on changing France and winning the approval of many groups in the process. But he may not have won over or held on to the key support groups amongst the upper and middle classes, indeed he may have alienated many of his core supporters.

The use of plebiscites, apparent measures to encourage the lower orders, the targeted uses of government patronage, a sense of the needs of adaptability and change, may well figure, within the context of the alleged 'liberal' phase of the 1860s.

The context of franchisal politics, opposition, circumstances and the changing (and narrowing) Bourbon support base might be assessed here. The changing economy (industry, agriculture) and tensions there can be linked to political and social pressures.

The extent to which so much of what he did was a simple bid for popularity and so lacking real depth and thoughtfulness can be examined also. It can be contended that, no matter failing health, he was still popular enough in 1870. Other views would disagree.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may be relevant.

The formulation 'How far' invites discussion of extent, scope and depth of achievement, mindful that Napoleon III was unpopular by the late 1860s and fell from power in the Franco-Prussian War. The sense of contrast between attempts at popularity and indeed popularity in the 1850s and growing disenchantment in the 1860s should be a feature of good answers. Did Napoleon try to do too much? Did he over-reach himself? Did he try to please too many? Were his policies superficial and nothing more? Did his liberal policies of the 1860s (e.g. diminished role of administration, increased role of parliament) backfire and encourage criticisms? Was his position insecure or secure enough by the end of the 1860s?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**Section 5: 1862–1914.****22 ‘The attempted reforms of Alexander II’s reign disappointed more than they satisfied.’  
How valid is this judgement?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A description of the reforms or a narrative of the reign will not lead to a successful answer, unless there are analytical elements. An answer built around persistent analysis and evaluation, focusing well upon the key words of the title, will succeed.

Candidates need to consider how far Alexander set out to liberate Russian society, politically, economically and socially. Context, circumstances, perceived aims and indeed opposition he faced (quite a range of such) conditioned how far he went. There are plenty of areas to assess and equal treatment is not expected: constitutional; legal; military; local; economic-agrarian (although 1861 will feature large, it should not dominate answers); the effectiveness of reforms, their impact and extent should be linked together and linked to aims.

Groups affected and responding to these reforms would include the nobility and Church leaders; the gentry; the middle classes and intelligentsia; the serfs, then peasants. The hopes of the educated middle classes, many increasingly politicised, might well figure in assessment. Opposition (rural, urban, party-based) might well suggest dissatisfaction or disenchantment as to the limited extent of reforms. It could be said that he largely safeguarded autocracy or that he weakened its effectiveness. These views could be related well to disappointment or even satisfaction.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may be relevant.

A good focus upon ‘attempted’, ‘disappointed’ and ‘satisfied’ will be required. Each word invites comment and a good linkage to policy initiatives will be important here. There is much that can be debated: for example, whether the reforms were more illusory than real (especially the agrarian); whether Alexander was a genuine liberal reformer; whether the impetus came much more from military needs; whether he found that policies got out of control and needed tempering. ‘Attempted’ is an important word here and the prevailing socio-political context, linked to changing educational-intellectual ideas, will be important to evaluation.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**23 How successful was Bismarck in establishing a balance between the forces of conservatism and change in the German Empire in the period 1871–90?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A narrative of Bismarck's actions or a description of his policies is unlikely to secure much reward, unless there are analytical elements there. Persistent analysis and good evaluation are required, with a sense of the criteria of success in this context.

Conservatism will be interpreted as the values and needs of the Kaiser and those around him, the Prussian elites, the Court, leaders of various States, some Liberals (especially in the 1880s). Change: economic and social pressures; trade unions; socialist parties; industrial growth; agrarian needs (e.g. tariffs); education.

The above should be linked to policies such as the preservation of authoritarian structures, managing political parties in the Reichstag, Prussianising Germany, politically challenging the Catholic Church, containing socialism and managing industrialisation and trade issues. Reference is likely to: the National Liberals; the Kulturkampf; tariffs; anti-socialist laws; realignments after 1878–80; pressures from the Kaisers and those around them; the very nature of Bismarckian and German politics and the nature of the Constitution, its federalist nature, centralising powers and indeed the role of Bismarck; the fast changing economic-industrial context and effects on politics, heightening tensions, especially after 1878–80.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may be relevant.

Candidates need to focus well upon 'How successful' and they may well conclude that Bismarck was indeed very successful. Then again, challenges to such a view are welcome, indeed expected in a good answer. Much will turn upon the linkage between analyses of the forces of conservatism and change and Bismarck's responses to those, his reading of situations, his grasp of a fast changing context (not least economic-industrial).

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

## 24 How stable was the French Republic in the years from 1871 to 1914?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A narrative or description of events will not take the answer far, unless there are analytical elements. Persistent analysis and evaluation are required, focusing well on the issues of stability (as in AO2 below). Political, economic and social features are likely to be examined and linked, related to leadership, parties, social tensions and uneven economic progress. Nationalism may feature as a part of evaluation. There is much to consider and a certain selectivity, given the time span, is needed: the scandals of Boulanger (1888–89), Panama (1889–93) and Dreyfus (1898–1906) may be seen as symptomatic of trouble, and problems these caused to politicians; the levels of internal stabilisation via Ferry and Clemenceau; political, economic and social problems (trade unions, syndicalism, socialists on the Left, the Army and Church on the Right); the ways in which the franchise favoured the conservative, rural areas over more radical, urban districts; the amount of power with the largely urban bourgeoisie; the powers divided between the President and Prime Minister on the one hand and the Senate and Chamber of Deputies on the other; the populist, democratic nature of the Republic.

Divisions between Left and Right and indeed within both (especially on the Left: socialists, more radical groups) might be explored: strands of anti-semitism; authoritarianism or the reverse; the views on the role of the educational system; anti-clericalism or the reverse; monarchists and militarists or the diametrically opposed; promotion of social reforms or the reverse; high or low taxation and public spending.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may be relevant.

'How stable' needs effective focus and interrogation; criteria will be needed and there can be debate as to whether the Republic was essentially unstable for so much of this period or whether there was much more stability than has been claimed in the past. Stability can be assessed on the surface, beneath, within the structures of politics and society. Governmental and bureaucratic structures at both central and local levels and the continuity of local elites could be considered here. The scandals may be deceptive and there may well have been underlying stability and security. Then again there may not.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

## 25 How successful were Wilhelm II's ministers in balancing social and political interests in the years 1890 to 1914?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A narrative will not go very far to answer the question. Analysis and evaluation are required, with a good focus on question wording and a sense of the measurement of success levels.

Social and political interests will need definition and explanation: for example, those of the conservative elites, especially in Prussia; the Army High Command; industrialists; great landowners and farmers; middle class interest groups; workers and the growingly assertive and successful SPD (reference to Reichstag elections can be made).

Wilhelm II's strong constitutional position will need to be appreciated: he appointed Chancellors and, through them, ministers and officials; as head of Prussia with its large number of votes, he controlled the federal council; he had absolute power in military and diplomatic areas; he was keen to assert his power personally and was difficult to judge and serve.

Examples of ministers and ministerial actions will be needed. Their actions, shaped by Wilhelm, will need assessment as to impact and outcome. Social welfare issues; social reforms; progression towards forms of welfarism and a type of limited welfare state; economic progress and industrialisation; the attempts to curb socialism and the SPD; trade unions; the uses of tariffs to protect trade and the economy; the success of trade policies; the maintenance of the socio-political prominence of the elites – these and other areas might be assessed. Some references to colonial and foreign policies would be in order, though connections to domestic policy areas will be needed; the bulk of answers should lie on the latter area.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may be relevant.

'How successful' needs to be addressed strongly. There needs to be consideration of social and political issues as well as of ministerial actions, in the context of the Kaiser's interventionist roles. It is possible to argue that there was a lack of success since war came in 1914 and it is further argued that this was a form of release from serious inner tensions. Or else it can be argued that there were successes, that tensions were at least dampened down, that the delicate balancing act that had been necessary since 1871 was maintained. The emphasis here must be upon domestic issues, with occasional references to external; it is not a question about foreign policy *per se*. The idea of 'balancing' will need assessment as well: was this easy or hard? Was an uneasy, delicate balancing act needed?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**26 How convincing is the argument that the causes of the First World War were largely confined to 1914 itself?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A narrative of events, either in 1914 or beforehand, will not deliver the answer required, unless there is, for example, causal narrative. Analysis of key themes and issues leading to evaluation of causes, long- and short-term, will bring success. Factors to consider: German ambitions, in Europe (Mitteleuropa) and beyond; the position of Turkey; the extent to which Russia posed a threat by resisting economic and political expansion into those areas (Serbia, the crumbling Ottoman Empire); general strategic thinking; German overseas ambitions and Anglo-German imperial, naval and commercial rivalries; German fears of French-inspired encirclement; the workings of the Alliance system and the Ententes; German and Austrian domestic pressures (1912, etc.; the 'blank cheque', etc.).

Evaluative focus on 1914 could be useful, using the mobilisation plans and actions as a way into assessing causes at the time and earlier.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may be relevant.

'How convincing' invites argument over the strength and accuracy of the view asserted. Candidates can argue that the trigger causes of War lay in 1914 in events in Sarajevo and then beyond, though it is more likely that they will see these events as triggering longer-term causes built around tensions. Then again, it is possible to argue that tensions were less great in 1913 and early 1914 than in previous years and so Sarajevo came almost from nowhere. Was the assassination merely a trigger cause or were Balkan issues the real cause? The question formulation allows for debate as to long- and short-term causes: the immediate trigger cause(s) and underlying causes will enter into discussion.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**Section 6: Themes c. 1815–1914****27 To what extent was Romanticism a reaction to the Enlightenment?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A description or form of narrative on both elements will not get very far; analysis and evaluation are required. Candidates will need to assess the key features of Romanticism (literary, social, political) and consider how far these were simply a reaction to the key ideas of the Enlightenment, or were something more. The shaping of political ideas on power, authority, the nature of society will feature and reference is likely to time and place, with a range of examples offered.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may be relevant.

The question form ('to what extent ....') offers a sense of argument and counter-argument to the effect that this was a movement that was more than a simple reactive one.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**28 Why was the issue of nationalism an increasingly important influence upon European diplomacy in the nineteenth century? You should answer with reference to at least two national groups.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The focus is upon explanation and candidates will need to draw on at least **two** national examples, there being plentiful ones from Eastern and Western Europe. Nationalism will need definition, examination, contextualisation and be set against a range of other factors in shaping diplomatic thinking and urgency (examples of Congress and Conferences, of national and international diplomacy will be needed). Other factors might include: rivalries; competitiveness; military, strategic, economic elements; power politics, balance of power ideas; possible strong personalities.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may be relevant.

The question form ('Why ...') invites consideration of a range of factors with some sense of relative importance, seeking argument and counter-argument as to nationalism's place and role, though connections will be appreciated.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**29 How important was the state in promoting economic growth in any two European states between 1870 and 1914?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A form of description of economic activity will not suffice. Analysis and evaluation are required. This was a period of some economic downturn (was there a Depression, c. 1873–c. 1896?) but also upturn; some states grew in economic power at a great rate. Some assessment of pace and scale would be useful. Candidates will need to balance the role of the state (the public sector, big purchaser and consumer, control of key industrial areas) against other factors such as private enterprise, demand and supply, competitiveness and rivalry, pressures of population growth and industrialisation, transport developments. Some may see the state's role in developing military (and naval) power as very important. **Two** examples are needed and comparison is welcome.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may be relevant.

The question form ('How important ...') invites argument and counter-argument, based around the role, input and demands of the state set against other non-state based factors. Some may argue that 'push-pull', public-private factors merged.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**30 Why did Paris and Vienna dominate European cultural life between 1880 and 1914?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A description of cultural activity is not required; rather examples are needed to illustrate analytical themes and aid evaluation. Comparison and contrast would be useful. Literary activity, music, theatre, opera are but some of the areas; so, too, salons, clubs, social groups. The role of urban authorities as of national governments, the patronage powers deployed, the cultivation of a cultural ethos and active promotion, the benefits from European recognition, visitors, the ‘pull’ of these centres, all can be assessed. Some sense of why other capitals, centres could not compete would be useful.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may be relevant.

‘Why ...’ invites an ordering of reasons, a sense of relative importance but with appreciation of connections. The competitiveness of the centres, the benefits of history and past success and grandeur may be considered alongside more immediate factors. Argument is invited and attention to each does not have to be equal, though both need coverage.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**31 Assess the impact of industrialisation on at least two European states in the period 1870–1914.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Description of industrial activity and life is not required. Analysis and explanation are required. ‘Industrialisation’ will need some definition and assessment as to features, nature and scale (including urbanisation). As with Q.29 above, this time-span embraced uneven economic features but, in all, some major economic activity and advance. **Two** exemplars at least are required and some comparison would be useful. Areas of impact can include (as above) urbanisation; supply and demand factors; the need for more workers and consequent issues of wages, working conditions, prices (etc.) and living standards; the promotion of factory systems; the development of wealth, power and competitiveness between states. Benefits and problems are likely to feature.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may be relevant. ‘Assess ...’ invites a sense of relative importance, the ordering of factors but with awareness of connections of factors. Debate is possible here: how great an impact? More positives than negatives? Economic gains but social tensions? Political significance?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**32 How great was the impact of developments in transport and communications on at least two European states in the period 1850–1914?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A description of changes is not required; rather analysis and evaluation, drawing on examples from at least **two** states. The dates embrace the ‘railway revolution’, the advent of motorised transport (as well as trams, etc.), the developments of the telegraph and associated systems. Impact areas will embrace economic activity (rural, urban), industrial growth; awareness of news and information; military mobilisation plans; social changes (effects on farmers, workers, growing middle classes); political powers and their scope, governmental outreach across regions, at frontiers.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may be relevant. ‘How great ...’ opens up explanation and evaluation, with a sense of debate as to extent, scope, character and a sense of how far these developments were really significant, set against other factors.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**Section 7: 1914–1945****33 Assess the importance of the role of sea-power in Germany's defeat in the First World War.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a description of seapower or a narrative of naval operations.

Seapower will be assessed against events on land, both the Western and Eastern fronts, with a sense of its growing importance over time. The anticipated big and immediately decisive sea battle did not occur as such; Jutland was a draw but the High Seas Fleet did not sail again. There were some skirmishes in the South Atlantic. The attacks by submarines were important, combated by convoys and other measures in 1917–18. The blockade of German ports was cumulative in its effects, linked to the 'Turnip Winters', unrest at home, weakened morale. The German strategic impasse after the Schlieffen Plan; the attritional nature of the Western Front; war on two fronts until the Treaty of Brest Litovsk; stalemate and its eventual breaking in 1918 (German offensive failed in the Spring); the respective management of the Home Fronts (morale, resources); mutinies, uprisings and politics inside Germany; the failures of the Central Powers; the attitude of the German High Command, contrasted to its Allied counterparts; the entry of the USA – all may be assessed.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, it could be argued that seapower (especially via the blockade that hit hard by 1917–18) was indeed crucial; or that the events on the Eastern Front and especially the Western Front were as significant, if not more so. Certainly, issues of home front morale mattered as did the political influences exerted – or attempted – over generals and admirals.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**34 'Without Lenin, there would have been no October Revolution.' Discuss.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required; analysis and evaluation, not a narrative of events from April to October or in October itself.

This is not a speculative question; the answer needs to be rooted in the practical politics of 1917. Lenin's importance was great, though there is debate as to its extent. An argument can be made for the progressive failures of the Provisional Government, linked to errors made by Kerensky after the 'July Days'. Failed promises and policies, the June Offensive, Kornilov Affair, growing urban disenchantment were important. So, too, Lenin's return, the 'April Theses', his message and its appeal, uneven but increasing support, the role of Trotsky and other Bolsheviks, the MRC and the plans for a coup, will need consideration and evaluation. Lenin may well have needed the push of Trotsky to secure support for the eventual coup plan. Then again, that coup was little opposed, suggesting the importance of the context and of popular mood.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. The formulation invites an attempt to put the arguments for and against Lenin's centrality. Here, of course, there is much debate. There is agreement as to Lenin's importance but disagreement as to its real significance. Was Lenin decisive? What of Trotsky? What of others? How significant were the failings of the Provisional Government? Was October 1917 very much a Bolshevik coup or a mass popular uprising?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

### 35 Why did the League of Nations succeed with some issues and fail with others?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is explanation of success and failure, not a description of the workings of the League. A chronological ordering will require considerable analysis within.

Candidates may refer to the hopes and ideals of the League of Nations and the actual outcomes. It is likely that they will highlight successes in such areas as health, labour, slavery and some aspects of Mandates. The League was a social and economic agency with internationalist machinery. Minor disputes (e.g. the Aaland Islands) and oversight areas (e.g. Upper Silesia partitioned) saw successes but even in the 1920s, generally a period of success, there were setbacks (e.g. the Corfu crisis). The League was linked to successes such as the Geneva Protocol and Germany's admission. But, in the changed atmosphere of the 1930s, it failed over Manchuria and Abyssinia and any attempt to limit Hitler's ambitions and attacks on the Versailles Treaty. Contrasts can be made between periods, moods, outlooks, expectations, the needs of states, the increasing isolationism after the Wall Street Crash. The absence of harmony, over-dependence on Britain and France, the aggression of key members Japan and Italy, the weaknesses of peace-keeping machinery, the failures of sanctions, the absence of the USA, are but some of the factors that can be cited.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may be relevant. Although the achievements in this period are often overlooked, they do need assessment here – no matter easier explanation of failings. Success should be played up and evaluated. Failures should be explained with some ease but they must not predominate, given the nature of the question.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**36 How accurate is the view that the key weakness of the Weimar Republic was that it was ‘a democracy without democrats’?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – analytical and evaluative approach is needed. A narrative of events will not answer the question unless there is embedded demonstrable analysis.

The Weimar Republic can be viewed as a perfect democracy but fatally flawed from the outset. There were potentially inherent weaknesses from its inception in 1919 (e.g. economic and social impact of the First World War; defeat and the Versailles Treaty; the Revolutions of 1918–19 and their impact; the nature of the Constitution and multi-party democracy, P.R., Presidential issues). The commitment to democracy depended much upon Ebert, the SPD and a strong centre. The élites were never enthusiastic and events after 1929–30 conspired against the democratic intentions of the founders. Much turned upon economic factors (‘a fairweather system’) and upon the eventual opportunities offered to the KPD and especially the NSDAP. Consideration of the period 1929–33 is necessary and whether the Republic collapsed through these weaknesses or whether its overthrow was accidental, due to external factors. Groups, attitudes and trends (political and economic) need to be assessed as pro- or anti- the Republic.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. The formulation ‘how accurate’ invites an attempt to put the issues into context with a focus on weaknesses and an attempt to give a sense of relative importance (‘key’) while acknowledging links between factors and issues: economic, financial, structural, political, personalities. This is not a question on the rise of Hitler *per se* and this needs to be borne in mind. Rather, that rise needs to sit in context of Weimar failings (as above).

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

### 37 How revolutionary was Mussolini's Fascist regime?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is the extent of revolutionary elements within Mussolini's policies. A narrative of events will not deliver the answer required.

Candidates will need to unpack and comment upon 'revolutionary', mindful of rhetoric, propaganda, claims and boasts, imagery. At heart is the issue of how far Fascism impinged upon and transformed Italy. Italian Fascism meant state power, the corporate state, economic modernisation, foreign involvement. It would be perfectly possible to argue that it lacked clear objectives. The corporate state and modernisation had little or no impact; Mussolini preferred to be pragmatic, working with and through elite groups – the monarchy, the Church, existing officials, local aristocrats and notables whose power and wealth were reinforced. No matter claims made, there was no attempt to change the very structure of society. But it could be argued that there was political impact, that Corporatism was realistic and had some achievements. Trade Unions were removed; labour was disciplined; wage cuts were enforced; employer controls were reinforced. Economic modernisation was attempted, via Tariffs, the IMI and the IRI, pro-wheat policies and land reclamation. Italy was not hit so hard by the Depression, though it could be argued that the economic system was less open to damage than elsewhere.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may be relevant. Although the Fascists are often seen as conservative in power, with ideological goals played down, there is scope for some counter-argument. There is debate: for example, it can be argued that, in some areas, Fascist ideology did predominate (as above). Of course, it can be argued that Mussolini's willingness to compromise with the elites automatically watered down revolutionary principles and zeal. Mussolini's pre-war radical socialist background may be worthy of some use in evaluating what followed after 1922.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**38 Assess the significance of Germany's invasion of the USSR to the final outcome of the Second World War.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Analysis and evaluation, cross-referencing Operation Barbarossa against other events and contexts, are needed. A narrative of the invasion or, more broadly, the war from 1941 will not answer the question.

Candidates will need to set the invasion of the USSR and its eventual outcome in setbacks, reverses, defeats and retreat against the wider context of other theatres of operations and their significance. The Battle of Britain, the Battle of the Atlantic, events in North Africa, the invasions of Sicily and Italy and of North-West Europe may well be assessed. That said, good focus on Barbarossa is expected. Hitler's overstretch and faltering strategic grasp plus poor decision-making, his declaration of war on the USA, the strain on German resources, the weaknesses of the Axis, the enormous potential of the USA and USSR, Britain as an island base to launch attacks on Nazi Europe, all may be considered.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. The formulation 'Assess' invites an attempt to put the factors and issues into an order of relative importance, with some prioritising, though candidates should see connections. There is plenty of scope here to argue for alternatives, though comparisons will be needed (as above).

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**Section 8: 1945–2000****39 To what extent can the origins and development of the Cold War up to 1949 be explained in terms of Soviet policy in Eastern Europe?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – narrative will not suffice, unless causal. Analysis and evaluation of issues are needed here.

Soviet policy in Eastern Europe will need to be assessed against other factors. Reference to the USA, to Potsdam, to Truman and his suspicions, to Kennan, to growing mistrust are to be expected but a European perspective is necessary (this is not a question on the USA and the Cold War or extra-European issues). Likely assessment areas are: Stalin's aims and perceptions of the needs of the USSR (buffer zone, security, satellite states); his suspicions of the West and especially the USA; his failure to keep promises made at Potsdam; his determination to control Eastern Europe; responses to USA policy decisions in 1947 (Truman, Marshall); the growing tensions over Berlin and the revived economy of Western Germany. The arms race, the USA's possession of the A-Bomb, the USSR's maintenance of massive conventional forces are further factors.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may be relevant. Although the Cold War had a range of causes, the Soviet actions in Eastern Europe were very important. It is possible to argue that they were central and crucial – or that other factors (including how their policy was interpreted by the USA) had pre-eminence. Again, perceptions, misunderstandings, misreadings, flawed intelligence may all be seen as significant. Stalin may bulk large in assessment, given recent work on his attitudes and views of the post-1945 European order.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**40 How is the growth in the prosperity and the influence of the German Federal Republic after 1949 best explained?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, an analytical response, evaluating factors and issues. No end date is given, though the 1980s would form a natural end. A chronological route is unlikely to answer the needs of this question.

Consideration needs to be given to both prosperity and influence, with links made: the West Germany 'economic miracle' gave it both prominence and voice, not least in the creation of the EEC. Economic success went with political stability. Allied influence, the imposition of liberal democratic institutions, designed to avoid political extremes, the Cold War, a new Right (Christian Democrats), decentralisation, the roles of Adenauer, Brandt and Schmidt, the Church and a pro-Western foreign policy, only occasionally looking East in the 1970s, all helped. US economic aid, Marshall Aid, no need to pay for expensive defence systems, the boost of rebuilding, the emergence of a mass consumer market; the corporate role, better industrial relations via the social market, Erhard's policies of low taxes and a stable currency, economic integration via the EC and effective anti-inflation policies in the 1970s, were features. Of course, the extent of prosperity may be questioned and the costs of Unification, leading to economic downturn, may be considered.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. The formulation 'best explained' invites a sense of relative importance, the ordering of factors, some prioritising, though candidates should be aware of connections. For example, it could be argued that the Federal Republic benefited greatly from the need to re-build comprehensively and from massive US aid. Then again, political skills and financial acumen by the leadership there may be cited as significant.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

#### 41 'The saviour of the French Republic.' How accurate is this verdict on Charles de Gaulle?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required: analysis and evaluation of context, problems faced and de Gaulle's impact, not a narrative of his time as President (unless analysis is present).

It will be important to assess 'Saviour' and to avoid a simple narrative of de Gaulle's career at this point. The context to his activities and policies will be important: whether the French Republic was in extreme danger and so in need of a saviour. Candidates may refer to his success (or failure) in saving the Third Republic and he disposed of the Fourth. After much instability, internal (rapid turnover of governments) and external (decolonisation, Indo-China, Algeria), de Gaulle created political and constitutional stability. A more presidential regime emerged (1962 Referendum) and divisions and weaknesses arising from the Algerian problem were confronted and solved, at least superficially. A nationalist stance unified the country and economic upturn and growth occurred. There was a sense of strong leadership. France took a major role in the emergent EC and de Gaulle pursued a robust and independent line in foreign policy (e.g. towards West Germany and over NATO). Gaullism (efficiency, reform, strength) was popular – until 1968 when a changing climate and mood suggested crisis.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. The formulation used here invites an attempt to put the case for and case against – though most will probably concur. There is scope for argument and debate: for example, the rapid turnover of governments and the mounting problems and costs of failure may well have cast de Gaulle as a 'saviour' – a unifier, a nationalist – or it could be argued that he benefited from his own mastery of the political arts and created an almost self-fulfilling (propaganda-type) image.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**42 How justified is the view that Gorbachev was ‘a failure’?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is justification of the view, based on argument, or the reverse. Analysis and evaluation are needed. A narrative of actions will not answer the question, nor will pure description of policies.

Perspective will be important here: externally, Gorbachev was regarded favourably and as a success, above all in helping to end the Cold War; internally, he came to be viewed as a failure, weakening both Communism and the USSR as a World power. Foreign policy can be considered alongside domestic. Answers will need to assess his aims in and after 1985, set against outcomes by 1990–1. It is likely that a strong focus on *glasnost* and *perestroika* will be a feature of answers. Evaluation of their impact and success or failure is important. Gorbachev aimed to keep the USSR united and strong; he did not intend the reverse; nor did he intend the weakening of the Communist Party. Openness in a range of areas and freedoms (press, media, speech, arrests, policy roles, archives etc.) was linked to economic restructuring, based on a mix of communist and capitalist ideas. He hoped to attract substantial Western help and ideas and investment. In part, this was linked to his changed attitude towards the USA and the diminution of Cold War tensions. But, arguably, he tried to do too much, too fast, without real thought and planning. The economic infrastructure was changed, a more balanced economy emerged (a key goal) but at much cost.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may be relevant. Although the achievements of Gorbachev in his period of rule may seem limited (and are still viewed as such by many inside Russia), it is possible to argue for some successes – and the context, the inheritance he faced, the legacy he left, all are worthy of analysis. A good case could be made that the collapse of the USSR cannot be blamed entirely on Gorbachev. It is possible to argue that short- and long-term perspectives matter here; so, also, Western and non-Western views of his status, motives and actions.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

### 43 How successfully did Eastern European states adapt to the post-Communist world in the 1990s?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – an analysis of ‘How successful...’, not a narrative or description of actions and events. Knowledge will need to be selected to support arguments.

Candidates can adopt a broad approach, thematically assessing the post-Communist world, or they can select a number of examples and use such to illustrate their arguments. ‘Adapt’ is an important word to gloss and evaluate in context. Responses to the end of Communist control and dominance, to the end of the Warsaw Pact, varied, though there were common features. The removal or diminution of Communist parties and their influence; the establishment of forms of democracy; economic changes of a capitalist, free market kind; more openness; the removal of the features of secret police activities; direct relations with the USA, the West, the EU, based on independent foreign policies – these are fruitful areas for discussion and evaluation. Romania, Bulgaria, Hungary and especially Poland would be useful example 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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, it could be argued that adaptation was generally successful or that surface success cannot mask deeper faultlines. Much may depend on the examples used. The focus on ‘How successfully .....’ invites such debate and argument levels. Responses did vary and eventual outcomes were (are) not that consistent.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**Section 9: Themes, c. 1914–2000**

**44 How far did the role and status of women change in the period c. 1914–1980? You should illustrate your answer by reference to at least two European states.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Selected knowledge will be used to support arguments.

A wide chronological span and evidence will have to be selected. The Wars, especially the First, and progressive industrialisation plus economic modernisation shaped changes. There was political progress, though uneven and sometimes reversed (as in Nazi Germany); this impinged on economic and social gains. The World Wars, a variety of structural, technical and educational developments led to significant but uneven progress. Possibly economic outweighed social gains. Welfare systems may have advantaged women. Much will depend on the states chosen (e.g. France was very different to Russia). Chronological change could involve, historically, gains that were temporary at times or else more image-based than real (e.g. women were idealised in Nazi Germany yet in a very traditionalist sense). If the period c. 1914–45 saw unevenness there were more solid changes after 1945, especially in the 1960s and 1970s, including in areas of equality, pay, employment and educational opportunities plus political aspirations. Of course, marked contrasts existed between Western and (Soviet) Eastern Europe and the USSR.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. The question formulation invites an attempt to put the arguments for and against the extent of change levels in role and status, all in context.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**45 To what extent do economic factors explain the decolonisation of European overseas possessions between 1945 and c. 1976? Your answer should refer to at least two European colonial empires.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – analysis and evaluation, not a narrative of events. Selected knowledge is needed to support analysis.

Relative importance of factors will need to be established. Economic factors (costs and difficulties of imperial defence at distance, uneconomic nature of empire, weakened trade benefits) need to be set against political (post-war socialism, right wing reappraisals, anti-imperial critics, different priorities, organised opposition groups) and moral (empire seen as outdated, outmoded, bad, subjugating the masses, poor treatment, etc.). Other issues would include the consequences of the Second World War, US dependence and disapproval, USSR encouragement of liberation movements. French, Belgian, Portuguese and the Dutch examples are possible areas; Indo-China, Africa, Indonesia, Algeria could all be examined. Factors were, of course, linked (e.g. Colonial affected domestic costs). Then again, decolonisation can be glossed (withdrawal or new colonialism via institutional and economic tier).

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may be relevant. Although economic factors are often cited as a key determinant, there are other possibilities and the question formulation invites argument and counter-argument, with a sense of relative importance of factors, some prioritising, though candidates should see connections (as above). There is debate over decolonisation as a process and its dynamic and imperatives.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**46 Assess the significance of the Treaty of Rome (1957) in changing the relationship between the states of Western Europe.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – an assessment of importance based on analysis and evaluation, not a description of the treaty or a narrative of subsequent events. The question has no terminal date and candidates will need to be selective of knowledge, to support analysis, and may range into the 1990s.

The Treaty of Rome can be regarded as having limited immediate, short-term importance but greater, long-term significance. Some examination of its content would be useful but the key focus must be upon the extent of its effects (e.g. the EC/EEC, the EU, economic and political ramifications, future treaties and agreements such as the SEA of 1986 or Maastricht in 1992). The Treaty established the EEC and committed members to institutional and economic-commercial collectivities and to seek closer political unity. Progressive expansion (the six became nine, etc., recent enlargements) brought into prominence the arguments over economic union and cooperation and longer-term political – with the idea of a ‘European Union’ becoming more high-profile. Economic disparities, issues of subsidies, the power of the EU bureaucracy, economic and monetary union, a European Parliament, foreign policy ‘voice’ – all may be considered. The effects on relations with the USA and old USSR, now Russia, may well be considered, though much focus on unity and its meaning, the removal of boundaries, the promotion of regions over states as identities, is to be expected.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, it could be argued that the Treaty had limited short-term significance but great long-term. It can be seen as a defining turning point at a number of levels: diplomatic; structural; economic, then political; the reordering of the post-War West European world; the projection of a new and dominant French-German axis.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

- 47 'Cultural achievements are often at their greatest amidst political upheavals.' Discuss this view with reference to either 1918–39 or the 1960s and 1970s and at least two European states.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Argument and counter-argument are invited here. Both periods will provide plenty of material for assessment and cultural-artistic changes can be interpreted broadly (the arts, literature, music, painting, architecture etc.). The scope of the question is wide and selectivity will be important. An understanding of two or three of the arts, and the 'popular arts' can be included, such as the cinema. Answers may cover aspects of architecture, drama, music, painting and sculpture, radically different to previous trends and reflecting changes in society, not least social and political upheavals. Literature is acceptable also. Contrasts between democratic and 'free' societies and dictatorial, totalitarian, unfree societies can be made. On occasion, cultural peaks did emerge amidst political tensions, violence, unrest; on occasion, cultural and artistic areas were harnessed strongly to the needs of the state. Modernism and post-modernism may feature. A range of examples will be important, to illustrate themes and issues. 1918–39 were dominated by the Fascism-Communism tensions. The 1960s and 1970s can be framed by reference to the on-going Cold War, ideological disruptions, social revolutions in tastes, fashions, consumerism, generational clashes and aspects of gender politics.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. The question formulation invites an attempt to put the arguments for and against, with either period offering good material to support such. For example, it could be said that cultural developments are often at their greatest amidst chaos and disorder or sharp tensions; or else that such developments were ultimately stultified by political and social contexts of tension and upheaval.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**48 Assess the impact of industrialisation and technological changes on at least two European states either in the period 1918–39 or 1945–80.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – analytical assessment. It is hard to see how a narrative or description of changes will answer the question.

Industrialisation and economic modernisation bred technological changes in both periods, so shaping and influencing a range of changes, political, economic and social. Features that can be examined: rapid economic expansion; better utilisation of resources and labour forces; issues of industrial relations; transport and communication changes; urbanisation and attendant social-welfare issues; population movements and growth; social mobility; the balance between civilian and militarised economies; spending on consumer goods and military needs; living standards; working conditions (hours, pay, health and safety, manpower v. machinery) and, of course, the intimate connections to the military-industrial complexes (very evident 1918–39, but also in the Cold War era later). A range of examples will be needed, to illustrate themes.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may be relevant. Although the impact was great, there was variability and there were variations, in part according to the nature of the states chosen (totalitarian – fascist or communist; liberal democratic).

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**49 'Developments in the mass media resulted in massive changes to the nature of politics in the period 1945–1990.' Discuss this view with reference to at least two European states.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – an analytical and evaluative approach is required, not a simple description of developments (unless there are analytical elements).

Industrialisation and technological changes in both periods affected political activity in turn. The modern apparatus of politics appeared – for example, the car, the plane, the microphone, the radio, T.V., film, the ability to stage (and stage-manage) rallies, conferences, mass adulation. Much of the above was in place by 1945 with, for instance, T.V., film satellite communications being developed further after c. 1960. The mass media became a facet and fact of political life, whether in free or so-called totalitarian states. The ways in which governments and political parties used the mass media to project messages, images, influence public opinion, can be examined, with clear differences between multi party, liberal-democratic and one party, dictatorial states.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, it could be argued that the nature of political activity was influenced greatly (excessively?) by mass media developments; or that such activity was influenced by a range of other factors, with the media harnessed to serve the needs of politicians.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/03**

Paper 3 US History Outlines c. 1750–2000

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN PAPER

**2 hours 15 minutes**

---

**READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST**

Answer **three** questions which must be chosen from **at least two** sections of the paper.  
All questions in this paper carry equal marks.

You are reminded of the need for analysis and critical evaluation in your answers to questions. You should also show, where appropriate, an awareness of links and comparisons between different countries and different periods.

---

This document consists of **5** printed pages and **1** blank page.



**Section 1: c. 1750–c. 1820**

- 1 How far can it be argued that the American colonies prospered under British rule in the period 1750–1776?
- 2 How is the success of the American colonies in the War of Independence best explained?
- 3 Explain why there was debate and conflict surrounding the nature of the constitution of the United States in the period 1781–1791.
- 4 How far does Jefferson deserve his reputation as a great president?
- 5 ‘An insignificant episode.’ How valid is this judgement on the War of 1812?

**Section 2: c. 1820–1865**

- 6 How successful was the presidency of Andrew Jackson?
- 7 ***(Candidates offering Paper 5g: The Origins and Causes of the American Civil War should not answer this question.)***  
  
Why did party politics undergo so much change in the period 1820–60?
- 8 How far did the Monroe Doctrine (1823) shape American foreign policy in the years up to 1861?
- 9 ***(Candidates offering Paper 5g: The Origins and Causes of the American Civil War should not answer this question.)***  
  
‘Economic issues provide the key to understanding the causes of the Civil War.’ How accurate is this view?
- 10 How is the victory of the North in the Civil War best explained?

**Section 3: Themes c. 1750–c. 1900**

- 11 To what extent did the success of the American economy between 1750 and 1865 depend upon slavery?
- 12 'Greed and speculation rather than virtuous individualism were the prime factors driving westward expansion.' How far do you agree with this view?
- 13 How importantly did large-scale immigration between 1840 and 1920 affect American society?
- 14 Account for the rapid changes in the American economy in the period 1865–1918.
- 15 How far did the status and role of women in the United States change in the course of the later-nineteenth century?
- 16 Explain how any American novel or novels you have studied help to explain the tensions in society in the nineteenth century.

**Section 4: 1865–1914**

- 17 To what extent can it be argued that the era of Redemption was 'a successful White counter-revolution'?
- 18 Account for the appeal of the Populist movement in the later-nineteenth century.
- 19 How much was achieved by American socialists in the period 1880–1929?
- 20 How accurate is the view that the period 1880–1914 saw the birth of 'American imperialism'?
- 21 How successful was the presidency of Theodore Roosevelt?

**Section 5: 1914–1953**

- 22 'The foreign policy of Woodrow Wilson, despite the outcome of the First World War, was largely a story of failure.' How well justified is this opinion?
- 23 How is the economic boom of the 1920s best explained?
- 24 'Roosevelt's New Deal policies achieved little except to raise the nation's morale.' How accurate is this view?
- 25 How justified is the view that the foreign policy of the United States was isolationist in the period 1920–1941?
- 26 How significant was the contribution of the United States to the Allied victory in Europe in the Second World War?

**Section 6: 1953–2000**

- 27 'The foreign policy of the United States towards Cuba was profoundly inept.' How valid is this judgement with reference to the period 1959–1962?
- 28 'In terms of domestic policy, Johnson was a far more successful president than Kennedy.' How accurate is this opinion?
- 29 To what extent can it be argued that the Vietnam War was lost in the American media rather than on the battlefield?
- 30 ***(Candidates offering Paper 5n: The Civil Rights Movement in the USA should not answer this question.)***
- How convincing is the argument that the decisions of the Supreme Court provide the best explanation for the success of the Civil Rights Movement?
- 31 'Without the Watergate scandal Nixon would be seen as a great president.' How valid is this judgement?
- 32 'A revolution of the rich.' Examine this assessment of the motives for and the outcome of Reagan's domestic policies?

**Section 7: Themes c. 1900–2000**

- 33** How far did the status and role of women in the United States change in the years 1914 to 1945?
- 34** To what extent can it be argued that the 'Jazz Age' represented a threat to traditional American values?
- 35** 'The economy of the United States in the thirty years after the Second World War is an extraordinary success story.' How valid is this view?
- 36** Explain the aims and evaluate the achievements of the feminist movement in the period 1968–1979.
- 37** Why did immigration become an issue for impassioned debate in American politics in the later twentieth century?
- 38** Why has organised religion exerted such a powerful influence on American politics in the twentieth century?

**BLANK PAGE**

---

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

University of Cambridge International Examinations is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/03**

Paper 3 US History Outlines, c. 1750–2000

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

**2 hours 15 minutes**

---

**MAXIMUM MARK: 90**

---

This document consists of **39** printed pages and **1** blank page.



**Section 1: c. 1750–c. 1820****1 How far can it be argued that the American colonies prospered under British rule in the period 1750–1776?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A narrative approach is highly unlikely. Rather candidates need to draw on their chronological awareness to illustrate what they analyse.

There is debate here as to the character and extent of prosperity. At one level, there is a view that prosperity intensified as economic and commercial links grew and strengthened. At another, there is a view that prosperity was uneven and that fears of unfair advantages to the mother country led to the unrest of 1776. It can be argued that British laws and policies over trade and taxation were felt to impede economic growth, stultifying independence and freedoms. Regional, coastal and hinterland examples can be adduced, with consideration given to the Northern and more Southern colonies and their developments. Variations in class as well as across the colonies can be examined. Diversity based around geographical differences was important.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, it could be argued that the colonies prospered very well indeed, albeit with some differences (e.g. inland, coastal). Then again, as above, the impact of taxation and more rigorous application of mercantilist-based regulations after the end of the Seven Years' War may well have had a countervailing effect. Certainly, some in colonial society believed so.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**2 How is the success of the American colonies in the War of Independence best explained?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – with explanation to the fore. A narrative of events will not get very far unless there are clear analytical themes.

The emphasis here needs to be upon events and outcomes in the colonies, though awareness and mention of key events and decisions taken in London will be acceptable when put in context. Some comparison of colonial rebels' and of British positions will be helpful to evaluation. Reference will need to be made to key phases, events and actions on both sides (turning points). Leadership, both political and military; geographical factors; the allocation and uses of resources; general strategies and tactics; errors and mistakes; maritime factors; morale; external interventions – all should be considered, albeit in a prioritised way, according to judgement of relative importance.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. The formulation 'best explained' invites an attempt to put the relevant factors into some order of relative importance, although candidates should also recognise connections between the issues. Furthermore, differing emphases on the reasons for success are possible: for example, the British lost the War more than the Colonists won; the distance, problems of communications and political attitudes in Britain may have been crucial; Washington may have been decisive; then again, the French role may have been vital.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**3 Explain why there was debate and conflict surrounding the nature of the constitution of the United States in the period 1781–1791.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is an assessment of the factors involved rather than a narrative of events from 1781–1791. A narrative might throw up some explanation but rigorous analysis is needed.

The drafting of the Constitution involved much debate at the time. As a document, it embraced, for all its checks and balances, conservative and radical elements, especially with the inclusion of the Bill of Rights. The settlement itself had an important context – the motives of those such as Hamilton and Washington, in seeking to preserve economic power and aware of the military problems during the War can be assessed alongside the (very) radical notion of the settlement and its authority derived from the people. Issues also include, for example, how far the eventual Constitution moved away from the spirit and intent of 1776; some groups were more satisfied than others, not all of the elites were happy; the organisation of the Senate and the electoral college elicited arguments. Different socio-economic groups were involved and had different ‘agendas’. The fact that the creation of a Constitution took ten years, including the vital Philadelphia Convention, may be seen as very significant. There was a need for compromise evident: some wanted unity for practical reasons of defence, trade, transport; some wanted a much looser, federal set-up.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may be relevant. As stated, the drafting process did involve much debate and there has been much subsequent debate plus differing interpretations of aims and outcomes. Here there needs to be strong focus on ‘debate and conflict’, rehearsing contemporary views, reflecting the outlooks, aims and aspirations of a range of groups (e.g. landed, commercial, unitary, federal, small v. big states, pro-slavery). The idealism of Jefferson may be set against the realism of Madison; the role of the Federalist Papers may be cited. Much could be made of the conflict between conservative and radical elements and so whether this was a document reflecting such elements. There is debate over an economic interpretation of the Constitution.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

#### 4 How far does Jefferson deserve his reputation as a great president?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – an assessment of reputation based around aims, impact, outcomes and standing at the time (and later).

Jefferson has attracted much admiration as President but there are issues over his all-round strengths and weaknesses, and so over his impact. 1800 was referred to as a 'Revolution' and he proclaimed, 'We are all Federalists, we are all Republicans'. His responses to events, the nature of his actions, his underlying political philosophy can be examined. He had a loose view of the Constitution over the Louisiana Purchase and continuance of the Bank but took a different attitude to the Alien and Sedition Act and showed a healthy preference for the farming community. Control of the government led to its growth, no matter critics and opponents. His presidency did not make the sharp break that opponents had feared. Many Federalist policies were quietly continued, especially over finance and banking. He showed restraint in attacking the Federal judiciary, so helping Marshall to start the Supreme Court on a vital path in the emerging US constitutional system. The Louisiana Purchase (increased territory by 828,000 square miles, gave access to the best port in region) was a triumph and there was interventionism abroad (Tripoli, Barbary Pirates) and the assertion of US neutral rights in shipping without getting into conflict with Britain or France.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, it could be argued that Jefferson was highly successful, in the mould of the 'great' Presidents of the USA. Then again, it is possible to question the extent and depth of his achievements, based in part upon his personality and his interpretation of the Constitution.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

## 5 'An insignificant episode.' How valid is this judgement on the War of 1812?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – a judgement is needed, based on analysis and evaluation.

A narrative of the events of the War is not required. An understanding of key events and features can be used in evaluation and some consideration of the consequences would be in order: there were both foreign and domestic consequences (it would be fair to go as far as the Monroe Doctrine and the Indian Removal Acts, for example, in assessment). The USA demonstrated strengths and weaknesses at sea and on land; it showed that it would not be poorly treated any longer. It defended itself; suffered ignominy in Washington, triumph in New Orleans; failed to gain anything in Canada but showed naval enterprise and power. 'Insignificant' needs be assessed: it can be argued that, though forgotten by many later (and now), it had contemporary resonance, not least in showing American power, albeit unevenly. There was some damage in the short-term but it can be argued that 1812 led to a new, more confident phase with a greater sense of American nationalism after this 'Second War of Independence'.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. Here, good focus upon 'insignificant episode' is needed: was it that insignificant at the time? Did it seem so much later? Has its status been under-estimated? Perhaps it has a 'fit' into subsequent foreign policy developments? The short- and long-term impact on Anglo-American relations might be assessed.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

## Section 2: c. 1820–1865

### 6 How successful was the presidency of Andrew Jackson?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – that is, an assessment of ‘successful’ rather than a narrative of events in his presidency.

Jackson has had and retains a good reputation as a tough, powerful, decisive President who had a major impact on both contemporary politics and the office of President. He was adept at using his background and military record; he blended such with populist policies; he showed skill in presenting himself as a friend of the ‘common man’; he was believed to embody the very spirit of the age. Of course, he was not popular everywhere and there were limits to his support – features, no doubt, of the more robust evaluation. He was robust towards political opponents and Native Americans alike. His dealing with the Supreme Court and with South Carolina especially will feature as will attitudes towards banking, fiscal and commercial interests and needs. The spoils system, states’ rights, a strong nationalism, nullification, tariff crisis leading to the Bank War will be features. He set out to level up not down and made the powers of the office felt. The President became the focal point of the political system. He was the first to use the veto extensively; he insisted Cabinet members carry out his orders and dismissed dissenters; he started the practice of a ‘kitchen cabinet’; he invented the use of the ‘pocket veto’. He set himself up as the champion of the people, a champion against vested interests. He invented a style of politics more ‘democratic’ and plebiscitary than before, though he was accused of subverting the Republic as ‘King Andrew’, in part a comment upon his powers and status and impact. Whig-Democrat conflicts at local levels; turnouts at elections; competitive electioneering by more organised parties form useful context to what he did.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may be relevant. A good focus upon ‘How successful ...’ is required, considering reputation and status (high) set against possible weaknesses and issues of the legacy he left behind him.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**7 (Candidates offering Paper 5g: *The Origins and Causes of the American Civil War should not answer this question.*)**

**Why did party politics undergo so much change in the period 1820–60?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – an explanation, based on analysis, not a simple narrative of political events or description of the parties themselves.

Party politics were remarkably fluid in these years. A constant was the Democratic Party, but even then, by 1860, it was in disarray. By then it faced a significant challenge from the Republicans. Along the way political groups or parties like the Whigs and the Free Soilers rose and fell away, often blending into others. Local caucuses replaced national; manhood suffrage was universal. Candidates should note the developments in electoral politics that contributed to higher turnouts, from the rise in competitive elections to the efforts of better organised parties to gain support. The role of the Democrats and, for example, the Whig campaign of 1840 should feature. Jackson's popularity and his actions had effect; so, also, the intensity of Whig-Democrat conflict at local levels. Ethno-cultural, economic and social issues led to more participation and activism and, in turn, to the efforts of parties to secure voters' allegiances. In many respects, voters and supporters increasingly felt unhappy with their parties and their stances (e.g. over 'free' or 'slave' lands, over tariffs, over respective powers) and shifted allegiances.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, it could be argued that party politics were exceptionally fluid throughout, or only in the 1850s; that external non-political factors were very important; that the calibre of leaders and presidents had an important bearing on developments.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**8 How far did the Monroe Doctrine (1823) decisively shape American foreign policy in the years up to 1861?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A narrative of events will not go far to answer the question. ‘How far’ is crucial: analysis plus evaluation is needed.

US foreign policy began to be shaped in this period, with some lasting consequences. There was still a legacy of the French Revolution, the European Wars and the War of 1812. The formation of the Monroe Doctrine and its subsequent impact will need good assessment. The idea of a defined ‘sphere of influence’ should be considered. The principles underlying American policy (no entangling alliances, economic needs, territorial expansionism, attitudes to European events and emerging ideologies, domestic political advantages) should be analysed; so, too, the consistencies or inconsistencies that followed. Relations with neighbouring states (e.g. Canada, Mexico – the Mexican War) will be a strong feature. The Mexican War may be prominent, with its impact assessed, but a suitable range across the period is expected in successful evaluation.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. The phrase ‘decisively shape’ needs examination as to subsequent developments and the status applied to the Doctrine, linked to ‘How far ...’ (i.e. extent). Was the Doctrine that decisive at the time? Perhaps its real significance only became obvious at the end of the nineteenth century?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**9 (Candidates offering Paper 5g: The Origins and Causes of the American Civil War should not answer this question.)**

**'Economic issues provide the key to understanding the causes of the Civil War.' How accurate is this view?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – analysis and evaluation of causes rather than a narrative of actions plus events before 1861. Causal narrative may have some value.

The causes of the Civil War were several and linked. Economic and social were important: slavery, its place, role, purpose, importance in the South; tariffs; the growing divergence of Southern and Northern economies; different economic outlooks; different views of the make-up of society and its proper ordering. Issues such as 'slave power', 'fire-eaters', growingly strident abolitionist calls, mattered in the late 1850s. Land and its status, free or slave, and links to political and constitutional issues were important: the balance or otherwise in Congress; states' rights; the collapse of the second party system; the rise of sectional politics via the Republicans and the divided Democrats; the election of 1860. Events in the 1850s heightened tensions. Sectionalism became a major issue; so, too, attitudes in the North and the South, often amongst powerful minorities; compromises failed more and more. The perceptions of the two sides – of each other, as much as events themselves, should be a feature of the strongest evaluation. Misunderstandings and misrepresentation were important in the lead-up to 1861.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, it could be argued that economic factors, in (large) part linked to slavery, were crucial. Then again, counter-arguments around political issues of sectionalism and states' rights, personalities (including Lincoln), the breakdown of a previous compromise spirit (the age or death of conciliators, for example) could all be assessed strongly.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**10 How is the victory of the North in the Civil War best explained?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A narrative of events is not required. Causal narrative may well work, though overtly analytical themes (e.g. leadership, resources, etc.) will bring the best outcomes.

Northern victory in the Civil War took time and it was only at the end of 1863 that success looked much more likely. Comparative analysis and evaluation will be important here. Leadership, both political and military, generalship, strategy and tactics, the provision of resources, morale, forms of propaganda, diplomatic manoeuvrings all played their part. War aims and changes, especially Northern, can be examined, linked to the nature of the War and issues of movement and a strategy of attrition versus survival and defence. Lincoln and Davis as respective war leaders deserve some mention in context as do key military figures. The respective merits and de-merits of political systems and war leadership should be considered, linked to the effects on military command structure. Key moments (Gettysburg, Vicksburg, the Emancipation Proclamation, the 1864 Election) can be cited.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. The formulation ‘best explained’ invites placing factors into some order of relative importance, prioritising such, though candidates should be aware of connections between issues. There is debate here: for example, whether the North won because of its strengths (inevitable triumph in the long term) or the South lost because of its weaknesses and mistakes. Also such issues as the dynamism of Lincoln, the military skills of Grant, the lack of external support for the South, can be debated and argued.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**Section 3: Themes c. 1750–c. 1900****11 To what extent did the success of the American economy between 1750 and 1865 depend upon slavery?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required here.

Candidates need to assess the role of slavery against other factors. Of course, slavery faded out of the Northern economy between the 1790s and 1808 (banning of the slave trade). There other factors played a role: entrepreneurship; vigour; the development of factories; tariffs; encouragement of State governments. In the South, after the development of the cotton gin (1793) had transformed economic activity, there was a period of slave dominance in economic performance: cotton was central; there were commercial and modern aspects (some debate there); international links; slave agriculture. Slavery was economically vital but increasingly a political liability; and by the later 1850s there were signs of its relative decline in importance. The Civil War removed its role and place. In effect, candidates will identify two, increasingly disparate, economies at work.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may be relevant. ‘To what extent ...’ requires good focus. There is plenty of debate here, in (large) part related to contemporary attitudes towards slavery, its place and importance (or the reverse). This has been reflected in subsequent analyses.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**12 'Greed and speculation rather than virtuous individualism were the prime factors driving westward expansion.' How far do you agree with this view?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – that is, on the key words. A description or narrative of westward expansion will not get that far – unless based around causal narrative. It is likely that focus will be upon the nineteenth century, especially the 1850s onwards.

All the key words of the statement will need to be engaged and assessed. 'Rugged' or 'virtuous' individualism was a contemporary belief and principle but there is plenty of evidence for both greed and speculation (in land, in minerals). In part, there is scope here to relate to the Turner 'frontier thesis', even if some of its tenets are questionable. The 'frontier' had an impact upon the psyche (individualism, 'rags to riches', etc.) and linked with the search for land, escapism, the flight from economic, social and religious pressures, confrontation with tribes and peoples. Changes in transport and communication facilitated expansionism. Candidates will need to select examples to support their arguments.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may be relevant. Each of the key words and phrases in the title will need assessment, linked to 'How far ....'. For example, it can be argued that 'rugged' or 'virtuous individualism' was seen as a great factor at the time, whereas later view would pull in more realistic explanations, not least greed, plunder, land and mineral speculation, a desire to oust Native Americans (racist ideologies possibly involved there).

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

### 13 How importantly did large-scale immigration between 1840 and 1920 affect American society?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. The time-span is long and selectivity will be required in the uses of knowledge. Analysis is required, not a narrative of immigration *per se*.

Answers should have some idea of numbers (e.g. 200,000 a year in 1840s) and where numbers came from (e.g. UK, Italy, Ireland, Germany, Scandinavia). Immigration brought economic (and intellectual, cultural) benefits but aroused controversies (impact on social cohesion, burden on welfare systems, increase in crimes, fear of Catholicism, fear of alien political ideas). Often immigrants were made scapegoats. Then again, immigration was seen in a context of long-standing belief in a right to emigrate, a demand for cheap labour, and so could be encouraged at times. Immigration increased the more after 1865 – 26 million at least, five times the level of the previous 50 years and three times that of the previous 250 years. Ethnic shifts occurred: by 1914, 85% came from South and Eastern Europe. Impact was considerable, set in the above context, including the nativist hostility and so immigration restrictions.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, 'How importantly' invites debate as to scale, effects, degrees of change within society (this can be interpreted broadly). As stated above, contemporary responses and views were mixed: scapegoats; alien presence; benefits of arrivals in the labour market or even in introducing new energies and ideas.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**14 Account for the rapid changes in the American economy in the period 1865–1918.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – an explanation, based on analysis and evaluation, not a simple description of features and events.

The economy took off in this period, spurred in part by the outcome of the Civil War and reaching an initial peak in its performance in the First World War. By the late-nineteenth century, it was outstripping the leading European economies. The reasons were mixed: enterprise; immigration; railroads; individualism; entrepreneurship; ideas and skills; the rise of trusts and conglomerates; developing mass production techniques; exploitable mineral wealth; new energy sources in oil, electricity, gas; telegraph and telephone; cheap labour, weak trade unions, dominant big business culture; cheap food; tariffs; successful internal and regional markets; federal governments keen to encourage big business and to avoid interventionism, linked to internal free market capitalism; investment levels and elements of banking reform; tolerance of some often very suspect business practices, often dressed up as a cult of new, progressive, true business culture.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. Here, explanation can be based around (e.g.) contemporary and later evaluations as to causes – with shifts of emphases seen. Internal American emphases (e.g. on individualism, flair, hard work, etc.) could be set against external views (hard-nosed business attitudes, federal government attitudes, simple luck of massive mineral resources).

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**15 How far did the status and role of women in the United States change in the course of the later-nineteenth century?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – an emphasis on status and role, analysing such, rather than describing features, events and actions. Coverage should end c. 1900.

Women were involved in many areas, not least in reform movements such as temperance, trade unions, education reform and suffrage. There were common patterns and also limitations of roles and also contrasts between East and West Coasts and between classes. There is argument that culture was ‘feminised’: the role of women in religious organisations and as readers of religious, and later, secular periodicals; the separation of life into conventionally masculine and feminine spheres of head and heart and the ‘cult of true womanhood’ were related as the old household economy of shared duties was replaced by more female responsibility for education, social welfare and matters of taste and culture. The pressures for social reforms (e.g. temperance-prohibition) and for the vote (suffrage) may figure prominently. The number of women at work quadrupled (c. 1870–1910), nearly all single or widowed. The average age of marriage and the percentage of women in higher education rose. Most States passed laws to enlarge property rights and contractual freedom. Divorce rates rose. Movement Westward meant more social freedoms and Western States were the first to give women the vote and access to the professions.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may be relevant. ‘How far ...’ should receive good focus and appropriate evaluation, linked to the extent and nature of changes involved, social, economic, moral and political. A sense of extent of changes as of unevenness will be important.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**16 Explain how any American novel or novels you have studied help to explain the tensions in society in the nineteenth century.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is explanation, based on analysis and evaluation of authorship and contents, rather than simple description of contents. Examples could be from the nineteenth century or the twentieth, set in and around the previous century.

Candidates will need to justify their choice(s). They need to avoid pure description of contents and literary criticisms. Rather they need to relate knowledge and understanding of contents to social and sectional tensions (e.g. racial-ethnic, gender, immigrant, Native Americans, class status). They need to explain the benefits of such studies and make appropriate links to historical events and trends. Candidates need to probe the role of such sources for a period rich in such materials. Many novelists were important commentators; differentiation of such, as of their works and the impact of their commentaries and descriptions, will be important. Possible nineteenth century exemplars: James Fenimore Cooper (the first great American novelist); Harriet Beecher Stowe (clear contemporary resonance and impact); Melville, Hawthorne, Thoreau, Whitman and possibly Longfellow.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may be relevant. It needs emphasis that this is a historical approach, not a literary. Choices will determine some approaches, but the use of contents of novels and their evaluation need to be related firmly to historical issues, events, actions, turning points etc.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

### Section 4: 1865–1914

#### 17 To what extent can it be argued that the era of Redemption was ‘a successful White counter-revolution’?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – an assessment and argument (or counter-argument), not a simple description of actions and events. Rather, such knowledge needs to be used to support analysis and evaluation.

The era of Redemption (starting in 1877 and lasting to 1896 or the 1920s, depending on view) can be represented as a phase of highly successful White backlash consequent upon the reforms and changes of the Reconstruction years. In effect, white-based Southern state governments ignored, overturned, brushed aside the formative changes of 1865–77: the reversion of the South to conservative Democratic rule after the Reconstruction era. Redeemer governments were very active, feeding off and indeed encouraging white fears, aided by the marked unwillingness of federal governments to act against them. The end of the Reconstruction era, the withdrawal of Northern troops, the Compromise of 1877, the attitude of the Supreme Court, all contributed to a strident, overt racism. Reference can be made to (e.g.) the development in the 1890s of ‘Jim Crow’ laws, the ‘grandfather’ literacy tests, developing segregation in transport, public places, education and general welfare; the vote was restricted to a small percentage of the black population; the imposition of poll taxes.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, it is possible to argue that the description is indeed highly accurate – then again, it could be said to be exaggerated: times and conditions were not universally and wholly bad for African Americans. ‘Counter-revolution’ should be assessed here.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**18 Account for the appeal of the Populist movement in the later-nineteenth century.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – explanation of appeal, not simple description of features and events.

Populism has to be linked to the agrarian discontent (cf. the Granger Movement also) of the 1870s and 1880s and the later 'battle of the standards' in the 1890s. Ultimately, by 1896, the People's Party appeared a failure, with even its identity subsumed into Bryan's Democratic Presidential campaign that year. Then again, the People's Party can be seen as a seedbed of American politics for the next 50 or so years (Democrats, Progressive movements). For a period of time, it had appeal. It varied across the country. In the short term, its appeal was good: local acts were passed. In the longer term, a lack of resources and patronage meant the movement could not compete nationally with the two major Parties.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, it could be argued that Populism was almost a 'fad', transient, limited in impact; or that its real effects were longer-term, emergent in the Progressive and Democrat movements and party politics.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**19 How much was achieved by American socialists in the period 1880–1929?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, not a narrative of events or a description of socialists at work. Analysis plus evaluation are required, in context, with awareness of argument. The period is a long one; material will need to be selected.

Candidates are likely to conclude that not much was achieved overall, other than as a form of pressure group politics. Socialism never really took root in the USA; often viewed as alien, viewed with suspicion, linked to excessive trade union demands and interests, linked to foreign ideas and events. It had some strengths but also weaknesses, from the 1870s through to the era of the First World War and after. It had a difficult relationship with the Labor movement and the role of the state, allied to that of the courts and big business, did much to curb it. Ethnicity played a role here also, limiting its appeal: ethnic tensions ran across class lines; foreignness; an immigrant import. And the First World War and a 'Red Scare' in 1917–19 and the 1920s did much to blunt such perceived radicalism. Also the political context of parties, appeal, support and the pre-business ideology prevalent then both weakened it as a force and a movement. The strength of Socialism was at a peak in 1912 (Debs polled a 6% vote). Weaknesses included the problems faced by all third parties in the American system as well as the factors outlined above.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. There is a need of good focus on 'How much ...' with debate as to a very limited effect and role or else as to more significance, especially in retrospect. The context to politics (two main parties; deep-rooted suspicions of socialism; the power of big business, supported by the courts and state governments) should be a feature of the argument developed here.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**20 How accurate is the view that the period 1880–1914 saw the birth of ‘American imperialism’?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – analysis of events plus features, linked to evaluation. A description or narration of events will not answer the question unless there is explicit analysis.

There is some argument about this as an ‘age of imperialism’, characterised by assertiveness, at times outright aggression albeit under a cloak of high-mindedness. The USA expanded its influence in Hawaii, Samoa, South America and some parts of China. This culminated in the 1898 Spanish-American War which the USA used as a chance to gain possession in the Philippines, Puerto Rico, Guam, with Cuba as a ‘sphere of influence’. The acquisition of the Panama Canal was a good example of the US hegemony in Central and Latin America. This phase was driven by Manifest Destiny as a concept, a growing belief in imperialism (A. T. Mahan, ‘white man’s burden’, the works of J. N. Fiske), a search for markets for a burgeoning economy. In many ways, this was a second-hand empire. The fact that the USA had become a great power was recognised in Theodore Roosevelt’s mediation in the Russo-Japanese war (he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize). Indeed, Roosevelt can be used as a good example of this new assertiveness and interventionism.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may be relevant. A sharp focus on ‘How accurate ...’ is required: is this an accurate view, or not? Was there ‘American imperialism’? Was it contemporary in resonance or more a later interpretation?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

## 21 How successful was the presidency of Theodore Roosevelt?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – an analysis of the presidency and its features, with suitable evaluation, not a narrative or description of actions and events. Theodore Roosevelt is always regarded as highly successful – in foreign policy and in domestic policy areas. He was seen as an adventurer and imperialist in foreign policy. At home he was regarded as something of a Progressive, though (for example) he went less far in anti-Trust legislation than Taft. He preferred to control rather than to ‘bust’ the Trusts. He was an activist and in many ways a larger-than-life character, culminating in his standing as an independent candidate in the 1912 elections. Reference can be made to anti-Trust activity; his attitude to labour; some public health and welfare measures; some consideration of reforms to the Stock Market; the ‘Square Deal’ (seen by some as a centrepiece): regulation of industry; conservation measures; actions in foreign policy (e.g. Cuba, the Philippines, Panama Canal, the Roosevelt Corollary; development of naval power via The Great White Fleet).

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. Good focus on ‘How successful ...’ is required, linked to a sense of reputation and status (high? over-drawn? realistic?).

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**Section 5: 1914–1953****22 ‘The foreign policy of Woodrow Wilson, despite the outcome of the First World War, was largely a story of failure.’ How well justified is this opinion?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

A narrative of events is unlikely to answer the question. Analysis and evaluation are required, with a good focus on the key words. Wilson’s decision to commit the USA to war with Germany in 1917 came for a number of reasons (and these can be mentioned briefly). US contribution to the war – on land and at sea – reached a peak in 1918 and undoubtedly helped towards stemming German success and then turning the war towards the defeat of Germany. Economic and financial reasons were important and the benefits for the US economy were many. Elite opinion was pro-English. Wilson played a major part in shaping the diplomatic thinking for a post-war settlement in Europe, culminating in his Fourteen Points and role at Versailles. Good assessment of both, of how far the Fourteen Points were a basis for peace and indeed were followed, will help; so, too, assessment of the role at Versailles (honest broker and mediator?) and the subsequent attempts to win approval for membership of the League of Nations. Balanced evaluation of 1917–18 set against 1919–21 will be important.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. Key words are ‘largely a story of failure’ and candidates need to address the strengths and weaknesses of Wilson’s foreign policy, dominated by USA entry into the War and its key role but also by the failure to convince opinion and the Senate that the USA should join the League of Nations. Has Wilson’s foreign policy been over-rated? How successful was he? Does the failure over the League and subsequent events dominate thinking too much? Did he have too idealistic a view (‘grand vision’?) of a new international order based on cooperation? Was he a visionary ahead of his time?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**23 How is the economic boom of the 1920s best explained?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Description of features will not succeed here. Candidates need to explain, using features to illustrate analysis and evaluation. The boom was extensive and deep in penetration, at some levels. It was fed, amongst a range of factors, by a non-interventionist, non-regulatory government; business venture capitalists and risk-taking; mass production and consumerism, fed by advanced advertising skills; hard work and a strong work ethic; weak trade unions and weak labour regulations; a heightened sense of the 'rugged individualism' seen by many as essentially American; powerful capitalist forces that were often unchecked, reckless and adventurist.

From 1922 onwards there was a great increase in productivity, based on new industries and high exploitation of mineral resources, wealth and labour, a building boom, radio, and, above all, the motor car revolution pioneered by Henry Ford and others. The result was a doubling of industrial production and a large increase in per capita income. Yet government expenditure was so low that a quarter of the National Debt was paid off between 1923 and 1929. There were, of course, variations in growth, benefit and gains, across regions, classes and ethnic groups.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. The formulation 'best explained' invites consideration of a range of factors, giving them relative importance and prioritising, yet seeing their connections. There is argument over the reasons and over the role of federal governments set against private business and entrepreneurial forces and actions. 'Pump priming' may be considered and the degree to which the boom was in part a post-War response, in part fed and fuelled by (excessive) financial investments and also speculation.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**24 'Roosevelt's New Deal policies achieved little except to raise the nation's morale.' How accurate is this view?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

A narrative or description of the New Deal (or New Deals – it can be argued there were two) will not answer the question as set, unless there are analytical elements present. Persistent analysis and evaluation based around the key words of the title should bring reward; examples of agencies (etc.) should be used to illustrate arguments.

Coverage: politically, the New Deal was a success, restoring capitalism's credibility, averting bankruptcy of the States, pointing a way out of the Depression and giving voters hope and belief that the government had a meaningful strategy. Economically, the recovery signs were mixed: full recovery did not come until 1941; unemployment was stubborn in some areas and industries and stood at 17% in 1939; investment lagged and living standards were often stagnant; some policies were harmful (e.g. areas of NIRA, gold-buying experiment); social groups and regions experienced mixed fortunes; trade unions expanded and members benefited from the NLRA; the TVA brought relief to the seven States it covered; the conditions for recovery were established and disaster averted; physical rehabilitation did occur; there was established the principle that government had oversight and care of the health, wealth and security of its citizens.

These areas can be linked both to morale and to overall impact. Confidence and hope as against despair and misery may well be seen as very important to evaluation here.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses.

'How accurate' invites argument and debate and, of course, there is much debate over the effectiveness of the New Deal. Contemporary and post-1945 opinions saw the New Deal as highly successful. Subsequent views challenged the depth and extent of the success achieved, pointing to unevenness, downturn in 1938–39, and the vital role of the Second World War from 1941 in stimulating lasting economic upturn. Focus upon 'raise the nation's morale' is needed here and there is plenty of scope to argue for or against success levels (as above).

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**25 How justified is the view that the foreign policy of the United States was isolationist in the period 1920–1941?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates need to cover the period from the rejection of the League to the Lend-Lease of Roosevelt, though equal treatment of the whole period is not needed. A narrative will not go very far to answer the question unless there are evaluative elements. Conscious and persistent analysis and evaluation are required. The 1920s can be challenged as isolationist given the economic policies towards Europe, especially Germany (loans, trade deals, etc.), the peace agreements and actions in Latin America (always an area of special interest). Then again, there is argument that, all the while, isolationism was not that far away. The gradual retreat into self-introspection, in large part the consequence of the Depression onset, during the 1930s was followed by slowly responding to the situation in both Asia and Europe by 1939–40. Roosevelt's attitude and interests set against Congress and public opinion can be assessed. His attitude towards Hitler and towards the Japanese leadership can be examined. He may well have talked isolationist – or felt he had to talk so – yet acted more involved (as in 1940–41). Good coverage of the late 1930s into 1941 is likely but there must be overview of earlier phases as well. There were, in reality, two phases here: 1920–33 when the USA and others tried to keep peace, outlaw wars and achieve disarmament; 1933–41 when it became clear that the Versailles Settlements had broken down and that Japan as well as Germany was intent on aggressive actions.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. The formulation 'How justified' requires evaluation and examination of content and arguments. Argument and debate are possible here: definition of 'isolationism'; isolationism versus internationalism; its practical workings; spheres of continuing influence; differences between economic and commercial involvements and political-diplomatic; the pressures on Roosevelt to avoid another big war; the evidence for his private views of (say) Hitler and what he could say in public; the interpretations of his support for Britain in particular against the Axis Powers and of his arguably provocative actions towards Japan (embargoes, etc.).

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**26 How significant was the contribution of the United States to the Allied victory in Europe in the Second World War?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Focus upon Europe is vital here: this is not a question about the war against Japan. Narrative will not work unless there are embedded analytical features. Persistent analysis and evaluation are required.

Coverage: Lend-Lease and other forms of support prior to direct entry into the War; US strategic and tactical roles, on land, sea and in the air; extra convoy protection; moving vast resources to Britain; the stationing of bomber forces and troops there; the roles in the invasion of Sicily, Italy and North-West Europe; Eisenhower; key generals; financial support in loans; determination to see the war through to the end.

These factors can be set against the contributions of Britain and the USSR; the fortuitous dimension to Hitler's decision to declare war on the USA; the importance of the Eastern Front.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. 'How significant' invites argument and consideration of a range of factors, assessing such, offering a sense of relative importance, yet seeing connections also. The role of the USA can be weighed against others' roles, including Britain (keeping the war alive until the USA intervened) and the USSR (the bitter fighting on the Eastern Front). That said, the USA must be prominent in the answer offered. Significance can be assessed at several levels, economic, military, strategic. There is argument that the USA's role was decisive. Then again, it can be argued that its role, though very important, was not necessarily totally decisive.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**Section 6: 1953–2000****27 'The foreign policy of the United States towards Cuba was profoundly inept.' How valid is this judgement with reference to the period 1959–1962?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – an awareness of the whole period, including the Revolution and Eisenhower's response to it, will be needed. Simple chronological narratives should be avoided but analysis may well proceed in chronological order. The question is best considered by looking at the unfolding issues, such as trade links, CIA plans, the landings at the Bay of Pigs and the Missile Crisis. A factual and analytical awareness of the consequences of these events is also vital. An awareness of Kennedy's options and methods, and the role of key advisors will help to give focus to the assessment of his handling of foreign policy.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts – such as brinkmanship or quarantine – enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, it could be argued that America mismanaged the problem in several ways but it could also be argued that the eventual outcome was a success. An awareness of this debate and how very different interpretations can be placed upon events will be evident in stronger candidates. The role of propaganda at the time will also be relevant here. The nature of the compromise that resolved the final crisis has also been debated and will be central to final interpretations.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**28 'In terms of domestic policy, Johnson was a far more successful president than Kennedy.'  
How accurate is this opinion?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – ‘successful’ can be evaluated in various ways, although knowledge of legislation will be vital. Long chronological narratives should be avoided: the question is best considered by topics or themes. These might include: policies with regard to education, the economy, health, poverty and civil rights. An awareness of the different circumstances both men faced in their relationship with Congress is expected.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, it will be necessary to look at the concept of the political effect of the assassination and how far this has created a distorted image of Kennedy. Stronger candidates will explore how far the ‘Great Society’ was just an expansion of the Kennedy agenda. It could be argued that Johnson was only successful because of Kennedy’s efforts and his untimely death. Alternatively, a balanced answer will look at Johnson’s unique political skill and his substantial legislative achievement.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**29 To what extent can it be argued that the Vietnam War was lost in the American media rather than on the battlefield?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – specific reference to the way events, perhaps such as the My Lai massacre, were treated by the media will be necessary rather than a simple survey of factors.

Long chronological narratives should be avoided: the question is best considered by topics or themes. These might include: an assessment of the way the media affected American public opinion, the anti-war movement and the political outcomes, such as Nixon's electoral victories. Other factors relating to the war, such as the problems associated with fighting a guerrilla army, the terrain, tactics, supply lines, bombing strategies and so-called 'hearts and minds' should, to some extent, be covered.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, it could be argued that the role of the media has been exaggerated and more traditional military factors explain America's failure to win. Nixon's escalation of the bombing campaigns despite the media and the anti-war movement might be used to suggest that domestic opinion was not that important. Alternatively, an awareness of the role of television, newspapers and student and or counter-culture leaflets could provide a different perspective. It may also be possible to place the main emphasis on 'battlefield' factors, so long as the 'media' topic is given adequate coverage.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**30 (Candidates offering Paper 5n: The Civil Rights Movement in the USA should not answer this question.)**

**How convincing is the argument that the decisions of the Supreme Court provide the best explanation for the success of the Civil Rights Movement?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – an awareness of other factors is very important. Long chronological narratives should be avoided: the question is best considered by topics or themes. These might include: analysis of the Supreme Court decisions in such areas as education and transport, with *Brown versus the Board of Education* as a vital reference. In addition, the role of Martin Luther King Jr. and other key protestors is important, as is the role of the various Civil Rights organisations, such as the NAACP. The importance of Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson should also be assessed. Stronger candidates may show awareness of the role of Congress, both in terms of obstructing and assisting the aims of Civil Rights.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, it could be argued that the success of Civil Rights came about largely as the result of sympathetic individuals in powerful positions, such as Earl Warren or Kennedy, but it could also be argued that the decisive force came more from 'below' – focusing on the youth movements who pioneered direct action. Stronger candidates will develop their answers significantly beyond the role of Martin Luther King Jr., although obviously his role will need to be analysed. They will also see the way that factors overlap and inter-connect: for example, the NAACP is important precisely because it was often its leaders, such as Thurgood Marshall, whose legal arguments prompted the Supreme Court to arrive at crucial decisions.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**31 'Without the Watergate scandal Nixon would be seen as a great president.' How valid is this judgement?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – clearly a wide-ranging analysis is necessary and some awareness of what might be meant by 'great'. However, long chronological narratives should be avoided: the question is best considered by topics or themes. These might include: Nixon's foreign policy, especially Vietnam and détente; his domestic economic policies such as the New Economic Policy; his social policies and his attitude and actions with regard to Civil Rights. Obviously, a discussion of Watergate is a pre-requisite, but again this ought to avoid mere narrative.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, there is an argument which stresses the way Nixon was hounded by the press and his enemies. It could be argued that he was to some extent a victim of a Liberal witch-hunt. Stronger candidates may bring in the comparison with Kennedy and his alleged corruption but positive reputation. Nixon's achievements might be stressed, such as détente and the end of the Vietnam War. Alternatively, it could be argued that Watergate was a symptom of a devious approach, and that other issues such as his escalation of the bombing campaigns in Vietnam also show the president in negative light. His often contradictory approach on social policy and on Civil Rights can be interpreted in several ways. Strong candidates will be aware of his difficulties with Congress.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**32 'A revolution of the rich.' Examine this assessment of the motives for and the outcome of Reagan's domestic policies.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required: clearly the question requires some separate analysis of 'motives' and 'outcome' but candidates may also wish to define the opening quotation. Long chronological narratives should be avoided: the question is best considered by topics or themes. These might include: Reagan's tax policies; cuts in welfare budgets and the thinking behind these policies, such as the 'trickle down' idea and supply side economics. Strong candidates will be able to bring statistical information in to support arguments.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, it could be argued that the motives had more to do with reviving an economy suffering from 'stagflation'. The results of Reagan's policies are open to significant debate: strong candidates will bring out arguments for and against whilst keeping a clear eye on the precise question.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**Section 7: Themes c. 1900–2000****33 How far did the status and role of women in the United States change in the years 1914 to 1945?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – an outline of the position of women at the beginning of the period is necessary.

Long chronological narratives should be avoided: the question is best considered by topics or themes. These might include: the struggle to achieve the vote, changing opportunities in the fields of employment and education, cultural changes such as the rise of the so-called ‘flapper’, and the mixture of problems and opportunities created in the 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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, it could be argued that this period saw great strides towards gender equality but it might also be argued that the progress was quite limited, particularly after the achievement of the vote. Strong candidates will bring out the complexity of the question, perhaps linking the issue to others such as race and class.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**34 To what extent can it be argued that the 'Jazz Age' represented a threat to traditional American values?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – it would be helpful to define both 'traditional American values' and 'the Jazz Age', although this need not be done at the beginning and may unfold in the course of the essay. Long chronological narratives should be avoided: the question is best considered by topics or themes. These might include: the rise of the so-called 'flapper' and the wider cultural changes such as dance crazes, fashion changes and artistic 'threats' in the form of movements such as the Harlem Renaissance or the work of individuals such as F. Scott Fitzgerald. Broader social changes, such as the impact of mass production and popular culture could also be brought in but it is important to keep a sense of what the term 'Jazz Age' implies. Prohibition and the rise of gangsters could also be relevant.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, it could be argued that traditional values were under threat, especially for women but perhaps also for African Americans too. However, a strong answer will point to the way that the Jazz Age is a phenomenon associated mainly with urban, affluent America: it had a limited impact upon the lives of most Americans, unless popular culture in general is used as part of the definition of the term.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**35 'The economy of the United States in the thirty years after the Second World War is an extraordinary success story.' How valid is this view?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – it is not asking why the economy was extraordinarily successful but whether it was.

Long chronological narratives should be avoided: the question is best considered by topics or themes. These might include: statistical evidence, such as changes in GNP, rise of consumerism and the so-called Affluent Society in the 1950s and 1960s. The economic problems in the early 1970s, such as the OPEC oil price rise, are also important.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, it could be argued that the Long Boom after 1945 is broadly a great success, particularly when compared with the pre-War depression. Alternatively, there was the 'Other America' of poverty and inequality which ought to be mentioned. Although a positive conclusion is likely, the problems at the end of the period might allow for a more negative or balanced conclusion.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**36 Explain the aims and evaluate the achievements of the feminist movement in the period 1968–1979.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – the question is clearly in two parts. Long chronological narratives should be avoided: the question is best considered by topics or themes. These might include: the idea of a Second Wave; key individuals such as Betty Friedan and the NOW movement; ‘consciousness raising’; rights at work, increased educational opportunities and rights to abortion.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, it can be argued that after the ‘legal’ achievements of the earlier period – the right to vote and Civil Rights – this period saw feminists help to bring about major attitudinal change and achieve important social rights, such as the right to abortion in 1973. Alternatively, it could be argued that feminism in this era had few tangible successes, involved relatively few women and eventually fragmented.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**37 Why did immigration become an issue for impassioned debate in American politics in the later twentieth century?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. What constitutes the ‘later twentieth century’ will need to be defined. It might be reasonably argued that this phase begins with the onset of a conservative era under Reagan. Long chronological narratives should be avoided: the question is best considered by topics or themes. These might include: the changing nature of American attitudes towards immigration and in particular towards illegal immigrants coming from central America. In explaining why this became an ‘impassioned’ issue it will be important to relate it to issues such as exploitation, perceptions about crime and drugs, and the wider debate about ‘threats’ to American identity.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, it could be argued that immigration as a problem is exaggerated by the right for various possible reasons. However, it may also be that it is perceived as a problem on the left too, because many illegal immigrants are exploited as cheap labour in America. The global context of the growing need to control borders for security reasons might also be brought in but candidates should avoid lengthy ruminations on the ‘war on terror’.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**38 Why has organised religion exerted such a powerful influence on American politics in the twentieth century?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required – a broad brush approach will be necessary for some of the answer, given the lengthy time frame. Long chronological narratives should be avoided: the question is best considered by topics or themes. These might include: a focus on influential groups that have in some way used religion, such as the Ku Klux Klan or the Civil Rights Movement. The importance of Christianity in the struggle against ‘atheistic’ Communism is central and might be related to a discussion of ‘American Values’. The way that some churches have become enmeshed with pressure groups such as the Pro-Life movement is also important and the role of presidents is also likely to be relevant.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses. For example, it could be argued that Christianity is so central to American culture and myths of itself that it is hardly surprising that religion is so influential. Strong answers will draw out the multiplicity of reasons for its influence and range across the century in giving examples.

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.





UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/04**

Paper 4 African and Asian History Outlines, c. 1750–2000

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN PAPER

**2 hours 15 minutes**

---

**READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST**

Answer **three** questions which must be chosen from **at least two** sections of the paper.  
All questions in this paper carry equal marks.

You are reminded of the need for analysis and critical evaluation in your answers to questions. You should also show, where appropriate, an awareness of links and comparisons between different countries and different periods.

---

This document consists of **5** printed pages and **1** blank page.



**Section 1: North and East Africa**

- 1 Explain the significance of the Anglo-French confrontation at Fashoda in 1898.
- 2 Why was Ethiopia/Abyssinia able to maintain its independence until as late as 1936?
- 3 Why was France forced to concede independence to its North African colonies?
- 4 How effectively have Egyptian leaders since 1952 promoted their country's international standing?
- 5 How is the instability in the Horn of Africa in the period c. 1960–2000 best explained?

**Section 2: West, Central and Southern Africa**

- 6 How is the brutal exploitation of the Belgian Congo in the period c. 1879–1914 best explained?
- 7 Why, and with what consequences, were the British in conflict with the Boers in South Africa?
- 8 Why, after independence, did some African states fall into the hands of dictatorial regimes? (Your answer should refer to at least **two** states.)
- 9 Why was majority rule so long delayed in Southern Rhodesia/Zimbabwe?
- 10 How convincing is the view that the collapse of apartheid in South Africa was more the result of international condemnation than internal pressures?

### Section 3: Themes: Africa, c. 1750–2000

- 11 Evaluate the main strengths and weaknesses of any **one** sub-Saharan African state and society which you have studied in the period c. 1750–c. 1850.
- 12 Assess the impact of the transatlantic slave trade in **one** region of Africa in the period c. 1750–c. 1850.
- 13 How are the motives for the ‘scramble for Africa’, on the part of the European powers, best explained?
- 14 To what extent has the role of women in society been affected by colonialism and independence in the period c. 1900–2000? (Your answer should refer to **at least two** African countries.)
- 15 How is the growth of African nationalism in the 1950s best explained?
- 16 How effective was international aid in addressing the issues of poverty and economic development in Africa in the second half of the twentieth century?

### Section 4: China

- 17 How successful were attempts at social and cultural reform in China in the period 1895–1911?
- 18 How valid is the judgement that the Chinese Revolution of 1911 was a failure?
- 19 Why was the Kuomintang unable to maintain itself in power in China?
- 20 ***(Candidates offering Paper 5m: China under Mao Zedong should not answer this question.)***  
  
How effective was the Communist government of China in dealing with the country’s problems in the period 1949–1962?
- 21 ‘A capitalist wolf in communist sheep’s clothing.’ How far does this opinion explain the economic expansion of China after Mao?

**Section 5: The Indian sub-continent and Ceylon/Sri Lanka**

- 22 The *Indian Mutiny* or the *First War of Indian Independence*. Which of these interpretations best explains the events of 1857?
- 23 Who made the greater contribution to Indian independence, Gandhi or Nehru?
- 24 Why, and with what consequences, was British India partitioned in 1947?
- 25 Why have India and Pakistan been so often in dispute in the period 1947–2000?
- 26 To what extent has India lived up to its reputation of being ‘the world’s largest democracy’?

**Section 6: Japan and Korea**

- 27 How significantly did the Meiji Restoration change Japan?
- 28 What motives and influences lay behind Japan’s aggressive foreign policy in the period 1931–1941?
- 29 How is the defeat of Japan in the Second World War best explained?
- 30 ‘An economic giant but a political pigmy.’ How accurate is this view of post-war Japan’s international role?
- 31 Why did war break out in Korea in 1950?

**Section 7: South East Asia**

- 32 Why did France fail to maintain its hold on French Indo-China?
- 33 How similar was post-colonial political and economic development in Malaysia and Indonesia?
- 34 Why, and with what results, has the military been so significant a political force in Burma in the period 1948–2000?
- 35 Why was the North Vietnamese state able to defeat the policies of the United States in South Vietnam?
- 36 By what means, and with what success, did China seek to extend its influence in South East Asia in the period 1949–2000?

**Section 8: Themes: Asia c. 1750–2000**

- 37 Why was China vulnerable to Western encroachment in the nineteenth century?
- 38 To what extent did the growth of the East India Company's power in India depend upon the weaknesses of the princely states?
- 39 How is the failure of successive attempts to impose a foreign authority on Afghanistan best explained? (You may confine your attention to **either** the nineteenth **or** the twentieth century if you wish.)
- 40 How is the rise and growth of the 'tiger economies' of Asia best explained? (Your answer should refer to **at least two** Asian countries.)
- 41 Assess the impact of Islamic fundamentalism upon the internal affairs of any two post colonial Asian states.
- 42 How importantly has the role of women been affected by colonialism and independence in the period c. 1900–2000? (Your answer should refer to **at least two** Asian countries.)

**BLANK PAGE**

---

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

University of Cambridge International Examinations is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/04**

Paper 4 African and Asian History Outlines, c. 1750–2000

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

**2 hours 15 minutes**

---

**MAXIMUM MARK: 90**

---

This document consists of **43** printed pages and **1** blank page.



## Section 1: North and East Africa

### 1 Explain the significance of the Anglo-French confrontation at Fashoda in 1898.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the Fashoda incident. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Entirely descriptive accounts are unlikely but if they do occur the rewards will be limited. Nevertheless, a brief explanation of events and context is necessary. In 1898, after Kitchener's victory at Omdurman, a British force advancing up the Nile encountered a French detachment under Marchand. It had arrived at Fashoda after advancing from Brazzaville. After an international crisis a settlement was reached by the French and British governments. In assessing the significance of the Fashoda incident for African affairs candidates may be expected to discuss the following: Fashoda marked the end of a period of aggressive British policy since 1882 to secure Suez, upper Egypt, the Sudan and the upper Nile; a suspected ambition by the French to dam the upper Nile had been prevented; in 1899 the French agreed to withdraw and renounced all claims to the Nile valley; Britain was confirmed as the major influence in Egypt and the Sudan for the next half-century; the French and British agreed upon a dividing line between their respective spheres of influence as the watershed between the Nile and Congo; the incident provides a major example of European powers dividing up Africa amongst themselves. The incident had wider European and international repercussions and candidates are likely to deal with the following: the immediate outcome was to bring France and Britain to the verge of open conflict and strengthened the Franco-Russian alliance; the settlement in 1899, however, prevented Britain from being driven into the arms of Germany; it might be argued that, in the longer term, Fashoda helped to bring about the Entente Cordiale (Delcasse, the French foreign minister who negotiated it with Grey, was also responsible for ordering Marchand to abandon Fashoda); the affair demonstrated the importance of the British navy since control of the Nile valley depended upon British sea power in the Mediterranean, a fact well appreciated by the French.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. There should be a specific focus here on the issue of significance and of the relative importance of outcomes. A balance of coverage of the significance for Africa and Europe will be expected with, if anything, the chief weight on the African aspect. Flimsy treatment of the African dimension will seriously affect the judgement of the answer.

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.

## 2 Why was Ethiopia/Abyssinia able to maintain its independence until as late as 1936?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required: an explanation of why Ethiopia/Abyssinia was able to keep its independence to such a late stage, especially compared with other regions of Africa. The coverage of chronology need not extend across the whole range c. 1750–1936. Brief mention might be made of European incursions in earlier periods, for example, Portuguese activity in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but the overwhelming concentration will be upon the later nineteenth and earlier twentieth centuries. Purely narrative accounts of European expeditions will take answers only so far but these will provide some useful illustrations as to how and why Ethiopia/Abyssinia resisted conquest and annexation. Useful illustrations are Napier's expedition to Magdala in 1868 (which although successful had limited objectives) and the Italian invasion of 1895 and its failure at Adowa in the following year. The successful Italian campaign which succeeded in entering Addis Ababa in 1936 may make for some useful comparisons. Among the themes to be explored are the particular and distinctive nature of Ethiopian/Abyssinian civilisation, language and religion; the abilities of rulers and the nature of their authority; the difficulty of access since the country was effectively landlocked; the exceptionally difficult terrain; the relative lack of interest by France and Britain (whose interest in the region were largely concerned with Egypt, Sudan and the Nile valley).

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. A sharp appreciation of the relevant importance of the relevant factors should be expected alongside a sense of perspective as to why Ethiopia/Abyssinia so long resisted annexation by European powers compared with the rest of the continent. One possible explanation for this may be Ethiopia/Abyssinia's apparent lack of resources.

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.

### 3 Why was France forced to concede independence to its North African colonies?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is explanations of the concession of independence by France to Tunisia, Morocco and Algeria. Narrative accounts of independence movements will respond only in part to the demands of the question. Some distinctions need to be made in that the independence of Tunisia and Morocco was gained with relative ease. The real difficulties and the strong element of France being constrained to grant independence, are concerned with Algeria. Algeria had a European population of one million out of a total of some nine to ten million, a population which owned much of the property and wealth and, like metropolitan France, Algeria was divided into departments. Thus there was a strong ‘Algerie francaise’ lobby, and at the beginning of the Algerian emergency the position of the French government of the Fourth Republic was that Algerian independence was ‘unthinkable’. It is important for candidates to have knowledge of this context in order to respond to the wording of the title (‘forced to concede’). In explanation candidates may be expected to deal with the following: the background of French weaknesses after the Second World War as shared by other colonial powers such as Britain and the Netherlands; the liberation of Europe in 1944–5 raised expectations; the defence of French Indo-China, which had imposed a crushing burden on France; the formation of the FLN and the leadership of Ahmed ben-Bella and Belkacem Krim; Egyptian help for the Algerian resistance movement; international pressure on France, especially once the scale of atrocities was realised; France’s own political instability (made worse by the Algerian crisis), the weaknesses of the Fourth Republic, the growth of hostile public opinion with the rising toll of deaths of French troops, the threat of an army coup (Massu) and the activities of the SOAS.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here candidates should demonstrate sharp insights into the relative importance of the issues and into the dimension of France being ‘forced’ to grant independence.

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.

#### 4 How effectively have Egyptian leaders since 1952 promoted their country's international standing?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required; the international standing of Egypt rather than, say, domestic developments per se, and the presidencies of Nasser (1952–70), Sadat (1970–81), and Mubarak (since 1981). To put the issues into perspective, some reference to, say, Egypt's relationship with Britain before 1952 and the revolution of that year might be helpful. In assessing the success of Egyptian leaders in furthering their country's international standing candidates are likely to refer to the following: attempts to extend Egypt's influence in the Middle East and relations with Jordan, Syria, Lebanon and Iraq; responses to opportunities presented by the Cold War and relations with the USA and USSR, extension of influence in North Africa and, for example, support for Algerian independence; Nasser's self-proclaimed leadership of Pan-Arabism; the nationalisation of the Suez Canal and the failure of British and French intervention; wars against Israel in 1967 and 1973; efforts to arrive at a Middle East settlement and of the Palestinian question in particular, including the Camp David summit, 1978; attempts to find a modus vivendi with Israel; the part played in the Organisation of African Unity; participation in the First Gulf 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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates should demonstrate a particularly sharp and argued focus on 'effectiveness' and, to an extent, success. There is, clearly a balance sheet here but a critical view might draw attention to the challenge to Egypt's position as leader of the Arab states by, at various times, Syria, Iraq and Saudi Arabia. The United Arab Republic project failed, the Sudan resisted union with Egypt whilst the assassination of Sadat struck a blow at the progress of a genuine reconciliation with Israel. On the other hand, it could be argued that Egypt had enjoyed considerable success in handling the Super Powers.

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.

## 5 How is the instability in the Horn of Africa in the period c. 1960–2000 best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required both in terms of the chronology and the region specified (Eritrea, Ethiopia, Djibouti, Somalia). In order to explain the instability in this region candidates may be expected to explore the following more general issues: climatic considerations, uncertain rainfall, desertification; famine (for example, in Tigre province which sparked insurrection and the deposition of Haile Selassie); authoritarian regimes (for example, Barre in Somalia and Mengistu in Ethiopia); corruption and economic mismanagement; tribalism. On a more specific level, among other issues, the following might be mentioned: civil wars with aid resources used to fund them; the rise in oil prices in 1973 which hit the poorest countries especially hard; the intervention of foreign powers (for example, the supply of arms to Mengistu by the USSR); Ethiopia's disputed frontier with Somalia and consequent warfare; wars of liberation by Eritrea (before independence in 1993) and Tigre; the flight of large numbers of Sudanese into Ethiopia in the 1990s; internal strife in Somalia, the dictatorial rule of General Barre and clan warfare after his fall.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here candidates will demonstrate especially sharp insights into the nature of the troubles of the region and will make clear distinctions between inherent, structural and impersonal issues on the one hand, and, on the other for example, the part played by individuals and particular events.

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.

**Section 2: West, Central and Southern Africa****6 How is the brutal exploitation of the Belgian Congo in the period c. 1879–1914 best explained?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Explanation for the exploitation is required rather than detailed description. The provision of some context will be helpful. The personal interest of King Leopold led to the formation of the International African Association in 1876, ostensibly for scientific and other forms of research into the region, and the services of Stanley were engaged in 1879. At the Berlin Conference in 1884, the Congo Free State was recognised. The brutal exploitation of the Congo is explained to a large extent by the personal ambitions of King Leopold. The Congo did not pass into the ownership of the Belgian government until 1908. Up to this point it was treated as the private estate of Leopold who created a personal fortune from a monopoly trade in ivory and rubber. The resolutions of the Berlin Conference on the treatment of native peoples were ignored. Administration was in the hands of Belgian officials over whom there was little control. The richness of the Congo's resources, not only rubber and ivory, but also a range of minerals offered great temptations for exploitation. Leopold was able to play off Britain and France thus consolidating his hold on the Congo. He was also able to exploit inter-tribal rivalries. After the Belgian government took over the administration in 1908 the more flagrant abuse were halted but a measure of exploitation remained and political rights were still withheld.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. A particular awareness of the relative importance of the issues should be expected. Candidates may also, in part at least, challenge the terms of the question. There was certainly extreme economic exploitation but strenuous efforts were made to end cannibalism, human sacrifice, the slave trade and inter-tribal warfare.

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.

## 7 Why, and with what consequences, were the British in conflict with the Boers in South Africa?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A strong focus on the demands of the question is required with a proper balance in the coverage of both aspects of it. Narrative accounts of conflict and wars will take answers only so far. Candidates may be expected to explain the context of the conflicting interests of the British and Dutch settlers at the beginning of the nineteenth century (after 1806), the Great Trek and the creation of the Boer republics of Transvaal and Orange Free State. Further tension arose over such matters as British expansion into, for example, Natal and responses to what was regarded as a threatening Zulu presence. In 1877 the Transvaal was annexed. This was followed by a Boer rising (the First Boer War) and renewed independence for the Transvaal in 1881. Candidates may point out, however, that independence was subject to certain limitations, for example, over the matter of foreign policy. Answers may then be expected to explore the new situation, with the potential for conflict, created by the Gold Rush of 1884 and the influx of 'Uitlanders'. This should be set alongside the expansionist policies of Rhodes. Candidates should be aware of and be able to explain the tensions which led to the Jameson Raid and, eventually, to the Second Boer War, 1899–1902. On the one hand Britain's policies between the Jameson Raid in 1895 and the outbreak of war could be seen as threatening the independence of the Boers. On the other, it may be argued that Britain's desire to safeguard the strategic position of the Cape was endangered by Boer hostility and fears were raised by the Kruger Telegram. Candidates should not engage in an account of the Boer War but should be aware of its significance and outcomes, for example, the death toll on both sides, the legacy of concentration camps, the annexation of Transvaal and Orange Free State with Boers becoming British citizens, the ultimate undermining of the popularity of the British Conservative government, the Union of South Africa in 1910.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may well be expected to enter into the debate about the responsibility of individuals for provoking conflict. Rhodes, Joseph Chamberlain, Milner and Kruger – their actions and motives bear a good deal of evaluation. How serious were the longer term consequences for relations between the British and the Boers? One area for exploration may be the attitude towards and part played in the First World War by Smuts and South Africans more generally.

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 overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

**8 Why, after independence, did some African states fall into the hands of dictatorial regimes? (Your answer should refer to at least two states).**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required: in chronological terms the period after independence, and upon dictatorial regimes. These may be regarded, broadly, as states which adopted one-party or military regimes (or, in some cases, both). Good answers should demonstrate an awareness of general explanations and of particular circumstances in particular states. Unadorned narrative is unlikely but, where it does occur, rewards should be modest. Candidates may be expected to explore some of the arguments, issues and explanations which follow, although the examples quoted are not exhaustive and others may well be used. The artificial nature of some African states (such as the Congo and Nigeria) as created by the European powers led to internal conflicts after independence and, hence, the emergence of dictatorial and/or military regimes. In some states delays in decolonisation (for example, by Portugal) intensified conflict and led to one party states (for example, Angola). Could democracy work where there were tribal divisions and strong regional differences? Zambia has over seventy distinct tribes for example. Anti-colonialist nationalist movements tended to favour the eventual triumph of one authoritarian party. In many states democratic and representative institutions were under-developed at the time of independence and this, allied to lack of training to produce widely based managerial and professional classes, led to power falling into the hands of small groups of politicians and soldiers. The availability of international aid, with insufficient control over its distribution and use, was a tempting prospect for greedy and corrupt cliques. A severe downturn in the economies of Africa in the 1970s, exacerbated by the oil crisis, gave opportunities to autocrats and soldiers. Useful examples of one-party states (although there are differences between them) are Zambia under Kaunda, Malawi under Banda, Kenya under Kenyatta and Tanzania under Nyerere. In some states authoritarian and/or one-party states were overthrown by military coups: Nkrumah in Ghana; Obote by Amin in Uganda. Further examples of military regimes can be found in Zaire after 1965 (Mobutu) and Guinea (where the authoritarian Marxist state was replaced after the death of Toure in 1984 by a bloodless military coup). One-party and authoritarian regimes were the norm in the newly independent former French colonies in Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Mauritania and Togo.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may perhaps critically explore the definition of ‘dictatorial regimes’, make distinctions between different forms of authoritarian rule and give examples of states which, for longer or shorter periods, did not have such an experience. Tanzania under Nyerere, it might be argued, was a one-party state but broadly enlightened and benevolent. In the period identified by the title some states, Kenya, for example, did not suffer seriously from tribal divisions. Distinctions should be made between one-party states such as Zambia and those dominated by outright tyranny such as Uganda under Amin and the Central African Republic under the Emperor Bokassa. Nkrumah, it might be argued, was an authoritarian rather than a dictator.

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.

## 9 Why was majority rule so long delayed in Southern Rhodesia/Zimbabwe?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Descriptive accounts of the process by which Southern Rhodesia/Zimbabwe achieved majority rule would meet the requirements of the question only in part. The focus of the chronology should be c. 1961–1980. Candidates should be aware of the context of the dissolution of the Central African Federation (CAF) and especially of the large white population of Southern Rhodesia as compared with Northern Rhodesia/Zambia and Nyasaland/Malawi. This caused real difficulties for the cause of majority rule especially when the formidable armed forces of the CAF, dominated by whites, fell into the hands of Southern Rhodesia. Candidates may also be expected to explore the following issues and explanations: both Conservative and Labour British governments were reluctant to use force and public opinion was generally opposed to fighting white Rhodesians ('kith and kin'); the economic sanctions imposed by Britain and the Commonwealth took a long time to bite; there were divisions among black leaders (Zapu and Zanu); Ian Smith showed great resolution/ruthlessness/skill including the declaration of UDI in 1965, in negotiation with successive British prime ministers and in arguing that majority rule would result in catastrophe as evidenced by the experience of Congo/Zaire and Uganda.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may be expected to explore, in some greater depth, the explanations for the successful and protracted defiance of the Smith regime and the dimension of 'so long delayed'. The role and motives of individuals such as Macmillan, Wilson and Heath may be expected to be evaluated more sharply.

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.

**10 How convincing is the view that the collapse of apartheid in South Africa was more the result of international condemnation than internal pressures?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. The formulation of the question demands an argued and evaluative approach and no set answer should be expected. There should be a balanced but not necessarily equal coverage between the two sets of explanations for the collapse of apartheid. A narrative of the development of apartheid and responses to it will meet the demands of the question only in part. As to chronology, the beginning of the premiership of Verwoerd (1958) to the release from prison of Mandela (1990) or his assumption of the Presidency (1994) might be a sound strategy, although a good deal of flexibility can be allowed. In terms of internal pressures the following might be considered. Opposition by blacks, coloureds and some whites to apartheid laws including the pass laws, segregation in housing, the Bantu Education Act and the Suppression of Communism Act. Specifically, the African National Congress and the Pan-Africanist Congress launched a mass campaign against the pass laws as early as 1960. More broadly, the role of Mandela, the National Action Council and the Spear of the Nation will need to be evaluated. The impact of particular events such as the Sharpeville Massacre (1960), the death of Steve Biko (1977) and unrest and violence in townships such as Soweto should be assessed. Changing attitudes and mindsets in the 1980s on the part of whites and the growth of a black middle class are also worthy of attention. The accession of de Klerk to the Presidency in 1989 and the release of Mandela may be seen to have exerted the final pressure. The issue of international condemnation may be addressed under the following main headings: economic sanctions imposed by the Commonwealth and United Nations; sporting sanctions and boycotts such as the exclusion of South Africa from the Olympic Games in 1968, the cancellation of the MCC cricket tour in 1966 as a result of the D’Olivera affair and abandonment of rugby football tours; boycotts of South African goods by individuals and groups; condemnation by writers, intellectuals and filmmakers.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and of differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may be expected to undertake an especially sharp evaluation of the relative importance of the factors and should recognise the difficulty in quantifying and assessing the effectiveness of some forms of ‘influence’, ‘opinion’, ‘condemnation’ and ‘pressures’.

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.

### Section 3: Themes: Africa, c. 1750–2000

#### 11 Evaluate the main strengths and weaknesses of any one sub-Saharan African state and society which you have studied in the period c. 1750–c. 1850.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Candidates will justify their choice and need to assess and evaluate strengths and weaknesses, using selected knowledge. ‘State and society’ need to be engaged, though not in equal measure, indeed they may merge in many answers. Factors that are likely to be considered: internal leadership, the extent of unity or disunity; inner divisions, tribal tensions; the nature of any economic activity; the openness to outsiders, the intrusions of such, the effects of intrusions; internal communications, travel, trade; cultural facets; vulnerability to epidemics (including cattle); population levels and losses; internecine and external-regional warfare.

The above can be related, for example, to the Muslim religious revival and its impact (e.g. Fulani, Futa Toro, Futa Jallon); Ashanti and Dahomey successes via the slave trade making for wealth and power; the disintegration of Oyo and Benin amidst violence and instability; the gains from the ivory trade in areas of Central and Eastern Africa; the deprivations of Arab slave trades on the Eastern coast; the presence of foreign (European) settlers amidst native peoples.

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. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The formulation ‘Evaluate ...’ invites assessment and judgement. Strengths may outdo weaknesses, or vice-versa; the quality of the argument is what matters here. It is for candidates to choose one appropriate area and assess its development in the period. Debate may take account of external factors and interventions as well as internal.

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.

**12 Assess the impact of the transatlantic slave trade in one region of Africa in the period c. 1750–c. 1850.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Candidates will choose the region and justify that selection in the manner of their developed response. Description of the slave trade is not required. Analysis and evaluation of impact are required, looking at regional outcomes.

Reference can be made to such factors as the triangular trade and its features; the effects on local leaders and élites, on tribes; the intrusions of and power of slave traders, their local agreements; population losses (individual, familial, nuclear); economic distortions from the losses of manpower, the arrival of monetary forms, bartering elements; the disruptions from foreign influences and exertions; the re-shaping of local cultures.

The trade was inaugurated by the Portuguese but extended by Dutch, British, French and other European nations, setting up their trading ‘factories’ along the coast. From 1470 to 1870 over 10 million Africans were transported from the West of Africa down to Angola, also from East Africa and Madagascar. The effects are debated: enforced demographic change was achieved [see also AO2]. Some African states gained in power and importance (e.g. Ashanti, Benin, Dahomey). Exploitation brought big profits to European slave traders and some local rulers. Cruelty, indignity, suffering, dislocation occurred; local political and cultural patterns were shaped, though much depended on the external of external influences and control.

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. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The formulation ‘Assess ...’ invites consideration of a range of factors, with a sense of relative importance but also an awareness of connections. Impact could be viewed as long-term and short-term. There is debate, of course, in this complex and controversial arena. Negatives are likely to be adduced but positives would be welcome, given some shift in historical opinions across time.

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.

**13 How are the motives for the ‘scramble for Africa’, on the part of the European powers best explained?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. ‘The scramble for Africa’ is usually dated in the period 1870s–1902 (or 1880–1913) and the European powers involved were many, though Britain, France and Germany are likely to figure prominently. A narrative or description of events involved, of expansion, colonisation and settlements is not required. Analysis and evaluation of a range of motives are needed, backed by selected examples. Many factors, often overlapping and interacting, were involved here: industrialisation and commercialisation in Europe required more, new markets plus raw material; social tensions at home were to be resolved by colonisation; strategic considerations (protection of trade routes and interests); military and naval power; the testing of new weapons platforms; initiatives of local agents (‘men on the spot’), often leading to conflict that required more support from their metropolitan bases; rivalries and desires to outdo rivals; religious zeal, missionary activity, the so-called humanising and civilising goals; the ‘white man’s burden’. Some aspects were planned (reference could be made to the big Conference of 1885), others unplanned; reference could be made to events and actions in 1879, 1881–2, 1893, 1896, 1898 across different parts of Africa, perhaps culminating in reference to the importance of the Boer War (1899–1902) and Moroccan crises (1905, 1911).

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. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The formulation ‘best explained ...’ invites assessment with a sense of relative importance of factors (motives here) but also awareness of links and connections. Evaluation of the intensity of the rivalries and of the competitiveness involved should be a feature of good answers. There is debate here and argument and counter-argument may feature, not least as to the prioritisation of factors and whether such varied at all according to place, time and European powers.

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.

**14 To what extent has the role of women in society been affected by colonialism and independence in the period c. 1900–2000? (Your answer should refer to at least two African countries.)**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A description of the lives of women is unlikely to secure much reward, unless there is some explanation offered. Attention and so evaluation need to be given to the effects as a result of both colonialism and independence, albeit not in equal measure. Given the datespan, knowledge will have to be selective and at least **two** countries used by way of exemplification.

Factors that can be assessed, including evaluation of similarities and differences, can be seen thus. In the Colonial arena, such as roles as servants, kept women, prostitutes; low-level economic employment; highly limited opportunities for any advancement; some limited educational and literacy gains; familial and marital status. In independence arena, any gains in rights and status, employment opportunities, education and literacy, local politics, familial conditions. Candidates can judge whether independence brought the benefits anticipated and claimed by some.

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. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. ‘To what extent ...’ opens up argument and counter-argument. The ‘role of women in society’ needs good focus and some range across colonialism and independence is expected; indeed, contrasts are expected here. It is possible to argue, for example, that colonialism was less disadvantageous than has been assumed and that independence rarely brought advantages, save for relatively few. Some reflection of recent thinking in gender studies would be welcome.

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.

## 15 How is the growth of African nationalism in the 1950s best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of events is possible here but will not suffice. Rather, analysis and explanation are required, drawing on a range of examples from the 1950s. Links to reactions to colonialism and imperialism and to independence movements are expected. African nationalism's roots go back to the effects of the partition of 1885 but it grew rapidly during and after the Second World War. A range of factors, internal and external, can be adduced here: rapid economic development in and after the War; consequent social changes; the wartime experiences of black soldiers; the humiliation of France and Italy; the educational experiences of members of the élites; the awareness of nationalism, identity, meaning; the examples of India and Indonesia; the U.N. conferment of independence on Eritrea and Somalia and later Libya created high expectations and fed activists; mass political parties (e.g. CPP, KAO, RDA) under a new generation of ambitious, vocal, sometimes charismatic leaders (e.g. Nkrumah, Sengar, Kenyatta, Torr , Nyerere) and older leaders (Houphuet-Boigny, Bourguiba); the weakening of European states, economically, militarily, politically; the role of the U.N.; pressures from the USA for decolonisation and an end to all old (and perceived bad) imperialist ways.

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. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The formulation 'best explained ...' invites assessment with a sense of relative importance of factors (reasons) but also an awareness of links and connections. Candidates can assess external alongside internal factors; or they may prefer one over the other. There is debate, for example, over the importance of examples and precedents in other parts of European Empires and also over the pressures from the USA. Then again, some see the Second World War and its damage to European states as paramount.

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.

**16 How effective was international aid in addressing the issues of poverty and economic development in Africa in the second half of the twentieth century?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A description of aid efforts may bring some very modest reward but assessment of impact and outcome is required; analysis and evaluation need to be delivered. Given the span of 50 years, supporting knowledge will be selective. Both poverty and economic development should be addressed, though not in equal measure; poverty may receive more attention.

Poverty can be linked to diseases and epidemics, human and animal (cattle especially), as well as to very low levels of economic activity, poor employment, poor educational standards (etc.). Economic development can be linked to aid packages – some designed to combat diseases, some to stimulate proper economic growth and structures – and their variable impact. Reference can be made to criteria such as GNP per head of population; literacy, infant mortality, birthrate and life expectancy; minimal sufficiency, absolute poverty, subsistence levels. By these criteria, lives got worse for so many, rather than better, and no matter the amounts of economic help pumped into economies. Reasons can be adduced, such as corruption, misappropriation, mismanagement, prejudices, the tendency to throw money at problems without thought, the absence of developed or developing economic structures, the effects of external and international economic and corporate activities, the effects of attempts at over-rapid modernisation and elements of social-socialist reforms. ‘Live Aid’ is a possible example area by way of a different approach to part of the question.

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. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. ‘How effective ...’ requires consideration of impact, levels with some sense of measurement criteria. There is argument here, with a view that such aid, either via national-based or truly international agencies, has achieved little, being littered with examples of corruption and misuse. Then again, there is scope for counter-argument, with some regional successes and some benefits from processes of economic modernisation.

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.

**Section 4: China****17 How successful were attempts at social and cultural reform in China in the period 1895–1911?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The question requires analysis and evaluation, not a description of attempted reforms. Some factual content is, of course, necessary, to support assessment of success. The context – political, military, diplomatic – defeat by Japan, imperialistic pressures from outside, the ‘battle for concessions’, the Boxer Uprising and subsequent heavy indemnity to pay, growing Japanese pressures, can be used to aid assessment and explain the attempts at reforms. Of course, ultimately, these attempts at reform did not prevent the Rebellion of 1911 and the fall of the dynasty.

Factors to consider here: the promotion of reforms in response to urgings of friendly foreigners as a key to survival; the abolition of the ancient examination system; attempts to create forms of representative provincial assemblies; attempts to improve education and free up elements of society; attempts to mix tradition and innovation; ideas for land reforms; a new spirit of reform and change, perhaps driven by a simple desire to survive. The scope as well as nature of reforms will need to be considered.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A good focus on ‘How successful ...’ is needed. Clearly, the reform programmes did not save the dynasty. Indeed, they accelerated a process of undermining the authority of the Imperial Court already underway. It can be argued that the reforms alienated important social and political groups, many traditional supporters (e.g. the gentry), without winning over support from new interests (e.g. those educated in foreign schools and countries). Overseas Chinese and students abroad were attracted to a genuine, if apparently ineffective, nationalist movement headed by Sun Yat-Sen.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**18 How valid is the judgement that the Chinese Revolution of 1911 was a failure?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative or description of the events of 1911 is not required. Rather good analysis and evaluation of the content, aspirations and outcomes of the 1911 revolutionaries are required here, with a sense of perspective and some clear terminal datespan offered.

The role, ambitions and ideas of Sun Yat-Sen may be examined: also the hopes and plans for widespread reforms, political, economic, social; nationalist aspirations as to new strength and assertiveness can be included; the role of Yuan Shikai; the emergent and conflict-ridden KMT; the beginnings of a modern industrial infrastructure, aided by foreign investment levels; the roles of the compradors; the importance of the 4 May 1919 demonstrations; the Comintern intervention and the founding of the CCP in 1921; the power and challenges of the warlords; the campaigns of the United Front forces and the inherent tensions, released from 1927–8, by when the 1911 Revolution seemed a distant memory.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A good focus on ‘How valid ...’ is required, opening up argument as to agreement or disagreement. A judgement is required, put in context and with a perspective beyond 1911–12. ‘Failure’ needs evaluation: for whom? In what areas? Full or partial? Because it led on to development of Communism? Led on to unleashing uncontrollable forces?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

## 19 Why was the Kuomintang unable to maintain itself in power in China?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of events is not required, unless there is decent explanation. Analysis and evaluation are required.

The KMT, no matter strenuous efforts (propaganda, bribes, sheer violence) failed to eradicate the CCP; indeed by the later 1940s the areas under the control were far smaller than when at a peak, c. 1927–34. Not even their efforts against the Japanese (now seen as significant in numbers and commitment) helped them after 1945.

Factors that can be assessed: Chiang's personal failings; the association of leadership and advisers with patent corruption; the over-dependence on control of towns and cities (creating the potential for a siege mentality later); flawed strategy and tactics against the CCP; misuse of American help and resources; the failure to defeat decisively the CCP in the mid-1930s; the distractions created by the Japanese invasion of 1937; the drawbacks in the uneasy 'alliance' with the CCP in fighting the Japanese; the effective ending of American aid c. 1946–7; Mao's leadership, the appeal of the CCP, their tactics (including 'hearts and minds', more effective propaganda); their expanded appeal and dynamism in the period 1945–9; their linkage of Communism to nationalism, so weakening KMT appeal.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Candidates will need to have a persistent focus on 'why' and balance KMT failings against CCP (growing) strengths, though coverage of the former is expected to predominate. There are arguments, of course, in essence whether the KMT contributed to its own defeat or whether Mao and his CCP became too powerful to stop. Some answers may make much of the contrasting personalities of Chiang and Mao as of the nature of appeal and support, above all amongst the middle classes and the numerous peasantry.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**20 How effective was the Communist government of China in dealing with the country's problems in the period 1949–1962?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative or description of actions will not go far, unless there is explanation. Analysis and evaluation are required. Answers will need to range from 1949 (the CCP takeover) to 1962 (the end of the 'Great Leap Forward', seen by many as a failure). They will need to consider aims and outcomes, so to measure effectiveness. Factors to be considered: the nature and range of the problems (political stabilisation; agrarian and industrial; the needs of control; social changes, commitment to reforms: education, women, for example). The nature and application of policies over these years, possible changes in policy direction, the pursuit of ideological goals, the influences of Mao and the CCP. Some consideration of the developing political controls exerted would be in order, though the likely thrust of answers will lie in associated economic and social areas such as attempts at land reforms and bettering the lives of peasants; communes; improving urban work conditions; controlling prices, wages, general economic activity; modernisation drives in industry, harnessing the vast labour pool and natural resources; the extent of help from the USSR; the progress and purpose of (including technical) education.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A good focus on 'How effective ....' is required, linking aims and policies to outcomes. Answers may well consider debates as to impact and success/failure levels and judge according to perspective (e.g. at the time, in Mao's lifetime; later, post-1976 and in the 1990s). It can be argued that Mao and the CCP created more problems than they solved, that personal ego and determination to retain power, control and root out critics, all got in the way of proper policy formulations; so, too, the attachment to true Marxist principles, amidst an essentially agrarian people, may have got in the way of success.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**21 'A capitalist wolf in sheep's clothing.' How far does this opinion explain the economic expansion of China after Mao?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of events will not answer the question. Analysis and evaluation are required, with a focus on the reasons for growth.

The implications of the quotation are that China adopted many of the dynamic features of capitalism (the wolf implies aggression and risk taking) while having a disguise, a façade of non-competitive economic development for the benefit of the people. “Socialism with Chinese characteristics” since 1976 has led to a large growth rate and has put China second in the world economy after the USA. By 2005 nearly three quarters of GDP was in the private sector with heavy industry, energy and utilities being controlled by the state. So in terms of strict capitalism, the quotation can be challenged, but there has been a shift to individual enterprise in services, lighter industries, finance. The growth of foreign trade has made China a major competitor to South Korea, Singapore and Malaysia – hence the ‘wolf’ because, perhaps of the mixture of entrepreneurial activity and state support in attracting foreign investment, introducing new management systems and providing investment in the infrastructure. Candidates could debate the balance between state and private input.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Argument and debate exist here. A good focus on ‘How far’ invites assessment as to the relative importance of the capitalist elements within a socialist appearance, or whether other factors such as population growth, foreign investment, Chinese business acumen are more important than this mixed economy.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**Section 5: The Indian sub-continent and Ceylon/Sri Lanka****22 The Indian Mutiny or the First War of Indian Independence. Which of these interpretations best explains the events of 1857?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of events will not answer the question. Analysis and evaluation are required, with a focus on the different possible interpretations. A mutiny suggests that the discontent was dominated by the army and puts the stress on short-term causes. These might focus on the army of the Bengal presidency who feared that their caste privileges, accepted by the Company before the 1840s, might be eroded. There were discontents specific to the army – low pay and an end to special money for service in the Punjab. Attempts to convert the soldiers were resented; there was also a fear of overseas service as travel on a troopship would mean caste pollution. The famous issue was the belief that the cartridges of the 1853 Lee Enfield rifles were greased with pork fat which upset Muslim soldiers or beef fat which upset the Hindu men. A wider analysis might consider more general causes which took the disturbances beyond a mutiny – the resentment of the ruling elites at annexation of states under the Doctrine of Lapse and disrespect shown by Dalhousie and Canning; cultural imperialism and the impact of reforms such as the abolition of Sati; a resentment of Company Officers privileged legal position as well as an awareness of economic exploitation. Economic discontents – high prices, the impact of British imports on local producers and land reorganisation – went beyond being causes of a mutiny. There may be discussion of how much political awareness there was and how much the disturbances were basically a form of protest.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Argument and debate exist here. A good focus on discussion of the relative importance of the army and the concept of mutiny against wider political, social and economic issues will be expected.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**23 Who made the greater contribution to Indian Independence, Gandhi or Nehru?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of events will not answer the question. Analysis and evaluation are required, with a focus on the different contributions of the two men. Gandhi offered the enormous spiritual attraction. Satyagraha combined political effectiveness with high moral authority. Gandhi's personal life style and his emphasis on Indian tradition purged of caste disunity gave the cause of Independence wide appeal internationally, made the British seem oppressive and eroded confidence in their authority. Congress became more than a political movement. Nehru offered a different type of appeal – he was Congress President as a young man in 1929; he had direct experience of administration in Allahabad in the 1920s and he had a more political, more 'modern' vision for India than Gandhi. Like Gandhi he was seen to suffer for the cause, but was perhaps a more calculating political figure – he preferred a more sympathetic view of the British struggle in World War II than Gandhi, through was imprisoned 1942–5. He also had travelled in Europe and was influenced by ideas of economic development and planning. It may be simplistic to set the visionary against the more practical man of politics, but this view could be considered. Nehru articulated the idealism which Gandhi's whole life represented. However, Gandhi's approach and tactics were deeply effective in political terms and some of Nehru's ideas were over-idealistic.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Argument and debate exist here. A good focus on discussion of the relative importance of the two leaders and their relative contribution to Independence, not just a character study of the men or similarities and differences in their backgrounds and careers to 1947, will be needed.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

## 24 Why, and with what consequences, was British India partitioned in 1947?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of events will not answer the question. Analysis and evaluation are required, with a focus on the different possible interpretations.

Why – candidates might consider the importance of political demands for partition which went back to conflict between Congress and the Muslim League. These went back at least as far as Muslim discontent to Congress rule in the 1930s. Jinnah and the League organised a Direct Action Day in 1946. The subsequent communal violence was the short-term trigger to an increased acceptance of partition, but the roots go deeper. The Sikhs also demanded an independent Sikh state. Demands for a partition might be linked to the expansion of nationalism in the post-war period; but partition also had to be accepted by the British. The question should not be focused generally on why the British left India but why they took up Partition. There was the hope that it could be achieved – there was a precedent, for example the administrative division of Bengal, and the Radcliffe commission was set up with hopes for a rational solution. At the back of this were the pressures on Mountbatten for a rapid solution and withdrawal.

Consequences. Immediately the communal violence and the huge movement of population – 4.5 m Muslims and 4 m Hindus. The million deaths caused by the way that Partition was effected make this a major tragedy. The long-term results offer the opportunity to use a wide range of material and could include the border disputes; the struggle over Kashmir; ongoing disputes between India and Pakistan; diplomatic alignments; subsequent split of East Pakistan and the problems of the huge physical and economic gulf between Pakistan and the future Bangladesh. There might be some awareness of the development of both Hindu and Muslim religious extremism as both saw co-religionists ‘oppressed’.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A reasonable but not perfect balance between discussion of causes and results, distinguishing between long-term and short-term, will be expected for higher marks.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

## 25 Why have India and Pakistan been so often in dispute in the period 1947–2000?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of events will not answer the question. Analysis and evaluation are required, with a focus on the different possible interpretations.

The actual wars between India and Pakistan took place in 1947 over a Pathan invasion of Kashmir which escalated into a conflict between India and Pakistan; 1965 after Indian retreat in an incident in the Rann of Kutch encouraged a full scale invasion of Kashmir by Pakistan in 1965 before the Tashkent agreement of 1966. Both these conflicts stemmed from claims to Kashmir which had considerable emotional significance and the possession of which had not been accepted in the 1947 partition. The situation had not been resolved by 1965 and some understanding of the context must be shown in order to explain the renewal of armed conflict – the US support of Pakistan; India's relations with China; the death of Nehru in 1964 and internal pressures on Ayub Khan. An independent Kashmir under Sheikh Abdullah would not have been a political possibility for India. The third conflict was different in nature, being related to the invasion of East Pakistan and the large number of refugees who came into India. India had Russian aid with the treaty of 1971 and trained the Mukti Bahini resistance forces in East Pakistan leading to a preemptive air strike by Pakistan and an Indian invasion. The short-term origins of these conflicts should be balanced against long-term features which have made settlement of the disputes difficult – the bitterness from the partition violence; the aid given by the superpowers to Pakistan and India which has resulted in a build up of forces predicated on future conflict; the political pressures on leaders in both Pakistan and India not to yield in border disputes and the growth of more extreme religious groups – Muslim fundamentalism and Hindu nationalism. Outbreaks of religious violence in both countries have kept the conflicts alive.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. This is a long period and better answers will be able to distinguish between short-term reasons for conflicts and longer-term conflicts which have made the resolution of those conflicts more difficult. More penetrating analysis will consider the disputes within the context of internal developments in the two countries and relate them to tensions and expectations going beyond the immediate causes of conflict, considering why their disputes have been ongoing.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**26 To what extent has India lived up to its reputation of being ‘the world’s largest democracy’?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of events will not answer the question. Analysis and evaluation are required, with a focus on the different possible interpretations.

Much depends here on a consideration of ‘democracy’. Simply in terms of maintaining free elections and not succumbing to periods of one party rule or ‘emergencies’, India has kept to procedures and elections have been a well-supported and important part of the life of post-war India. Mrs. Gandhi’s state of emergency proclaimed in 1975 which lasted until January 1977 did involve repression. However, this was the exception rather than the rule. If democracy is associated with guaranteeing the rights of all members of the national community, fair and equal administration, breaking down social discriminations then some discussion could take place about the success of India’s democracy. However, after the decline of the virtual monopoly of Congress, India did sustain a multi-party democracy; it could not keep all conflicts within the political arena, but politics has remained a means of expressing different views and the political process has been more successfully sustained in India than in other countries with ethnic and religious diversity and literacy problems. Candidates may approach this question in different ways and deploy a wide range of possible factual support. General elections took place in 1952, 1957, 1962, 1967, 1969, 1972, 1977, 1980, 1984, 1989, 1991, 1998, and 2004. These are listed not only for reference but to show the ongoing commitment to regular political consultation with the world’s biggest electorate.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Some discussion of the positive and negative aspects of political life is called for and some awareness of the implications of the term ‘democracy’. Better answers will offer a balanced discussion with reference to the period as a whole.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**Section 6: Japan and Korea****27 How significantly did the Meiji Restoration change Japan?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of events will not answer the question. Analysis and evaluation are required, with a focus on the extent of change.

The Meiji Restoration of 1868, with the capital moved to Tokyo in 1869, brought reform and consolidation: the 1871–3 tour of the world and the selective import of European and American ideas, economic and political models, all done with skill; the development of modern political parties in the 1880s and a constitution promulgated in 1889, with elections and an assembly following; more self-confidence and the renegotiation of existing treaties with western powers, leading to progressive gains in the 1890s and the removal of previously objectionable restraints; military and naval successes (1894) and assertion of status over China (1895), with a major indemnity gained and used to modernise her army and navy. The successful balancing of native, traditional Japanese interests and outlooks with judicious Western imports of ideas, skills, economic thinking and practices, should be a feature of evaluation.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Argument and debate exist here. A good focus on ‘How significantly ...’ invites assessment as to the extent and nature of changes in context. Emphasis does need to be placed on the pace, scale and character of changes (political, economic, military etc.), with an eye for the amalgam of native and non-native practices and ideas.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**28 What motives and influences lay behind Japan's aggressive foreign policy in the period 1931–1941?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of events will not suffice; explanation and evaluation are required. Focus needs to be upon 'motives and influences'. Foreign policy became demonstrably aggressive between 1931 (the invasion of Manchuria) and 1941 (the attack on Pearl Harbor and war with the USA).

Factors to be considered: the increasing domination and influence in Japan of the military with their agenda; the search for territory and resources; the plans to assert rights and to create a Greater Co-Prosperity area, under Japanese influence; traditional tensions with China; deteriorating relations with the USA, culminating in sanctions in 1940–1; a belief in inherent military and naval superiority; the possible narrow 'window of opportunity' believed to exist in 1941, to attack US naval power, to attack and seize territory, to secure a position before any US response could be formed.

Answers need to draw on a range of material from across the period. Excessive concentration on 1941 will not answer the question sufficiently; the attack on China in 1937 should receive good assessment.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this instance, motives and influences are linked. Candidates may consider the possible balance or imbalance between internal, domestic factors and pressures and external pressures or opportunities. They may assess the increasingly strident nationalism of Japanese leaders, linked to a belief in a natural right to dominance or else a fear that, if opportunities were not seized, any possible advantage would pass irrevocably from Japan. There was an element of high risk strategy involved by 1941, perhaps less so earlier on.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**29 How is the defeat of Japan in the Second World War best explained?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of events will need embedded explanation to merit reward. Analysis and evaluation are required here, with a strong focus on explanation. A range of factors can be drawn upon: leadership, above all military; strategy and tactics; over-stretch; lack of key resources; the power and strength (military, economic) of the USA; key battles (e.g. Midway, Guadalcanal, Coral Sea, etc.); the nature of campaigns in different areas and terrains; the consequences of the failure to deliver a decisive knock-out blow on the USA's naval-airpower. Comparison of Japanese and above all American assets and resources would be useful, though the emphasis should be on the Japanese dimensions. A focus on 1944–5, when the Japanese were on the retreat, would be acceptable, though reference to earlier key moments is expected also. Candidates distinguishing between longer-term and short-term defeat factors would be helpful, though a focus simply on 1945 (e.g. A-Bombs) would be too narrow.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The formulation 'best explained ...' invites an examination of reasons, a sense of relative importance, some prioritisation, though there should be awareness of connections. Candidates may emphasise external factors more (for example, USA resources and strength), though consideration of internal Japanese factors will be needed (as above in AO1). There is scope for debate here. Did the Japanese failure stem from the early failure to destroy all aspects of American naval and airpower? Did the military command stretch itself too far? Were economic resources ultimately crucial? How did initial Japanese advantages and strengths become dissipated? Was a particular campaign area crucial, a turning point?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**30 'An economic giant but a political pigmy.' How accurate is this view of post-war Japan's international role?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A description of political and economic developments will not yield the answer required unless there are analytical features. Good analysis and evaluation will deliver, assessing 'giant' set against 'pigmy' – a view with which many may agree (but see AO2 below). Factors that can be assessed in the context of the defeat, American occupation and organised constitution and political order; economic factors would include the need to rebuild much of the economic infrastructure, allowing for a new start and new technologies and skills; the development of entrepreneurial talents, the growth of big companies, a keen capitalist spirit, a sense of opportunism; neutrality and a mixture of externally- and self-imposed restraint, local and regional vision, non-militarism; ability to spot and act on global developments, breaking into a wide range of markets; developing modern business ideas, good work ethic, commitment of managers and works to corporate success; active governmental backing. World status came from industrial success, productive capacity, international trading acumen, often leading to tensions with the USA and the EU.

No specific dates are given, so candidates can range across the years, though it is likely that they will focus on the period of real economic dominance (1960s–1980s).

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'How accurate ...' invites debate, argument and counter-argument. A sense of the international scene and features will help as will a good focus on the economic and political, though not in equal measure. Indeed, it is likely that the former will receive preferential treatment in evaluations offered. Candidates may well focus on the 1960s and 1970s when economic success was very potent if uneven at times, though they will need to convey a sense of range, hopefully being aware of further changes in the 1980s and especially 1990s. Japan's economic superpower, world power status was founded on economic success; she lacked some of the characteristics of the major superpowers. A limited defence capability, the renunciation of nuclear weapons, dependence on foreign sources of energy and raw materials, contribute to evaluation here.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

### 31 Why did war break out in Korea in 1950?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of the war is not going to be relevant. So, too, a narrative of the background will not really answer the question. Analysis and evaluation of causes are required. A good focus on ‘Why ...’ is required and candidates may well assess long- and short-term causes such as the legacy of 1945; the onset of the Cold War; the nature of the divisions of North and South Korea; the effects of the Communist takeover in China of 1949; the aspirations of the North Korean leadership; (role of Kim Il Sung); perceptions of South Korean weaknesses and so opportunities for attack; (role of Syngman Rhee); dissatisfaction with the post-War settlement; ideological and strategic factors; pressures from China and the USSR on North Korea; belief that the USA would not react quickly or decisively to North Korean aggression.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Candidates may well relate material to various debates and issues, with a persistent sense of ‘Why ...’. It can be argued, for example, that the Korean War emerged logically out of the Cold War or out of localised political issues that became all too easily internationalised. Then again, the roles of both Mao and Stalin may be considered as crucial, with both (perhaps Stalin above all) pushing the North Korean leadership under Kim into aggression. Again, it is possible to argue that the South Korean leadership had a part to play: Rhee, arrogant, manipulative, dictatorial, may have provoked Kim into an attack, expecting US intervention and so a rollback of the North.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**Section 7: South East Asia****32 Why did France fail to maintain its hold on French Indo-China?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A good focus upon reasons is necessary. A pure narrative of events will not answer the question – unless there is a causal narrative. The dates involved are likely to be 1945–54 and the defeat at the hands of the Vietminh, leading to the Geneva Peace Conferences and the division of Vietnam.

Factors to be assessed: the legacy of the Second World War and its changed international climate; anti-imperialist sentiments, not least fostered by the USA (its general attitude to empires); a lack of help from the USA; China under Mao after 1949; the strengths gained by the Vietnamese Communists during the War and the leadership and focus of Ho Chi Minh; a comparison of Vietminh and French strategy, tactics and uses of resources; French errors; a possible lack of political commitment from successive French governments.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A good focus upon ‘Why ...’ is required here and causal factors could be both long-and short-term. There are various areas of debate that can be evaluated in explanation. For example, emphasis could be placed on the strengths of the Vietminh or on the weaknesses (and errors) of the French; emphasis could be placed on the lack of significant US help to the French.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

### 33 How similar was post-colonial political and economic development in Malaysia and Indonesia?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of events is not required; even with some explanation, it is unlikely to score very well. Analysis and evaluation are needed, preferably based around a comparison of features and issues involved. Focus is upon the post-colonial and treatment of both political and economic developments is required, though not necessarily in equal measure. Malaya gained its independence from Britain in 1957 (the Federation of Malaysia being set up in 1963) and Indonesia from the Netherlands in 1949. There had been a Federation of Malaya since 1948 with legislative and franchisal features and a dominance of Malays. From 1948–1960 a state of emergency held in place as British forces dealt with Chinese-backed Communists. From 1945 to 1949 Dutch forces tried to regain control over the Indonesian territories but ultimately recognised independence in 1949.

The Malaysian Federation (minus Singapore, 1965) has enjoyed successful leadership (e.g. Tunku Abdul Rahman) and stable political life, in the main. Its economic growth has been strong, based on rubber and tin, then technological and financial services. Compared to much of Indonesia, living standards and per capita wealth have been decent. Indonesia has been dominated by the strong dictatorial rule of Sukarno and then Suharto, pursuing strongly anti-Communist lines. Political order has been controlled with rigid controls and censorship, police activities, human rights abuses. Economically, great disparity over the territories making up the United States of Indonesia has been experienced: modernisation; capitalism; industrialisation; much poverty and backwardness in many areas. Early democratic efforts (1949–59) gave way to military, authoritarian based solutions and economic chaos on occasions. Ethnic tensions inside the Indonesian lands have been matched at times by those inside Malaysia, given economic and language policies favouring the Malays.

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. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. ‘How similar ...’ invites comparison, comparative analysis of key features. Good answers will offer decently developed levels of such analysis. A sense of contextual factors would be welcome and some imbalance of coverage would be acceptable if candidates wish to focus their evaluation on one area more than the other. Political as against economic development may be assessed: it is possible to argue the former was minimal (by Western standards), the latter the greater.

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.

**34 Why, and with what results, has the military been so significant a political force in Burma in the period 1948–2000?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of events after independence in 1948 is not required and would need good explanation to merit some reward; analysis and evaluation are required. Given the continuation of military rule and contemporary events, concerns and tensions, the question has a wide time span.

There are two parts to the question, though each does not require equal treatment. The very start to independence was troubled and communist groups plus ethnic minorities demanding separation mounted serious challenges in 1948–9. Prime Minister U Nu did achieve some stability but the army under General Ne Win intervened in 1958 and again, decisively, in 1962. He upheld a Marxist-based ‘Way to Socialism’ and in 1974 the Socialist People’s Republic appeared. Military rule had replaced attempts at proper, democratic, parliamentary forms of government with such institutions eroded. Consequently, results have embraced harsh military rule, censorship and other controls, crackdowns on dissent (above all the long-standing pro-democracy movement), abuses of human rights; international condemnation at times but no decisive sanctions or similar actions, with friendly neighbours at times or major Western Powers being prepared to back the military rule, or else turn a blind-eye to its abuses. References to the developments of the 1980s, including student unrest and severe military repression, the role then and later of Aung San Suu Kyi and her democracy movement, the military junta’s actions and the entrenchment of the political role of the armed forces in the constitution, may well be prominent.

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. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. ‘Why, and with what results ...’ sets up two parts to the question, though equal treatment is not required; the best answers will probably blend the two and offer reasoned analysis, cause and effect. ‘So significant’ should be considered – role, place, power, importance. Contextualisation will help, though internal focus is necessary. Candidates may examine personalities, structures and the interesting tie-up of military rule and socialist ideas (as above).

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.

### 35 Why was the North Vietnamese state able to defeat the policies of the United States in South Vietnam?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of the Vietnam War is not required, unless it has causal elements. Analysis and evaluation of a range of factors are required.

The focus of the question is upon ‘Why ...’ and upon ‘the North Vietnamese state’ and this needs to be borne in mind in reading responses. Although USA perspectives and the international context of the Cold War will be assessed, a good focus upon North Vietnam is needed in a good answer.

Comparisons would work and could well help towards a strongly successful answer, allowing for the above proviso. Factors here: North Vietnamese strengths in morale, commitment, leadership, harnessing of resources, responses to US tactics (bombing, interdiction of the Ho Chi Minh Trail, etc.); support for the North from USSR and China; the NVA activity in the South and links to the role there of the Vietcong, methods and tactics; the successes of guerrilla warfare; South Vietnamese weaknesses, military and political (corrupt, unpopular governments); US failings in strategy and tactics (firepower dependence, ‘hearts and minds’, etc.); anti-war movement in the USA and pressures on politicians; the importance of 1968 and the Paris Peace talks.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Argument and debate are expected here. There has been and remains plentiful historical debate. For example, it can be argued that the USA lost the war, rather than that the N.V.A. and V.C. won it; or else that the weak South Vietnamese governments were crucial; or else that the North Vietnamese commitment and ‘win-at-all-costs’ mentality were decisive. The handicaps that the US military believed they operated under may have been very significant. A consideration of ‘policies’ will be useful here: these could pre-date the military intervention of 1965 and so embrace military advisers, economic aid, backing for (unpopular, narrow-based) South Vietnamese governments.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**36 By what means, and with what success, did China seek to extend its influence in South East Asia in the period 1949–2000?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. There are two parts to the question, though equal treatment is not expected. A narrative is not required and will not suffice unless there is at least an attempt to relate it to the terms of the question. Analysis and evaluation are required. Given the time span some selectivity of knowledge is required here. The effects of the Communist Revolution of 1949 should be noted, linked to the leadership and diplomacy of Mao and his successors.

Methods would embrace diplomacy; agreements (military, commercial); economic and military aid; support for Communist groups and fighters; conflict. The on-going question of Formosa (Taiwan), the role in the Korean War, conflicts with India and indeed Russia, involvements in the long Vietnam Wars and in Laotian and Cambodian affairs are likely to figure; so, too, economic aid to some regimes, negotiations (with Burma, for example), the resolution of the Hong Kong leasing issues, technological growth, economic power and ‘muscle’ can be engaged. Dealings with USA (uneven but with the Nixon initiatives prominent), with Australasian powers and U.N. interests in the area could all be considered as to methods and outcomes.

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. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. ‘By what means, and with what success ...’ requires coverage of methods as well as outcomes. Consideration can be given to the balance between diplomatic and non-diplomatic methods and to that between different levels of outcome: economic strength; military might; status at the U.N.; standing as a major influence over South East Asian affairs. Ideological momentum and motivation may also be assessed. Debate surrounds several areas: the ideological, the geopolitical; the ability to intrude into perceived power vacuums; the links to the massive economic expansion of China (the ‘tiger economy’ par excellence).

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.

**Section 8: Themes: Asia c. 1750–2000****37 Why was China vulnerable to Western encroachment in the nineteenth century?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative or description of Western encroachments will not satisfy the requirements of the question. Rather a good analysis of reasons is required, with a focus on ‘vulnerable’. Responses will consider internal factors as well as Western opportunism and strengths, but with the former predominant.

Examples of Western encroachments, successes and gains on land and at sea and in trade can be given. Provocations to Western Powers encouraged more intervention and exploitation.

Issues that can be assessed: internal Chinese weaknesses, divisions (e.g. the major internal rebellion of 1850–64); regionalism; a weak Imperial Court; the attractions to some of admitting Western influences and resources, often leading to mishandling of Western ideas and technologies; the strengths of Western responses to perceived Chinese provocations (1839–42, 1860); the effects of growing Japanese strength; the build-up to the Boxer Uprising.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question invites causal explanation. The use of ‘vulnerable’ opens up debate as to the balance between internal and external factors. A sense of how far Western Powers (and indeed Russia) were able to use Chinese weaknesses to seize lands and resources and to gain favourable trade agreements would be helpful to argument. The failure to recognise that the challenge from the West differed from any previous external threat can be seen as important; so, too, what was seen as obstructionist Chinese officialdom by foreign traders and indeed diplomats could be assessed in context here.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**38 To what extent did the growth of the East India Company's power in India depend upon the weaknesses of the princely states?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The chronological focus may be expected to range from c. 1700 to 1857. A narrative or description of the growth of the commercial, financial and territorial power of the East India Company will meet the demands of the question only in part. The approach should consist of an analytical and balanced exploration of a range of relevant factors. The weaknesses of the princely states, their rivalries and their susceptibility to manipulation, as well as alliances with Europeans (British and French) should have a prominent focus. Important here is the collapse of Mughal central authority in the middle years of the eighteenth century and the consequent rivalries and independence of various claimants as successors. This at first proved of benefit to the French but was later exploited in turn by the British. Examples of particular princely states will be helpful. Other factors to be assessed might include: the weakening of the Dutch and Portuguese positions by the early eighteenth century; the overthrow of French influence and subsequent territorial expansion in the later eighteenth century; the role of individuals such as Clive and Hastings; the successful quelling of the Marathas; the administrative reforms of the later eighteenth century and the interventionist policies of the British government, including the creation of the Board of Control; the settlement of the north-western frontiers in the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries and further territorial expansion; the development of an Indian civil service and army.

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 arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. The question invites comparison of sets of relevant factors and the development of argued judgements as to their relative importance. Candidates should recognise, too, that the relevant factors are often interconnected and that this forms an important dimension to the argument. They should also be aware of the lengthy time span and that there is change and continuity in terms of the influence of the various issues at work. It should also be recognised that the East

India Company itself suffered from serious weaknesses, for example, the corruption and financial difficulties of the late-eighteenth 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.

**39 How is the failure of successive attempts to impose a foreign authority on Afghanistan best explained (You may confine your attention to either the nineteenth or the twentieth century if you wish)?**

\* example of focus on twentieth century

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The dates embrace the Soviet commitment of troops (invasion) in 1979 and Gorbachev's decision to pull out, after considerable manpower, material and financial losses. A narrative of events is not required and will not provide the necessary analysis of reasons – though a causal narrative could work. Candidates will need to draw upon a chronological awareness for their supporting material.

Factors to be considered here: leadership; command and control; strategy and tactics; over-reliance on firepower and elements of technology; unease over the terrain; problems in handling guerrilla operations; over-dependence on big strategy bases; the qualities of the Mujahideen; a failure to win over the people; costs; losses; domestic pressures; the changes once Gorbachev came to power, with a clear desire to placate the West; USA-CIA support for the Mujahideen.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A good focus upon 'How ...' is important here; so, too focus on 'impose its authority' (i.e. control winning hearts and minds). There are several possible angles to explanation and evaluation: it can be argued that the Soviets ignored past history and never became familiar with terrain and peoples; that they did not adjust to the needs of guerilla warfare; that they became involved in their own version of the Vietnam War ('The USSR's Vietnam'); that resources were misapplied; that USA help for the Mujahideen was crucial. The context of the Cold War and the growing pressures on the USSR would merit consideration.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**40 How is the rise and growth of the ‘tiger economies’ of Asia best explained? (Your answer should refer to at least two Asian countries.)**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A description of ‘tiger economies’ is not required and will not merit much reward unless there is evident explanation. Analysis and evaluation are required. ‘Rise and growth’ need assessment, though not necessarily in equal measure and the linkage of the two will be a feature. **At least two** countries should be used as examples – Japan, South Korea and China are the likeliest. Common features, comparisons, would help analysis.

Originally, Singapore, Taiwan, South Korea and Hong Kong were seen as the four ‘Pacific tiger economies’. China now (alongside India) would be seen as the pre-eminent example. GNPs were comparable to those of many Western economies, if not greater. Newly industrialised countries competed strongly in world export markets because they attracted firms from Europe taking advantage of much cheaper labour; low production costs, low unit costs, low wages, long work hours, a lack of regulatory controls over working conditions, all helped; these economies could sell their goods at lower prices and the quality of such goods was often such to match those of Europe and the USA. Profit margins were good; investment levels strong; modernisation was made at pace; government support and favourable attitude helped further. Entrepreneurship, good corporate identities and objectives, high morale, absence of bad industrial relations were further factors. Output levels were high; foreign markets were attacked, at times flooded; increasingly, Asian companies bought into or bought up Western companies. Educational standards, literacy, awareness of scientific and technical potential, an ability to adapt Western ideas and techniques, to copy and develop core skills, all were further factors.

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. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The formulation ‘best explained ...’ invites a sense of relative importance of factors (reasons), though awareness of links and connections should be evident. There is scope here for some debate as to explanation areas. Did these economies emerge as a result of post-colonial developments? How much did they depend upon real innovation as against successful re-cycling and use of existing ideas and techniques? How important have been the low wages, long hours, low unit costs? How far have respective governments encouraged such growth by their policies?

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.

**41 Assess the impact of Islamic fundamentalism upon the internal affairs of any two post-colonial Asian states.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Candidates need to offer assessment; analysis and evaluation are required, not a narrative of events or a description of features. The emphasis is upon explanation. **Two** states should be featured and similar or different features can be considered. ‘Internal affairs’, ‘post-colonial’ need to be prominent in assessment here. ‘Impact’ will need good and sharp focus in evaluation levels. ‘Islamic fundamentalism’ will need some assessment: religious, social, ethnic, perhaps political; possible shaping of society and its laws and structures; the extension of harsher rules and regulations; involvement in government; opposition to government; terrorist activities and challenges in the name of Islam. Impact can be considered at a positive and also a negative level.

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. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. ‘Assess ...’ opens up consideration of a range of factors, with a sense of relative importance but also an awareness of connections. There is much (contemporary) resonance here, with considerable debate. Answers may wish to focus on the social and legal or on the more political and terroristic. How far has this force re-shaped societies? How far has it demanded changes of political stance and methods of rule? How far has it challenged old elites and socio-political orders?

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.

**42 How importantly has the role of women been affected by colonialism and independence in the period c. 1900–2000? (Your answer should refer to at least two Asian countries.)**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Candidates will need to be selective in their use of knowledge and make use of **at least two** countries. Description will not go far, unless there is some explanation. Rather, analysis and evaluation are required, with a good focus upon both colonialism and independence, though not in equal measure. Candidates may favour one more than the other in their line of argument.

Likely areas for consideration include: In the colonialist era, attitudes to women as servants and workers; inter-marriage; racial stereotyping; economic status and roles were at a lower level; an absence of status and rights, save on very rare occasions. In the independence era, attitudes changed, though not necessarily strongly; some limited sense of rights and status appeared (sometimes within a Communist context); some greater role in the higher levels of economic and business activity; some recognition politically but limited governmental roles. Similarities as well as differences can be assessed: legal status; wages; employment opportunities; familial and marital features; educational standards; literacy levels; urban and rural models and features. Candidates can judge whether independence brought any discernible changes in attitudes and roles, or not.

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. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. ‘How importantly ...’ sets up both argument and counter-argument. Some of the issues raised in the assessment of Q.14 apply here as well. There is scope for debate. As above, it is possible to argue that colonisation was less disadvantageous than has been assumed and that independence intensified rather than resolved problems. Counter-argument is possible. Some reflection of recent thinking in gender studies would be welcome.

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.





UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/05A**

Paper 5a Special Subject: The Norman Conquest, 1051–87

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN PAPER

**2 hours**

---

**READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST**

Answer Question 1 and **one** other question.

The number of marks is given in brackets [ ] at the end of each question or part question.

You are reminded of the need for analysis and critical evaluation in your answers to questions. You should also show, where appropriate, an awareness of links and comparisons between different countries and different periods.

---

This document consists of **4** printed pages.



**Answer the following question.**

**Nominated topic: The Reign of Edward the Confessor: the crisis of 1051–2**

1 Study all of the following documents and answer all the questions which follow. In evaluating and commenting upon the documents, it is essential to set them alongside and to make use of your own knowledge.

**A** *A contemporary author, sympathetic to the cause of the Godwine family, comments on events in 1051.*

When King Edward returned from Francia, men of that nation accompanied him. And these he enriched with many honours, and made them his privy counsellors and administrators of the royal palace. Among them was Robert of Jumièges who, they say, was always the most powerful confidential adviser of the king. [Because of] him the king began to neglect more useful advice. Hence he offended quite a number of the nobles of his kingdom. [Since] the good king lent his ear more to the rival party, the earl suffered a defeat [over the archbishopric of Canterbury].

His ambition satisfied, Robert began to provoke and oppose the earl with all his strength. However, [the issue that] that certain lands of the earl ran with some that belonged to Christ Church, served to direct the hostile movements into a cause in which right was on the bishop's side. The active earl suffered peaceably the rash fury of the bishop, both for the sake of the king's honour and because of the innate character of his family. Robert asserted to King Edward that the crime of his brother's death was perpetrated on the advice of the glorious earl and persuaded him that Godwin was planning [Edward's] ruin. [The] guiltless earl was forced into banishment. Yet the archbishop, in order that not a single member of the earl's family should remain at the king's side to provide for the country's well-being, [ensured] that even the queen should be separated from the king. [She] was in all the royal counsels, as we might say, a governess and the fount of all goodness, strongly preferring the king's interests to power and riches.

*The Life of King Edward, chapter iii, composed c. 1066–75.*

**B** *An author, probably John of Worcester, comments on the events of 1051, but from a different standpoint.*

[Following the Dover incident] Godwine was excessively angry that such things should happen within his jurisdiction. He therefore collected a very large force. Sweyn did likewise and Harold. King Edward therefore sent to Leofric and Siward and entreated them to come quickly with all the men they could collect. At first they came with only a few men, but finding out how things stood, they assembled a large army. Meanwhile [the Godwinist] forces [were] threatening war unless [Edward] gave up Count Eustace and his companions and also the Normans and the men from Boulogne who held the castle at Dovercliff. For a time the king was in great distress, not knowing what to do, but when he found that [reinforcements] were coming in, he stoutly [refused]. [So] excited were [his troops] that, if the king had permitted it, they would immediately have attacked Earl Godwine's army.

*'Florence of Worcester', Chronicle, composed in early-twelfth century.*

- C** *A chronicler, probably based at Worcester, reflects on key moments in the crisis of 1051.*

[Godwin's disgrace] seemed remarkable because he had been exalted so high even to the point of ruling the king and all England, and his sons were earls and the king's favourites, and his daughter was married to the king. Then forthwith Count William came from overseas with a great force of Frenchmen, and the king received him.

*The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, version 'D', composed later in the eleventh century.*

- D** *A compilation of sources, probably from the mid-eleventh and early-twelfth centuries, mentions the outcome of the crisis in 1052. Version C emanates probably from Worcester.*

Then Godwine was given [back] his earldom and all his sons [theirs]. And they confirmed full friendship with them. And they outlawed all the Frenchmen who had promoted injustices and passed unjust judgements and given bad counsel in this country.

*The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, versions 'C' and 'D'.*

- E** *A modern historian comments on the significance of the crisis of 1051–2.*

The story of 1051 is complicated by the existence of two contemporary narratives which take the same facts from different angles. These stories show at least the general development of a crisis which greatly impressed contemporaries, and through its results became one of the ultimate causes of the Norman invasion of 1066. The crisis marks an important turning-point in the Confessor's reign. It established the house of Godwine so firmly that neither the king nor any rival family could ever dislodge it. It reduced the Normans in England to political insignificance, and thereby decided that, if the Duke of Normandy was ever to become King of England, it could only be through war. Godwine brought the country to the verge of civil war at a time when there was grave danger from abroad. The campaign by which Godwine forced himself back on a reluctant king was an encouragement to every lord with whom the king was at variance and, by its revelation of English naval weakness, to every foreign ruler with designs on the English Crown.

*Sir Frank Stenton, Anglo-Saxon England, 1971.*

- (a)** How far does Document B corroborate Document A in helping to explain the divisions inside England in 1051? [10]
- (b)** How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that the crisis of 1051–2 and its outcome demonstrated Edward the Confessor's poor judgement and lack of authority?

In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as all the documents in this set (A–E). [20]

**Answer one of the following questions.** *Where appropriate, your essay should make use of any relevant documents you have studied as well as contextual knowledge.*

- 2 'Luck was the key to William's success in 1066.' How far do you agree? [30]
- 3 'Old structures but new personnel.' How accurate is this view of the government of England under William I? [30]
- 4 How great were the changes made to the Church in England after 1066? [30]

---

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

University of Cambridge International Examinations is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/05A**

Paper 5a Special Subject: The Norman Conquest, 1051–87

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

**2 hours**

---

**MAXIMUM MARK: 60**

---

This document consists of **6** printed pages.



- 1 (a) How far does Document B corroborate Document A in helping to explain the divisions inside England in 1051? [10]

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues should be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation. Comments upon tone, language, reliability and typicality will aid evaluation, with especial focus upon provenance issues. Both Documents focus directly upon the nature of the crisis of 1051–2, but they differ according to partiality and tone. Both suggest a noticeable depth of division. Document **A** is partial to Godwine, reflecting its author's pro-Godwinist sympathies and sentiments. Document **B**, written later, takes a harder line towards the family. Document **A** points up Robert of Jumièges' hostility to Godwine, explaining the injustices meted out to the latter (though he sees some right with Robert in property dispute); **B** reveals Godwine's hostility towards Eustace and other foreigners (the Dover affair). **A** has much good to say of the Earl, while **B** points up support for the King's stand, suggesting the imminence of civil war. **A** seeks to justify the family position, power and status, seeing them as effectively blameless, while **B** sees the reverse, indicating hostility to that very same power and its usage by the Earl and his family.

- (b) **How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that the crisis of 1051–2 and its outcome demonstrated Edward the Confessor’s poor judgement and lack of authority?**

**In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as all the documents in this set (A–E). [20]**

The answer should treat the documents as a set and should make effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It should be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material should be handled confidently with strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument should be well constructed. Historical concepts and vocabulary should be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected. A good focus on the terms of the question and so the argument advanced is important here. Edward’s lack of judgement and authority needs to be assessed against other factors surrounding the crisis of 1051–2; consideration needs to be given to the outcome and aftermath as this affected Edward’s position and powers. Document **E** provides a sound overview, with links to the other Documents. There is plenty of apparent evidence to support the argument, but the evidence is not all one-sided. Documents **A**, some of **B**, **C** and **D** seem to offer support to the view, with links to **E**, while parts of **B** and some of **E** offer an alternative view, albeit with the suggestion in **E** that Edward’s authority was never the same again, indeed the outcome left the kingdom vulnerable. **A** shows Edward neglecting good advice, offending some nobles by listening too much to Robert of Jumièges, sidelining Godwine, the most powerful nobleman, believing Robert’s accusation that Godwine was responsible for the death of Edward’s brother. The accuracy of all this may be challenged on the grounds of partisanship and from topic knowledge. **B** reflects Godwine’s anger, directed at the King, over the Dover incident. Candidates may know that, according to one version of the ASC, Edward ordered Godwine to ravage the Earl’s own lands. This obviously reflects on the King’s authority and judgement. There is mention that Leofric and Siward came to the King’s aid, at first with a few, then with more, men; confrontation and war seemed likely. Edward is said to have stood up to Godwine and refused his demands. **C** emphasises the fall and disgrace of the Godwine family – albeit temporary – and introduces the issue of the succession (‘Count William came ...’). Knowledge can link to that area as to the presence of Norman-French influence in the kingdom. By **D** Edward’s position has collapsed and that then links to the tenor of **E**, again linking to the future succession issues. In all, these Sources can be interpreted as reflecting a genuine, possibly strong, desire by Edward to be rid of Godwine influence and assert his own authority, but the very fact that this did not happen over time shows poor judgement as well as a lack of real support (or did the nobles not want to fight for fear of the damage done to the realm’s stability?). Own knowledge of 1051–2 will be used; so, too, evidence of Godwinist ambition (plenty of opportunity for development there); also, consideration of the events of 1051–2 as precipitated by Edward’s decision to bequeath the Crown to William. Subsequent developments can be used for perspective: Edward’s apparent lethargy and lack of prominence, the advance and power of Harold and his impact; the crises of 1057 and 1065; the apparent strengths of the kingdom’s government and even economy.

**2 'Luck was the key to William's success in 1066.' How far do you agree?**

**[30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative or description of events in 1066 will not secure much reward unless related to explanation (e.g. causal/narrative). The emphasis needs to be upon analysis and evaluation. Knowledge of events and the Battle of Hastings will be used to illustrate and support analysis. Importantly, this is not a question on the succession issue, and it is difficult to believe that an essay largely devoted to that matter could really answer the question. A full narrative account of the events of 1066 might offer enough of an implicit answer to the question to merit some reward. Essays answering the question 'Why did William win the battle of Hastings?' which are effectively limited to the battle itself and have just the odd comment on 'luck' will probably also gain limited reward. Answers offering a supported explanation of why William was successful, with the strong ones focusing substantially on the role of luck (which may, however, perfectly properly be rejected as the key to William's success), will merit much more. It is perfectly reasonable that the battle itself should loom large in answers, but a variety of other factors can be brought into play, including the strength of the rival claims; other demands on, or threats to, Harold and his supporters; William's careful preparations; the role of the weather; ill- or well-judged decisions; the Papal banner; the possible strength of the Norman-French forces and the unity provided by William's effective command and control; the possible weaknesses of Harold's position and forces, his exhaustion after fighting in the North, his over-eagerness to join battle.

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. Where appropriate, essays may make use of any relevant historical documents studied. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The formulation of the question invites argument and counter-argument, with some sense of relative importance and ordering of factors but with links appreciated. For some, luck has been seen as very significant. But others stress Harold's problems of over-stretch and exhausted forces (etc.), while others see William's abilities as a tactical battlefield commander as the key.

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects].

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.

**3 'Old structures but new personnel.' How accurate is this view of the government of England under William I? [30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A description of the workings of government will not suffice. Analysis and evaluation are needed here. Knowledge will be used to illustrate and aid explanation. One would not want to be too prescriptive about the matters to be covered, but it is difficult indeed to think that an essay which ignored the institutions of either central government (insofar as this can be said to have existed) or local government could achieve decent reward. A range of institutions/structures are potential to the answer here: the 'justiciarship' (to use later terminology), the multifaceted role of the household and its officers, the sheriffs, local government officials below the sheriffs, even honorial administration. Some candidates may introduce matters such as writs, coinage and law: although discussion of none of these is required, their deployment is perfectly acceptable and should be credited. Expect more on 'structures' than 'personnel', while bearing in mind that *some* discussion of both is necessary for a good, higher reward. Examples of Anglo-Saxon survivals will be important as will examples of Norman-French imports and key personnel, especially at the mid to higher levels of government. There may be focus on, for example, the writing office and the treasury, the use of Latin, formulae used in documentation, devices used to project the royal will, evidence from Domesday Book, charters and writs. A sense of change over time (the importance of the 1070s, the deaths of Anglo-Saxon personnel, etc.) will help in evaluation.

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. Where appropriate, essays may make use of any relevant historical documents studied. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The formulation 'How accurate ...' invites debate, argument and counter-argument. Some would argue that it is very accurate and the Normans simply intruded new masters and leaders, showing flexibility and adaptability. But some believe there was quite substantial change, while recognising that the Normans saw the advantages of areas of existing machinery. At core here is an on-going debate about how much the Normans effected change after 1066. Some argue that Norman personnel were intruded at all key levels; others that Anglo-Saxons remained of some importance at lower levels (e.g. hundredal).

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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.

**4 How great were the changes made to the Church in England after 1066?****[30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A description of the changes will not suffice, rather there needs to be explanation, analysis and assessment. Knowledge will be used to illustrate the extent and nature of changes. A brief survey of the key features of the late Anglo-Saxon Church would be in order, but best delivered by direct linkage to the issues of change and the extent of change. Much can be covered here, including relations with the papacy, the issue of the primacy, changes of episcopal and abbatial personnel, diocesan reorganisation, parishes and archdeaconries, church courts, and, generally, 'reform'. In all these matters – and there are more – conclusions are, of course, up to the candidates; there are no 'right' answers. Again, answers might consider the context (state of late Anglo-Saxon Church, continental developments) and the prevalence of Anglo-Saxon ecclesiastical personnel at the lower levels of the Church. Lanfranc may well figure prominently; so, too, his relations with William I in forging a strong, loyal church. But Lanfranc should not predominate and this is not a question about Lanfranc's role per se. Examples of key personnel (bishops, abbots) would be useful; so, too, of conflict areas (often monastic). An awareness of areas and practices, including veneration of saints, that were retained from Anglo-Saxon times would be useful. Attention may be given to the extent of new, European practices imported under Lanfranc. Consideration may be given to change over time – slow and measured, sudden and hectic.

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. Where appropriate, essays may make use of any relevant historical documents studied. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The formulation 'How great ...' opens up a debate, offering argument and counter-argument. Many would say the changes were fundamental and massive, a real 'top-down' re-structuring, with a focus on bringing the Church much closer to Continental standards and practices. But some point to the levels at which changes operated (top v. bottom) and note Lanfranc's use of some Anglo-Saxon practices and personnel. Again, at core here is the debate as to the extent of changes wrought by the Norman Conquest.

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/05B**

Paper 5b Special Subject: The Crusades, 1095–1192

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN PAPER

**2 hours**

---

**READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST**

Answer Question 1 and **one** other question.

The number of marks is given in brackets [ ] at the end of each question or part question.

You are reminded of the need for analysis and critical evaluation in your answers to questions. You should also show, where appropriate, an awareness of links and comparisons between different countries and different periods.

---

This document consists of **3** printed pages and **1** blank page.



**Answer the following document question.**

**Nominated topic: The First Crusade**

- 1 Study all of the following documents and answer all the questions which follow. In evaluating and commenting upon the documents it is essential to set them alongside, and to make use of, your own contextual knowledge.

- A** *A French chronicler, who was chaplain to Raymond of Toulouse and present on the First Crusade, describes the fall of Antioch on 3 June 1098.*

Forced to retreat, the thwarted Turks spurred their steeds so hurriedly that all plunged together from the rocky cliffs. The fatal plunge of the Turks was indeed a pleasant spectacle for us . . . We shall not comment upon the amount of booty, but you may believe whatever comes to mind and compute more. . . . The city of Antioch fell on the third day of June, but it had been under attack from around October 22 of the preceding year. Our troops refrained from taking the citadel while they examined and took inventory of the spoils; and further oblivious to God, the bestower of so many favours, they gourmandised sumptuously and splendidly as they gave heed to dancing girls. On the third day thereafter the crusaders were besieged by the pagans; and thus it happened that they, who had laid siege to Turkish Antioch through God's compassion, now found themselves hemmed in by the Turks through His will.

Raymond of Aguilers, *Historia Francorum*.

- B** *An anonymous follower of Bohemund of Taranto, whose chronicle may be based on a form of diary of the events of the First Crusade, gives his account of the victory over Kerbogha, 28 June 1098.*

At last, after three days spent in fasting and in processions from one church to another, our men confessed their sins and received absolution, and by faith they received the Body and Blood of Christ in communion and they gave alms and arranged for masses to be celebrated. Then six lines of battle were drawn up from those who were in the city. . . . There also appeared from the mountains a countless host of men on white horses, whose banners were all white . . . The Turks fled in terror and we pursued them right up to their camp, for the knights of Christ were more eager to chase them than to look for any plunder . . . The Armenians and Syrians who lived in those lands, hearing that we had overcome the Turks, killed any of them whom they caught. We returned to the city with great rejoicing, praising and blessing God who had given victory to his people.

*Gesta Francorum*.

- C** *A Muslim chronicler who wrote in the early-thirteenth century, but based much of his work on earlier sources, offers his account of the discovery of the Holy Lance.*

There was a holy man who had great influence over them, a man of low cunning, who proclaimed that the Messiah had a lance buried in a great building in Antioch: 'And if you find it you will be victorious, and if you fail you will surely die'. Before saying this he had buried a lance in a certain spot and concealed all trace of it. He exhorted them to fast and repent for three days, and on the fourth he led them all to the spot with their soldiers and workmen who dug everywhere and found the lance as he had told them. Whereupon he cried 'Rejoice! For victory is secure'. So, on the fifth day they left the city in groups of five or six . . . When all the Franks had come out and not one was left in Antioch, they began to attack strongly, and the Muslims turned and fled. This was Kerbogha's fault, first because he had treated the Muslims with such contempt and scorn, and second because he had prevented their killing the Franks. The Muslims were completely routed.

Ibn al-Athir, *The Perfect History*.

- D** *A letter from the crusading leaders to Pope Urban II, in September 1098, as recorded by Baldwin of Boulogne's chaplain.*

Meanwhile, with the kindest mercy of Almighty God watching over us and assisting us we found the Lord's lance with which the side of our Saviour was pierced by Longinus. It was revealed three times to a certain servant of God by St. Andrew the Apostle who showed him the place where the Lance lay in the church of the Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles. Confronted by this discovery and by many other divine revelations, we were so strengthened that we who had previously been dejected and timid now most bravely and promptly urged each other to battle.

Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolymitana*.

- E** *Writing some seventy years after the event, the Archbishop of Tyre presents his evaluation of the Holy Lance episode.*

At this time, the matter of the lance which had been found at Antioch again came up. Was it in truth that which had drawn forth blood and water from the Lord's side, or was the whole thing a fraud? The people had grave doubts on the subject, and the leaders were also much perplexed. Some declared that this was the actual weapon which had pierced the side of the Lord when He hung upon the Cross and that by divine purpose it had been revealed for the inspiration of the people. Others said it was merely proof of the count's cunning, a fraudulent trick devised for his own advantage.

William of Tyre, *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum*.

- (a)** How far, and in what ways, does Document E corroborate the views expressed in Document C? [10]
- (b)** How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that the success of the Crusaders at Antioch is chiefly explained by their piety and religious devotion?

In making your evaluation you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as all the documents in this set. (A-E) [20]

**Answer one of the following essay questions.** *Where appropriate your essay should make use of any relevant documents you have studied as well as contextual knowledge.*

- 2** How is the failure of the Second Crusade best explained? [30]
- 3** To what extent did the survival of the Crusader states depend upon the Military Orders? [30]
- 4** How far can the limited success of the Third Crusade be explained by the departure of Philip Augustus from Outremer in August 1191? [30]

**BLANK PAGE**

---

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

University of Cambridge International Examinations is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/05B**

Paper 5b Special Subject: The Crusades, 1095–1192

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

**2 hours**

---

**MAXIMUM MARK: 60**

---

This document consists of **6** printed pages.



- 1 (a) How far, and in what ways, does Document E corroborate the views expressed in Document C? [10]

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues should be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation. Document C seems to take the story of the Holy Lance at face value. Peter Bartholomew, not named but described as a 'holy man', (although of 'low cunning') is the finder of the Lance and the author gives a detailed account of the search and discovery and the effect on the Christians. However, he does not necessarily ascribe the Christian victory to the discovery but more to the mistakes made by the Muslims under Kerbogha. There is corroboration in E but the author, William of Tyre, gives no details of the search and discovery. He is open-minded, sceptical even, as to the authenticity of the Lance. He, like the author of C, refers to the element of cunning but this is ascribed to Count Bohemund rather than to Peter Bartholomew. He makes no mention of the effects of the discovery of the part possibly played by the Lance in the Christian victory. In terms of evaluation candidates may point out that the accounts were written well after the events, although Ibn al-Athir used earlier sources and William of Tyre has a high reputation as an historian. Both, given their respective faiths, can be said to show considerable objectivity.

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that the success of the Crusaders at Antioch is chiefly explained by their piety and religious devotion? [20]

The answer should treat the documents as a set and should make effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It should be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material should be handled confidently with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument should be well constructed. Historical concepts and vocabulary should be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected.

This set of documents should be seen in broad context. The Crusader army arrived at Antioch on 21 October 1097 (it was important as the key to North Syria and the seat of a Patriarchate). Antioch was ruled by a Seljuk emir but its population was largely Armenian and Greek Christians. The Crusaders, although suffering from famine, mounted a lengthy siege and on 3 June 1098 were let into the city by an Armenian captain, Firouz. Almost immediately the Crusaders were besieged in Antioch by a Muslim army under Kerbogha of Mosul. On 26 June a decisive battle outside the walls ended in a Crusader victory. Some of the events are outlined in Document **A** which, as far as explaining Christian success is concerned, simply records a Turkish disaster. Documents **C**, **D** and **E** all give substantial attention to the matter of the Holy Lance. **D** is unequivocal in testifying to it inspiring religious zeal and raising morale in preparation for battle. Although **D** gives some detail about the discovery of the Lance it is non-committal as to its efficacy but has other explanations for Frankish success. **E** is sceptical but does not entirely dismiss the Lance and there may be an implicit indication of its possible inspirational qualities. Of the five documents, **B** and **D** provide the strongest evidence for piety and religious devotion. In **B** the Crusaders confess their sins and attend Mass and are further inspired by a vision during the battle itself. **D** goes somewhat beyond the impact of the discovery of the Lance and mentions 'many other divine revelations'. In explaining the success of the Crusaders, candidates should set the documents alongside their contextual knowledge and may be expected to mention such issues as crusader morale and Muslim divisions and mistakes. There are references to these factors in the documents but expansion is required. Crusader leadership is to be emphasised, in particular that of Bohemund at Antioch, and also the importance of chance (the crusaders being admitted into the city by Firouz and the late arrival of Kerbogha, for example). The documents can be evaluated by reference to authorship, dating, provenance and purpose.

**2 How is the failure of the second Crusade best explained?****[30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is a set of explanations for the failure of the Second Crusade rather than, say, a detailed coverage of its causes and/or a narrative account of its course. Nevertheless, a brief explanation of the context of the Crusade may well help answers. It was provoked by the capture of Edessa in December 1144 by Zengi of Mosul. The first crusading Bull was not issued until December 1145 and was reissued in March 1146 when St. Bernard of Clairvaux preached the crusade at Vezelay. The cross was taken and the Crusade led by Conrad III and Louis VII who set out, separately, in early summer 1147. It might be argued that the delayed response to the fall of Edessa affected the chances of a successful outcome, especially since Zengi had died in 1146. Divided leadership and later recriminations undermined the enterprise. The march to the Holy Land took its toll: Conrad was heavily defeated at Dorylaeum in October 1147 and three months later fell ill and had to return to Constantinople. Meanwhile, the Crusaders blamed the Byzantines for limited help, for example, an inadequate supply of ships. Once arrived in the Holy Land there were differences in opinion as to the objectives of the Crusade. Aleppo might have proved a sensible target but, in the end, the catastrophic decision to attack Damascus was taken and the conduct of the campaign once arrived there proved disastrous. An underlying current which undermined the Crusade was the difference and disputes between the resident and crusading Franks. Meanwhile, on the Muslim side, there was greater unity than at the time of the First Crusade and Nur ed-Din proved a formidable adversary.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may be expected to sharpen the argument by evaluating the relative importance of the issues.

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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.

### 3 To what extent did the survival of the Crusader states depend upon the Military Orders?

[30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates should know what the Orders were: the Templars and Hospitallers were both founded in the reign of Baldwin II and the Teutonic Knights during the Third Crusade. Omitting coverage of the last is not a serious matter and to a very large extent the first two can be treated together. Candidates should recognise that a shortage of manpower was a constant problem for the Crusader states. This was made more acute as the Muslim states surrounding the Franks became more united under Nur ed-Din and Saladin, and by the geographical configuration of the states. To put this into further context, as a way of demonstrating the importance of the Orders, the rulers of Outremer fell back on a defensive policy of fortified castles and cities. Even so the strain of providing garrisons, and from time to time a field army, was great. Before Hattin, for example, garrisons were stripped to put soldiers into the field but once the army was destroyed fortifications were defenceless. By the second half of the twelfth century the military force of the Crusader states was some 1,200 knights and 10,000 sergeants, a force which had to provide a mobile army as well as garrisons. The size of the combined forces of the Orders cannot be determined exactly but it may have almost matched these numbers. For a major expedition against Egypt led by King Amalric, the Hospitallers alone promised 500 knights and 500 turcopoles. The contribution of the Orders was not just a matter of numbers. They provided trained fighting men – knights and sergeants – who were in a constant state of readiness and could be deployed at short notice and in emergencies. Not only this but they built and manned castles of their own and defended and patrolled border areas. The power and influence built up by the Orders in the West enabled them to funnel resources to the East. It has been estimated that one third of the wealth of the Hospitallers was transferred to Outremer. By as early as the 1130s, then, the Crusader states were deeply reliant upon the Orders. As to the extent of this dependence, no set answer is to be expected. It is the quality of the argument that should be rewarded.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates should be aware of other factors which enabled the Crusader states to survive for as long as they did. These include further Crusades after the first and a stream of 'visiting Crusaders' and armed pilgrimages. At the same time, the presence of the Orders was not an unmixed blessing. They had great independence, rulers were sometimes forced to accept their advice or have policy dictated. At times the Orders acted irresponsibly, for example, the almost suicidal conduct of both Orders at the Springs of Cresson in 1187 and the advice given to King Guy before Hattin. There were clashes, too, between individuals, for example, the personal enmity between the Grand Master of the Templars, Gerard de Ridfort and Raymond, Count of Tripoli. Candidates should be expected to have a particularly sharp focus on 'survival' and be able to argue this through.

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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.

**4 How far can the limited success of the Third Crusade be explained by the departure of Philip Augustus from Outremer in August 1191? [30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Entirely narrative approaches are unlikely. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument that should be rewarded. There is a case for arguing that Philip's departure undermined the Crusade or that it made further success unlikely. Some of Philip's followers and supporters left him but by no means all. Philip's stay in Outremer was short but, at least, Acre had been taken before he left. It might be argued that Richard's unease at Philip's departure caused anxieties about the fate of his own Angevin lands in his absence and led him to cut short his own stay. On the other hand, Philip's departure left an undivided command over the army (although it was not entirely unchallenged) and control of negotiations with Saladin. Whilst both Richard and Philip were present they quarrelled over a number of issues and especially over support for the rival claims of Conrad of Montferrat and Guy de Lusignan. Besides the issue of Philip's departure, candidates will need to consider some other issues in order to achieve a balanced argument. It might be argued, for example, that the long siege of Acre sapped the strength of the Crusade. Although both Philip and Richard took the cross at Vezelay in July 1190 it was a further year before either arrived in Outremer. The Third Crusade suffered a tremendous blow from the death of the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa. His prestige and leadership could have united the Crusade and led it to greater success whilst much of his army broke up after his death. With larger and more united forces could the ultimate goal of the recapture of Jerusalem have been achieved?

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. There are good opportunities here for candidates to assess the relative importance of the relevant factors. In addition, candidates might choose to challenge the terms of the question. Did the Crusade only have 'limited success'? How limited is 'limited'? Acre was taken and fortified, Richard's coastal campaign and his victory at Arsuf won valuable territory, Ascalon was made into a formidable stronghold, Cyprus had been taken by Richard en route to Outremer and was of enormous importance for the future, a treaty was made with Saladin, Jerusalem was not retaken but perhaps Richard was wise not to try. Once taken could it have been held?

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/05C**

Paper 5c Special Subject: The Reign of Henry VIII, 1509–1547

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN PAPER

**2 hours**

---

**READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST**

Answer Question 1 and **one** other question.

The number of marks is given in brackets [ ] at the end of each question or part question.

You are reminded of the need for analysis and critical evaluation in your answers to questions. You should also show, where appropriate, an awareness of links and comparisons between different countries and different periods.

---

This document consists of **3** printed pages and **1** blank page.



**Answer the following question.**

**Nominated topic: The accession of Henry and the Wolsey years to 1529**

- 1 Study all the following documents and answer all the questions which follow. In evaluating and commenting upon the documents it is essential to set them alongside and to make use of your own contextual knowledge.

- A** *A member of Wolsey's household gives an account of the Cardinal's wide-ranging activities and responsibilities.*

He would most commonly stay awhile at a bar made for him a little beneath the Chancery and there commune sometime with the judges and sometime with other persons. And that done he would repair into the Chancery, and sit there until eleven of the clock, hearing suitors and determining of divers matters. And from thence he would divers times go into the Star Chamber, where he spared neither high nor low, but judged every estate according to their merits and deserts.

Thus in great honour, triumph, and glory he reigned a long season, ruling all thing within this realm appertaining unto the King by his wisdom, and also all other weighty matters of foreign regions with whom the King and this realm had any occasion to intermeddle. All ambassadors of foreign potentates were always despatched by his discretion, to whom they had always access for their dispatch.

George Cavendish, *The Life and Death of Cardinal Wolsey*, written 1556–58.

- B** *The Venetian ambassador reports on the conduct of affairs in England.*

The Cardinal of York rules both the King and the entire kingdom. On my first arrival in England he used to say to me, 'His Majesty will do so and so'. Subsequently, by degrees, he forgot himself and began saying, 'We shall do so and so'. At this present he has reached such a pitch that he says, 'I shall do so and so'.

He is about 46 years old, very handsome, learned, extremely eloquent, of vast ability, and indefatigable. He alone transacts as much business as that which occupies all the magistracies, offices and councils of Venice, both civil and criminal; and all state affairs are likewise managed by him. He is thoughtful and has the reputation of being extremely just: he favours the people exceedingly, and especially the poor; hearing their suits and seeking to dispatch them instantly.

Tomasso Giustiniani, *Letter*, 1519.

- C** *The papal legate in England assesses Wolsey's position on the matter of the divorce proceedings between Henry VIII and Queen Catherine.*

As far as I can make out the Cardinal is actually not in favour of the affair, but your lordship can be sure that he would not dare to admit this openly, nor can he help to prevent it; on the contrary he has to hide his feelings and pretend to be eagerly pursuing what the King desires. I talk freely with the Cardinal, since I know his opinion is as I have described it. In the end he shrugs his shoulders, and says there is nothing he can say except that the only course open is somehow to satisfy the King whatever the consequences, since in time some remedy will be found.

Cardinal Lorenzo Campeggio, writing on 9 January 1529.

- D** *Wolsey's biographer reports the Cardinal's deathbed conversation with Sir William Kingston, Constable of the Tower, who had been sent to escort the Cardinal to London in November 1530.*

'Well, well, Master Kingston', quod he, 'I see the matter against me how it is framed. But if I had served God as diligently as I have done the King, he would not have given me over in my grey hairs. Howbeit, this is the just reward that I must receive for my worldly diligence and pains that I have had to do him service, only to satisfy his vain pleasures, not regarding my godly duty. Wherefore I pray you with all my heart to have me most humbly commended unto his royal majesty, beseeching in my behalf to call to his most gracious remembrance all matters proceeding between him and me and the progress of the same. And most chiefly in the weighty matter yet depending (meaning the matter newly begun between him and good Queen Catherine) – then shall his conscience declare whether I have offended him or no.

*George Cavendish, The Life and Death of Cardinal Wolsey, written 1556–58.*

- E** *A modern historian analyses the relationship between Henry VIII and Wolsey.*

Wolsey was accused of being a 'one-man council', and of monopolising access to the king. What Wolsey did do was to manage the council on the king's behalf. Henry intervened from time to time as he felt inclined – and sometimes showed surprising knowledge of the issues – but by and large he let the cardinal get on with it. Wolsey decided who did what, reserving for his own attention issues such as foreign policy, and the need to raise additional funds. He often used his own servants, when he should have used the king's, and this was an issue that left him vulnerable to criticism. Wolsey is even alleged on one occasion to have used the revealing phrase 'I and the king' but he was never as all powerful as his detractors chose to believe, and after 1525 the king's confidence in him became increasingly uncertain. What he also did for Henry, and with the latter's full approval, was to increase the authority of central government.

*David Loades, Henry VIII, 2007.*

- (a)** How far does Document B corroborate the account of Wolsey's work habits as presented in Document A? [10]
- (b)** How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that the relationship between Henry VIII and Wolsey was that of master and servant? [20]

**Answer one of the following questions.** *Where appropriate your essay should make use of any relevant documents you have studied as well as contextual knowledge.*

- 2** How significant was the role of Thomas Cromwell in carrying out the Breach with Rome? [30]
- 3** How are the religious policies of the last decade of Henry VIII's reign best explained? [30]
- 4** To what extent was the Pilgrimage of Grace driven by political rather than religious considerations? [30]

**BLANK PAGE**

---

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

University of Cambridge International Examinations is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/05C**

Paper 5c Special Subject: The Reign of Henry VIII, 1509–1547

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

**2 hours**

---

**MAXIMUM MARK: 60**

---

This document consists of **5** printed pages and **1** blank page.



**1 (a) How far does Document B corroborate the assessment of Wolsey's work habits as presented in Document A? [10]**

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues should be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation. Document **B** certainly makes clear that Wolsey worked very hard, although there is clearly a large element of exaggeration, as well as giving an indication of the breadth of his responsibilities and, indeed, their importance. Document **A** paints the same picture of a hard-working Cardinal, but is much more specific about his work in the Chancery and Star Chamber and with foreign ambassadors. Both draw attention to Wolsey's work on behalf, and concerns for the suits, of the poor. Both mention the dominant position Wolsey occupies ('rules both the king and the entire kingdom' in **A** and 'ruling all thing within this realm' in **B**). As to critical evaluation, candidates may wish to assess the degree of exaggeration shown by both authors as well as their credentials as observers and witnesses.

**(b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that the relationship between Henry VIII and Wolsey was that of master and servant? [20]**

The answer should treat the documents as a set and should make effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It should be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material should be handled confidently with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument should be well constructed. Historical concepts and vocabulary should be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected. There is a good debate here. Candidates should make use of their contextual knowledge, alongside these documents, in order to explore the extent to which Wolsey depended upon the King for his appointment, promotion and continuation in office. Did Wolsey, for example, have a 'constituency' of his own or was his dependence on the King complete? Was there a difference in the relationship as between the beginning of Wolsey's ministry (the Cardinal an older man, the King relatively inexperienced and perhaps diverted by pleasure and recreation) and the end (as the King grew in experience and was pursuing a matter so close to his heart – the Divorce)? To what extent, as it has been argued, was the King content to leave domestic affairs in Wolsey's hands whilst showing more interest in matters of war and foreign policy? How far and how frequently did the King intervene, for example, over the Amicable Grant? In debating the central issue as to whether Wolsey was a kind of 'alter rex' or simply the King's servant, candidates should evaluate the documents as to dating, authorship and purpose. Of the five documents, **B** gives the strongest impression that Wolsey was something more than a servant ('he rules both the King and the entire kingdom' and 'I shall do so and so'). A similar, although less strong impression is given in **A**. Document **B** certainly refers to the earlier part of Wolsey's ministry and **A** may well do so. The well-known passage from Cavendish (**D**) recording Wolsey's death-bed speech demonstrates Wolsey's own recognition of his dependency upon, and indeed devotion towards, the King. This is corroborated by **C** and candidates should pick up on the significance of the reference in both **C** and **D** to the importance of 'the King's Great Matter'. Document **E** provides a balance: of the large measure of Wolsey's independence over a wide range of matters of state, domestic and foreign, whilst pointing out that the King did intervene as he saw fit, and that after 1525 the King's confidence in the Cardinal was less certain. Candidates might make reference to **C** and **D** with regard to this last point whilst, elsewhere in **E**, the phrase 'I and my King' has echoes in **A**.

**2 How significant was the role of Thomas Cromwell in carrying out the Breach with Rome?** [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is upon the Breach with Rome, rather than upon Cromwell's religious and ecclesiastical policies after, say, 1536. The visitation and dissolution of the monasteries could be made relevant but this should be handled with care in terms of the question. The question is concerned with 'carrying out' the Breach but an assessment of Cromwell's influence upon the King would certainly be relevant; the concentration need not be entirely upon policies and measures. Some brief account of the position before Cromwell became the King's chief minister in 1532 would be helpful, as would a short review of Cromwell's accumulation of offices and thus of power and influence. By the time Cromwell came to office the Reformation Parliament had already been summoned (with Cromwell as an MP) and some anti-Church and anti-Papal measures had been taken. How far, then, did the position change after the accession to power of Cromwell and how decisive and effective was his role? Among the measures associated with Cromwell, candidates may be expected to deal with the following (whilst assessing Cromwell's role rather than giving a plain account): the Submission of the Clergy; Act in Restraint of Appeals; Act of Succession; Act of Supremacy; Treasons Act; Act for the Submission of the Clergy; Act in Absolute Restraint of Annates; Act Extinguishing the Authority of the Bishop of Rome. Candidates need not be expected to know the precise titles or contents of these measures but should recognise their broad direction, and intent (and, above all, Cromwell's part in them). Particular attention might be given to the preamble to the Act in Restraint of Appeals where England is defined as 'an Empire' governed by one 'Supreme Head and King'. More widely, candidates may well deal with Cromwell's role in managing Parliament and also his orchestration of propaganda and use of a 'police' system.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. There are good opportunities here for exploring and evaluating the historiography. Candidates are most likely to present the Elton thesis of the difference the arrival of Cromwell made, how he presented the key to unlocking the King's problem, his role as a 'constructive revolutionary', his introduction and use of the concept of Imperium. The best answers will give due weight to Elton's challengers. How far were concepts and ideas about the Supremacy and Imperium already current before Cromwell's arrival? What other influences were at work on Henry VIII (for example, the work of Christopher St. German, the *Collectanea satis copiosa* and the Boleyn faction). Did Cromwell have a monopoly of influence over the King? And there should, of course, be a particularly sharp focus upon 'how significant'.

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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.

### 3 How are the religious policies of the last decade of Henry VIII's reign best explained? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. The focus must be on religious policies although this can be stretched to include what might, strictly, be called ecclesiastical policies. There can be some flexibility in terms of chronology (last decade) and a starting point in 1537 (in the aftermath of the suppression of the Pilgrimage of Grace and the beginning of the surrender of the greater monasteries) would be acceptable but 1536 would make better sense. The thrust of the question is to suggest explanations for the adoption of radical measures in the later years of Cromwell's ministry and the extent of their abandonment for more conservative policies (even before Cromwell's fall). Among the factors at work, candidates may be expected to explore the following: the influence of Cromwell and his later fall; the search for allies among the Lutheran princes; the King's inherent conservatism over doctrinal matters; the attempt to conciliate Charles V and to move back to more traditional pro-Habsburg and anti-Valois policies; the possible influence of the Howard faction after Henry's marriage to Catherine Howard; the personal influence of Cranmer upon Henry and of Catherine Parr. In considering measures and policies answers may be expected to deal with the following: the Ten Articles and Cromwell's Injunctions (both in 1536); the dissolution of the greater monasteries; the advancement of radical clerics; the Bishops Book (1537), although candidates will need to link it to the Ten Articles; Cromwell's Injunctions of 1538 including provisions for the placement of the Bible in English in churches; an attack on 'superstitions' and the destruction of shrines; the Six Articles of 1539 (which mark a clear move towards conservatism and which provoked the resignations of Shaxton and Latimer); the attempt to restrict access to the Bible and the King's Book (both 1543); the burning of Anne Askew (1546).

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here candidates should be sharply aware of the nature and extent of changes in religious policy and the relative importance of the factors which brought them about. They should also recognise the unevenness of the process, that there was not a straightforward progression from radicalism to conservatism, for example: the Royal Supremacy was maintained (even though Henry continued to receive the traditional Mass); there were further editions of the Great Bible and the English translation was still to be placed in parish churches; the King's sixth marriage was to a woman of reforming sympathies; an English litany was introduced; before the end of the reign the dissolution of the chantries was being contemplated.

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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.

**4 To what extent was the Pilgrimage of Grace driven by political rather than religious considerations? [30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is, the motives which lay behind the Pilgrimage of Grace. Since the question asks ‘to what extent’, a good balance is required between political and religious explanations, and to give the answer further perspective candidates may well address social and economic considerations. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. On the religious side, candidates may see the Pilgrimage as a response to an attack on traditional beliefs and practices, to the dissolution of the smaller monasteries, and Cromwell’s Injunctions of 1536. The rising was represented as a ‘pilgrimage’, the rebels adopted the banner of the Five Wounds of Christ and took a religious oath. The insurgents demanded the restoration of Papal authority and the condemnation of a range of heresies. Similarly, the advancement of ‘heretical’ bishops was denounced. Benefit of clergy was to be upheld. As political motives, answers might be expected to quote resistance to the subsidy of 1534 (being collected in 1536) and the grievances surrounding the Statute of Uses. Among the rebel demands was the restoration of Princess Mary to the succession, reform of elections for knights of the shire and burgesses, that a Parliament be called at Nottingham or York and that the Statute of Treasons (‘for words’) be repealed. Moreover, it could be argued, any large confiscation and redistribution of land and wealth (as entailed by the dissolution of religious houses) was bound to have political repercussions. As to economic and social issues answers may be expected to refer to the economic and social distress feared as a result of dissolution, grievances over enclosures, the poor harvest of 1535 followed by a disappointing one in 1536.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here, candidates may be expected to undertake a particularly sharp assessment of the relative importance of the relevant factors. There are good opportunities for exploring the historiography. For example, how far can the Pilgrimage be regarded as a ‘neo-feudal’ revolt? How convincing is the Elton thesis of the Pilgrimage as an extension of Court faction? How far can religious and political considerations be separated out in the context of the sixteenth century? Did the demand for the restoration of Mary arise out of religious sentiments or political calculation, perhaps connected with the Aragonese faction? Was the demand for the dismissal of ministers because they were corrupt and low-born or because they represented the policy of religious reform? A crucial question is to whom did the rebellion ‘belong’ – clergy, commons or gentry and nobles? Does the Pilgrimage demonstrate a political protest by the ‘great’ or a shared ideology? There are opportunities, too, of using and evaluating primary sources available in accessible collections.

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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.





UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/05D**

Paper 5d Special Subject: Reformation Europe, 1516–1559

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN PAPER

**2 hours**

---

**READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST**

Answer Question 1 and **one** other question.

The number of marks is given in brackets [ ] at the end of each question or part question.

You are reminded of the need for analysis and critical evaluation in your answers to questions. You should also show, where appropriate, an awareness of links and comparisons between different countries and different periods.

---

This document consists of **3** printed pages and **1** blank page.



**Answer the following question.**

**Nominated topic: The Netherlands, Spain, Italy and the Valois-Habsburg rivalry to 1559**

- 1 Study all of the following documents and answer all the questions which follow. In evaluating and commenting upon the documents it is essential to set them alongside, and to make use of, your own contextual knowledge.

**A** *Charles V sets out for himself a wide range of aims and ambitions.*

If I can only keep my army on foot, it will surely force the King of France to fight to its own great advantage. Or else it must force him to withdraw from Italy, which would be a great disgrace to him. In either case, when the King and his army have retired to France without doing any harm and the duchy of Milan has been reconquered, it will be best to lower the taxes to treat the soldiers whom I retain as well as possible. . . . In this way I ought to be able to set out for Italy. . . . in this very autumn. I shall go first to Naples, on whose loyalty I can rely. Here I shall receive my crown and raise an army before winter falls. I shall thus be ready for an important undertaking by the following spring, and I shall ask the King of England to carry out his great plan at the same time.

Charles V, private memorandum, January 1525.

**B** *One of Charles V's secretaries, in a format typical of the period, constructs an imaginary conversation on Papal policy towards the events of 1525–6.*

Lactancio: While the Emperor was doing his duty by defending his subjects, the Pope was neglecting his duty by waging war against him. It was the Pope who destroyed the peace and started a new war in Christendom. Under these circumstances one cannot blame the Emperor for the ensuing evils. . . .

Archdeacon: What war did the Pope stir up?

Lactancio: He was responsible for breaking the peace between the Emperor and the King of France. The war now going on was started by him and it is God's judgement that he should suffer the consequences.

Archdeacon: . . . . How do you figure that the Pope provoked a war against the Emperor after peace was made with the King of France?

Lactancio: It's perfectly plain. As soon as the King of France was released, the Pope absolved him from the oath he had given the Emperor. This released the King from his promise and left him free once more to wage war against the Emperor.

Alfonso de Valdes, *Dialogue of Lactancio and an Archdeacon*, 1526.

**C** *Charles V's reply to the French herald's challenge on behalf of Francis I.*

I have understood what you have read on behalf of your master and I am surprised that he challenges me; but having taken him prisoner in fair combat and having accepted his word of honour, I cannot myself challenge him. It is indeed strange that he should challenge me to fight when for six or seven years he has been waging war on me without any formal declaration of war. And since by the grace of God I have been able to defend myself, as he and everybody else knows, when the French king fought me without having declared war, now that he has I should be able to defend myself all the better.

Charles V, December 1527.

**D** *The Spanish ambassador to the Republic of Venice advises his master.*

Sire, keep what you have, and strengthen your own power and reputation. Milan is a fit inheritance for your only son and rightful heir. . . . Milan is the gateway to Italy. Let it but once fall into the hands of the French and all your friends in the peninsula will desert you.

Don Diego Mendoza, letter to Charles V, 1543.

**E** *At a critical point in his reign, Charles V gives advice and warnings to his son.*

France has never kept faith and has always sought to do me hurt. The young King seems about to follow in his father's footsteps. . . . The French will always be casting about for excuses to resume their royal claims on Naples, Flanders, Artois, Tournai and Milan. Never yield to them, not so much as an inch. . . . From the beginning of time these French kings have been greedy for their neighbours' land. Defend Milan with good artillery, Naples with a good fleet, and remember that the French are discouraged if they do not immediately succeed in anything that they undertake.

Charles V, political testament, 18 January 1548.

- (a) How far, and in what ways, does Document E corroborate Document D in setting out the priorities for Habsburg strategy? [10]
- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that the contest between Habsburg and Valois is explained entirely by the personal rivalry between Charles V and Francis I? [20]

In making your evaluation you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as all the documents in this set. (A-E) [20]

**Answer one of the following essay questions.** *Where appropriate your essay should make use of any relevant documents you have studied as well as contextual knowledge.*

- 2 How valid is the judgement that Luther was driven into rebellion rather than choosing to oppose the Papacy? [30]
- 3 Why were relations between the Papacy and Charles V so frequently strained? [30]
- 4 Assess and explain the extent of the success of Calvinism outside Geneva by 1559. [30]

**BLANK PAGE**

---

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

University of Cambridge International Examinations is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/05D**

Paper 5d Special Subject: Reformation Europe, 1516–1559

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

**2 hours**

---

**MAXIMUM MARK: 60**

---

This document consists of **5** printed pages and **1** blank page.



- 1 (a) How far, and in what ways, does Document E corroborate Document D in setting out the priorities for Habsburg strategy? [10]

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues should be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation. Document D is entirely concerned with Milan and it is described as 'the gateway to Italy'. Certainly it can be seen in this way from a French point of view. From contextual knowledge candidates will know of the battle of Marignano (1515) as a result of which Francis I had captured the city and held it, defying an attempt by Maximilian I to take it in 1516. The French possession of Milan enabled them to control Northern Italy and Genoa. Milan and Genoa were vital to Habsburg strategy in linking their Spanish and Italian possessions to Germany and the Netherlands (the 'Spanish Road'). Charles V and his allies took Milan in 1521, it was recovered by Francis I in 1522 but this was reversed by the battle of Pavia (1525). Document D certainly underlines the importance of Milan which is to be defended by 'good artillery' but other towns and regions are mentioned, with particular emphasis on Naples. Flanders and Artois were hotly disputed since from there a strike on Paris from the Habsburg/Burgundian Netherlands was all too likely. Tournai had been taken from the French in 1521 and incorporated into the Habsburg Netherlands.

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that the contest between Habsburg and Valois is explained entirely by the personal rivalry between Charles V and Francis I? [20]**

The answer should treat the documents as a set and should make effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It should be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material should be handled confidently with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument should be well constructed. Historical concepts and vocabulary should be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected. There was personal rivalry between Charles V and Francis I which arose in part from differences of temperament and personality and there was personal antipathy. Such rivalry was only to be expected when monarchy was personal and kings personified their kingdoms. Both had come to their thrones at much the same time and both were young. An early example of rivalry was Francis I contesting the election to the Imperial crown in 1519. Personal antipathy was intensified after 1525 as a result of the capture of Francis I at Pavia and, as Charles V saw it, his dishonourable actions afterwards. The document which illustrates personal rivalry most sharply is **C** which concerns Francis I's challenge to a duel after his release from captivity. Document **B** makes reference to this period of captivity and subsequent release. In **A** Charles refers to the actions of France in terms of its king but this is to be expected in the context of the sixteenth century. Document **E** dates from Henry II's reign but, nevertheless, refers to Francis I in personal terms: 'he has never kept faith and has always sought to do me harm'. **D** does not mention Francis I but Milan was at the heart of much of the rivalry. However, the contest of Valois and Habsburg cannot be seen entirely in terms of personal rivalry between its rulers. Given Charles V's inheritance (the Burgundian Netherlands, the Habsburg Empire, the Spanish kingdoms and Italian lands) he was bound to take on the interests formerly pursued by his respective ancestors and which had brought them into conflict with France. Once Charles V had come into possession of the Habsburg lands and the Imperial title by 1519 the 'Habsburg ring' around France was complete. At the same time, however, Charles's communications between Spain and the Netherlands could be broken by France. Thus Genoa, Milan, Flanders and Artois assumed even greater strategic importance. (Here, candidates may choose to use some of the material already deployed in 1a; this is acceptable but the same material should not be credited twice). Apart from this, Naples was vulnerable to French sea power and the crown of France had a claim to it and Sicily. On the Franco-Spanish frontier there was the issue of Roussillon and Cerdagne.

## 2 How valid is the judgement that Luther was driven into rebellion rather than choosing to oppose the Papacy? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is an assessment of the validity of a proposition. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument that should be rewarded. A plain narrative of events is unlikely but, where it occurs, it should not be well rewarded. However, analysis, argument and evaluation within a chronological framework may work perfectly well. The best answers will explore and analyse issues and arguments as well as identifying key events. There are two big groups of issues: the development of Luther's theology and the extent of his radicalism; his questioning of and challenge to Papal authority. Among the more detailed issues to consider are the following. Whether Luther considered himself a 'revolutionary', concerned to bring about 'Reformation' rather than a reformer who saw himself remaining within the Church. How radical was the doctrine of justification by faith? The extent to which his challenge to indulgences in 1517 was radical or innovatory. The actions and stance of other individuals, for example, the slowness of Leo X to address the issue of indulgences and the intransigence of Cajetan at Augsburg. How, and how far the issue of indulgences became a direct challenge to Papal authority and how far Luther was to blame. The extent to which the development of Luther's views on doctrine and Papal authority made reconciliation impossible. In terms of key events candidates may be expected to refer to the following: the publication of the 95 theses; the Diet of Augsburg (1518); the debate with Eck at Leipzig (1519); the excommunication of Luther (1520) and Luther's burning of the Bull; the publication of the three great Reformation treatises of 1520; the Diet of Worms (1521).

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here candidates may be expected to have an especially sharp focus on 'driven into' and 'choosing' and Luther's enduring view of himself of remaining a reformer within the universal Church. There are good opportunities for assessing the part played by the personalities of the leading figures and for evaluating competing interpretations.

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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.

**3 Why were relations between the Papacy and Charles V so frequently strained? [30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, a set of explanations rather than a narrative account. All Popes in this period were, with one exception, Italian. Relations with three of them, Leo X (1513–21), Clement VII (1523–34) and Paul III (1534–49), are especially important. In answering this question candidates are likely to discuss the following issues. There was the long-standing issue of Emperors and Popes as Heads of Christendom which had caused disputes for much of the medieval period and which still lingered on. Popes were also secular princes ruling territories, exercising jurisdiction, collecting revenues and fighting wars. They also had family interests throughout the Italian peninsula; Leo X and Clement VII were both Medicis whilst Paul III was a Farnese. Therefore, they were bound to protect their interests against those of the Emperor and to become involved in the Valois-Habsburg contest, taking and changing sides. Papal elections were accompanied by lobbying by both the French and the Imperialists. Lombardy was still regarded as part of the Empire and claims go back at least as far as the Hohenstaufen emperors. It was Papal policy to oppose a ruler of Naples and Sicily who was also the Emperor. The German Reformation provided occasions for both cooperation and disagreement. Some illustrations of strained relations might include: the initial support given by Leo X to Francis I's candidature for the Holy Roman Emperorship; the Sack of Rome in 1527 by Imperial forces and the effective imprisonment of Clement VII; opposition to a General Council of the Church by, for example, Clement VII in 1530 and later by Paul III; the disputes over Parma and Piacenza with Paul III.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates should be aware of some kind of balance in the set of relationships between Charles V and the Papacy. Emperor and Pope were not always at odds. There were times when the Papacy took the side of Charles V against France and also when it attempted reconciliation between the two rulers. To a large extent the Papacy and the Emperor saw eye to eye on the Reformation in Germany and cooperated, and a General Council was eventually called. Paul III supported Charles in his war against the Schmalkaldic League. The coronation of Charles V by the Pope in 1530 was intended as a reconciliation between Empire and Papacy (although it proved imperfect).

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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.

**4 Assess and explain the extent of the success of Calvinism outside Geneva by 1559. [30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is the spread of Calvinism outside Geneva up to 1559. A fair balance between the two thrusts of the question will be necessary, although these need not be treated separately. Indeed there is a good case for dealing with them, in large measure, alongside each other. It has been argued that Calvinism offered a sharper and clearer alternative than Lutheranism as a reformed faith. The teaching of the doctrine of double predestination and the idea of ‘gathered churches’ proved especially attractive. Geneva gave support to churches outside its boundaries by sending ministers. The printing houses of Geneva (34 by 1559) had a large output in different languages. The greatest impact of Calvinism was upon France and not surprisingly, given Calvin’s own origins. The Institutes was addressed to Francis I. After the annexation of Savoy in 1536 Geneva was surrounded by French territory on three sides. Of the thousands of religious refugees who took up residence in Geneva the great majority were French and this movement was a two-way process; ideas and people went back into France. By 1562 there were over 1700 Calvinist congregations in France consisting of some two million people. In some areas in France 40% of the nobles converted and they influenced their tenants and clients. ‘Gathered churches’ developed quickly in France, the first being in Paris in 1555. The impact of Calvinism in the Netherlands was first experienced in the southern French-speaking areas in the 1540s and in Dutch areas in the 1550s. In Germany Calvinism was largely imposed from above by rulers (the so-called ‘Second Reformation’) but the first ruler to convert (the Elector Palatine) was in 1563.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here candidates may be expected to develop some of the more contentious issues and matters which give rise to competing interpretations. How far was Calvinism a ‘creed for rebels’, for example, and did this make it attractive? If so, to whom? To what extent can Calvinism be seen as ‘democratic’ or especially attractive to the ‘bourgeoisie’ and nascent capitalism? How important was this in conversions to Calvinism?

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/05E**

Paper 5e The Reign of Charles I, 1625–1649

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN PAPER

**2 hours**

---

**READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST**

Answer Question 1 and **one** other question.

The number of marks is given in brackets [ ] at the end of each question or part question.

You are reminded of the need for analysis and critical evaluation in your answers to questions. You should also show, where appropriate, an awareness of links and comparisons between different countries and different periods.

---

This document consists of **3** printed pages and **1** blank page.



**Answer the following question.**

**Nominated topic: The Years of Personal Rule (1629-40):  
the Bishops' Wars and the recall of Parliament in 1640**

- 1 Study all the following documents and answer the questions which follow. In evaluating and commenting upon the documents it is essential to set them alongside and to make use of your own contextual knowledge.

**A** *Charles I orders members of the nobility and gentry to return to their own counties.*

The King's most excellent Majesty hath observed that a great number of the nobility and gentry, and abler sort of his people, have resorted to the cities of London and Westminster, and places adjoining, and there made their residence contrary to the ancient usage of the English nation ... By their residence in the counties they served the King according to their degree and ranks, in aid of the government, and by their housekeeping in those parts, the realm was defended and the meaner sort of people were guided, directed and relieved; but by their residence in the said cities... they have not employment, but live without doing any service to his Majesty or to his people. A great part of their money is spent in the city in excess of apparel provided from foreign parts, to the enriching of other nations.

Therefore his Majesty doth command the nobility and gentry to depart from the cities of London and Westminster... and resort to the counties where they usually resided.

*Royal Proclamation, 20 June 1632.*

**B** *A Cambridge academic, who provided information to those living abroad, writes to the King's ambassador in Paris.*

All things are at this instant here in such calmness that there is very little matter of novelty to write, for there appears no change or alteration either in court or affairs for all business goes undisturbedly on in the strong current of the present time to which all men for the most part submit, and that effects this quietness. And although payments here are great yet people only privately breathe out a little discontented humour and lay down their purses, for I think that great tax of the ship money is so well digested, and amongst most winning an affection to it, I suppose that it will become perpetual; for indeed if men would consider the great levies of monies in foreign parts for the service of the state, these impositions would appear but little burdens.

*John Burghe, letter to Viscount Scudamore, October 1637.*

**C** *A Kentish Justice of the Peace records local reactions to the issue of ship-money and related matters.*

At the assizes at Maidstone, Judge Weston, when he came to speak of ship-money, the audience did then listen with great diligence, and I did see a kind of dejection in their very looks... Some held that more could not be hoped for from a prince to proceed by the advice of his judges and that the declaration the judges had made was fully to the point and by that the king had full right to impose it, and all concluded that if a kingdom were in jeopardy it ought not to be lost for want of money. Others argued far differingly that it could only be expected that a just king would take counsel of his judges in a case of this weight. They confessed the last Parliaments had been much to blame in their conduct towards his majesty, but the goodness of monarchs had formerly forgotten errors such as this.

*A memorandum in the papers of Sir Roger Twysden, 1638.*

- D** *The wife of a parliamentary officer in the Civil War presents a hostile account of Charles I's Personal Rule.*

The King still persisted in his design of enslaving his people and found other ministers ready to serve his self-willed ambition, such as were Noy, his attorney-general, who set on foot that hateful tax of ship-money, and many more illegal exactions.... Besides these, and a great rascally company of flatterers were all the corrupted tottering bishops.... But there were two above all the rest, who led the King's evil counsellors, and these were Laud, archbishop of Canterbury, and the Earl of Strafford, a man of deep policy, stern resolution and ambitious zeal to keep up the glory of his own greatness.... But above all these the King had another instigator of his own violent purpose, and that was the queen.

Lucy Hutchison, *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchison*, Written c. 1664–71.

- E** *A modern historian identifies tensions in society and government during the period of Personal Rule.*

The objective of 'Thorough' was a deferential, strictly hierarchical, socially stable, paternalist absolutism based on a close union of Church and Crown. While these policies were being implemented, the governing elites began to split apart, so that the reaction had to be carried out by a regime already half at war with itself. In the administration, the new advocates of efficiency, austerity and discipline – self-styled 'Thorough' – fought the older, easy-going, routinely venal bureaucrats. In the Privy Council, Protestants fought Catholics and crypto-Catholics. Laud and his supporters fought Weston and the Queen. The aristocracy split apart as more and more were ejected from or refused to come to Court, and some drifted over to join, and indeed to lead, the opposition. The Episcopal bench was split, as Laud and his Arminian allies fought Bishop Williams and his friends. Many of the lay courtiers and officials were jealous of the increasing interference by the bishops in secular administration and policy.

Just as the Anglican laity were forced into the camp of the Puritans, so the gentry were thrust into alliance with them by royal use of the prerogative courts and judges to crush opposition and to impose taxation.

Lawrence Stone, *The Causes of the English Revolution*, 1972.

- (a)** How far does Document B corroborate the impression given in Document A as to the King's concerns for the welfare of his subjects? [10]
- (b)** How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that, far from being a time of peace and prosperity, the period of Charles I's Personal Rule was one of oppression and discord? [20]

**Answer one of the following questions.** *Where appropriate your essay should make use of any relevant documents you have studied as well as contextual knowledge.*

- 2** How significantly did the Irish Rebellion of 1641 influence events in England? [30]
- 3** How is the influence and later crushing of the Levellers best explained? [30]
- 4** Why was Civil War renewed in 1648? [30]

**BLANK PAGE**

---

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

University of Cambridge International Examinations is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/05E**

Paper 5e The Reign of Charles I, 1625–1649

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

**2 hours**

---

**MAXIMUM MARK: 60**

---

This document consists of **6** printed pages.



- 1 (a) How far does Document B corroborate the impression given in Document A as to the King's concerns for the welfare of his subjects? [10]

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues should be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation. The Royal Proclamation of 1632, from which Document A is taken, has to be seen in context. To deal with possible unrest connected with bad harvests in the opening years of Personal Rule the Book of Orders was issued in 1631. This was meant to address the issues of poverty and vagrancy in the localities by instructing magistrates in their duties. This, alongside the Proclamation, was important in that the absence of Parliament left the government less in touch with the localities. At face value A seems to demonstrate a concern for the 'meaner sort of people' who could be 'guided, directed and relieved' by the gentry were they to return to their own localities. Furthermore, there is a suggestion that the spending power of the upper classes would benefit the people of their localities were they not using it to the benefit of foreigners by buying luxuries in the capital. Candidates may argue that government policy, as demonstrated, is as much concerned with public order as with the material benefit of the King's poorer subjects. There is some evidence in B that the King has followed policies for the benefit of his subjects – peace at home, the conduct of 'business' is undisturbed, discontent with taxation is limited and the financial burden on Englishmen is light compared to that experienced by foreigners. However, contextual knowledge might point to different conclusions about attitudes towards ship money, for example, and B does not touch directly upon the condition of the poor. Critical evaluation of the documents may be based upon dating, authorship and recipients. For example, might Burghe simply be telling Scudamore what he wants to hear?

- (b) **How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that, far from being a time of peace and prosperity, the period of Charles I's Personal Rule was one of oppression and discord?** [20]

The answer should treat the documents as a set and should make effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It should be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material should be handled confidently with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument should be well constructed. Historical concepts and vocabulary should be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected. Clarendon represented the period as one of economic prosperity and plenty such as had rarely been seen before. It might be argued, however, that this applied very largely to his own class, the nobility and gentry who reaped the benefits of rising rents. Contextual knowledge could be used to show that there was certainly internal peace until the very end of Personal Rule. There was opposition from such as Prynne, Burton and Bastwick. This had been savagely punished but candidates might question the scale of opposition and the rarity of such punishments. Sentence on these three had been passed by Star Chamber, which came to have a bad name, but any change in its function was largely concerned with enforcing fines. Increasing numbers of taxpayers were assessed for ship money but there was no mass, active resistance. This came from men higher up the social scale such as Lord Saye and Sale and John Hampden. Nevertheless, ship money was not the only example of unpopular financial expedients. There was certainly widespread dislike of Laud's policies in the Church. The Court of High Commission was used for political as well as religious purposes. The gentry resented the interventionism represented by 'Thorough'. To all appearances, however, the Crown was in control of a quiet country but the years 1639–40 saw an effective breakdown of royal control in the counties. Document **D** makes a strong case for the period being characterised by 'tyranny'. Targets for criticism are Noy (associated with financial exactions), Laud and the bishops (unpopular religious policies), Stafford ('Black Tom Tyrant') and the Queen (suspected of influencing Charles in the ways of despotism and Popery). Document **C** demonstrates some sort of balance, although it represents the views of only one county and class, but there is concern about ship money and how it has been handled by the King and his judges. Document **A** might be regarded as an example of laudable paternalism or, on the other hand, an attempt to achieve social order and interference with the independence of the gentry and nobility. **B** makes the case for a quiet and contented realm, although candidates may regard it as complacent. **E** reflects some of the mood of **D**. It contrasts the ideal of a 'paternalist absolutism' with the reality of a society divided within itself and with a deepening rift between the Crown and substantial sections of its subjects.

## 2 How significantly did the Irish Rebellion of 1641 influence events in England? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Narrative accounts of the Irish Rebellion and of subsequent events in England will not score highly. Assessment of ‘significance’, argument and analysis are required. The Rebellion came at a crucial time in the contest between Charles I and the Long Parliament – Strafford had already been executed, Star Chamber and High Commission abolished, Ship Money declared illegal, the issue of ‘root and branch’ divided MPs and the opposition was demanding that the appointment of royal officers should be subject to Parliamentary approval. The second session of the Long Parliament opened in September 1641. News of the Irish Rebellion reached London on 1 November. It began in Ulster and spread south and there were reports, to a large extent exaggerated, of massacres of Protestants. The crux of the problem was that Charles I could not suppress the Rebellion unless Parliament granted funds to do so and the opposition moved on to demand control of the militia which was a serious invasion of royal prerogative. In England opinions were inflamed by fears of Catholicism and of an Irish invasion of England on behalf of the King. Rumours raised tensions and stories of atrocities were greatly exaggerated. One quarter of all the pamphlets collected by the bookseller George Thomason in the period November – December 1641 were concerned with the Irish Rebellion. The Rebellion restored the political fortunes of Pym and it was he who proposed that Parliament should grant the King funds for the suppression of the Irish on the condition that he appoint officers only with the consent of Parliament. Candidates should be aware of the connections between the Irish Rebellion and the Grand Remonstrance (an indictment of Charles I’s government since 1625 which, among other things, accused him of relying on the support of a ‘popish and malignant party’). The final section of the Remonstrance spelled out the consequences of an army plot and the Irish rebellion. In March 1642 Parliament passed the Militia Ordinance which gave it control over the raising of armed forces – a very serious attack on the royal prerogative. In the longer term, Englishmen felt that there was a reckoning to be made with the Irish. The Civil War in England prevented this and it was not until summer 1649 that Cromwell could lead an expedition to Ireland.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here, candidates may be expected to sharpen the argument as to how ‘significant’ the Irish Rebellion was and the part played by rumour, exaggeration and myth and propaganda. How important a step was it towards the outbreak of Civil War? Conrad Russell wrote: ‘Without the Irish Rebellion, as much as without the Scottish, Charles I would have overcome opposition and stayed in power’. This approach might be evaluated.

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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.

**3 How is the influence and later crushing of the Levellers best explained?****[30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required and a good balance of coverage between the two elements of the question. Some indication of the ideas of the Levellers is to be expected but not necessarily in great detail. The rise of the Levellers and their influence should be seen in the context of the Civil War: the instability caused by the conflict; the ferment of ideas, many of them radical; the end of censorship. The Levellers were especially influential in the Army among the lower ranks and junior officers and in London among the lower middle class, artisans and journeymen. That the ideas of the Levellers sprang very largely from a strong sense of religious motivation made them attractive. Leveller aims of greater social equality, political and civil rights and specific demands such as the deposition of the King had great appeal in the Army and in London. As far as the Army was concerned, the Levellers and Agitators were able to represent the genuine interests of the rank and file and junior officers over such matters as arrears of pay, disbandment and service in Ireland. Candidates should also assess the quality of the leadership of the Levellers and their ability to persuade and propagandise – Lilburne, Walwyn, Wildman, Petty, Rainsborough. The Leveller manifesto, as presented in the various Agreements of the People, attracted wide support. In explaining the reasons why the Levellers were, in the end, crushed candidates might be expected to argue that the ideas of the Levellers went too far for the comfort of the propertied classes and the senior officers (or Grandees). The Levellers were one among a number of radical groups and there was a real sense of ‘the world turned upside-down’ across the whole spectrum of religious, social, economic and political values. Much depended, of course, upon the ability of the senior officers to keep control of the Army and to turn it against the Levellers. At the Putney Debates the senior officers, including Cromwell, Ireton and Lambert, opposed the Leveller programme. Cromwell’s role in defeating the Leveller cause was especially important; he showed great determination in putting down a Leveller inspired Army mutiny at Ware in November 1647 and ruthlessness in dealing with serious Leveller risings in London and at Burford in 1649. Other factors to be considered in the failure of the Leveller cause (and it being successfully crushed) are the divisions among the Levellers themselves and the execution of the King which deprived them of an important plank in their platform.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates might argue that however influential they were the Levellers could not have succeeded once the senior officers took against them and won the Second Civil War. It might be further argued that the aims of the Levellers in widening the franchise and appearing to undermine property rights just could not succeed in the context and climate of the period.

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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.

**4 Why was civil war renewed in 1648?****[30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is a set of explanations for the renewal of civil war in 1648 not, for example, an account of the war itself. A plain narrative of events leading up to war will have rather limited value but argument, analysis, explanation and assessment within a chronological framework could work well. The best answers, whilst taking key events into account, should be expected to examine and evaluate a range of relevant factors and issues. The key may well be the divisions which existed within the broad Parliamentary alliance (which had included the Scots): disagreements between Parliament as such and the Army; religious differences such as between Independents and Presbyterians, to say nothing of the sects; fundamental disagreements between the Grandees and the Levellers as revealed in the Putney Debates. Charles I was able to exploit these divisions and he gained a measure of independence as a result of his escape from Hampton Court to Carisbrooke in November 1647. In particular, Charles was able to play upon the grievances of the Scots, to make an alliance with them and to agree to the establishment of Presbyterianism in England. The King's actions further reinforced the impression that he could not be trusted; negotiations broke down, agreement on the Heads of Proposals, for example, failed. In the end he rejected the Four Bills presented by Parliament and Parliament replied with the Vote of No Addresses. Meanwhile the fleet declared for the King. Royalist sentiment, and, indeed support, still remained and when the Scots invaded England in summer 1648 there were risings in Essex, Kent and South Wales.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here, there are good opportunities for evaluating the relative importance of the issues and for assessing, for example, the responsibility of the King.

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/05F**

Paper 5f Special Subject: The French Revolution, 1774–1794

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN PAPER

**2 hours**

---

**READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST**

Answer Question 1 and **one** other question.

The number of marks is given in brackets [ ] at the end of each question or part question.

You are reminded of the need for analysis and critical evaluation in your answers to questions. You should also show, where appropriate, an awareness of links and comparisons between different countries and different periods.

---

This document consists of **3** printed pages and **1** blank page.



**Answer the following question**

**Nominated topic: The period 1789–1792 and the descent into civil and foreign wars**

- 1 Study all of the following documents and answer all the questions which follow. In evaluating and commenting upon the documents it is essential to set them alongside and to make use of your own contextual knowledge.

**A** *The King sets out his thoughts on the condition of France in autumn 1791.*

The condition of France is such that she is perhaps fast approaching a total disintegration. . . The solution is to end partisan divisions and to restore the authority of the government. . . But for this there are only two means: force or reconciliation. Force can only be employed by foreign armies – the émigrés by themselves are capable only of exercising a suicidal revenge. . . The émigrés flatter themselves that the rebels will capitulate immediately before such immense forces, thus avoiding war. But the leaders of the Revolution those who control the levers of power both in Paris and the provinces, are committed up to the hilt to the Revolution. . . .

War will therefore be inevitable. . . it will be terrible because it will be motivated by violence and despair. Can a King contemplate all these misfortunes with equanimity and call them down on his people?

The nation likes the Constitution. . . . One can never govern a people against its inclinations. . . . I have carefully weighed the matter and concluded that war presents no other advantages but horrors and a continuance of discord. I have therefore thought . . . that I should try once more the sole means remaining to me, namely the junction of my will to the principles of the Constitution.

Louis XVI's secret memorandum to his brothers, 25 September 1791.

**B** *A conversation between Louis XVI and Bertrand de Molleville, who was Minister of Marine from October 1791 to March 1792.*

'This, then, is what I think,' said the King. 'I am far from regarding the Constitution as a chef d'oeuvre. I believe there are great faults in it; and if that I had been allowed to state my observations upon it, some advantageous alterations might have been adopted. But of this there is no question at present; I have sworn to maintain it such as it is, and I am determined, as I ought, to be strictly faithful to my oath.'

Bertrand de Molleville, *Private Memoirs*, relating to October 1791.

**C** *The King expresses his anxieties to the Baron de Breteuil, an ardent royalist.*

The cruel law against the émigrés forced me to make use of the veto; the necessity of this has been recognised by a large part of the nation. But the men of faction . . . have passed the detestable law on refractory priests. . . .The absurd law on émigrés was a two-edged sword. . .

It will be the same with the decree on the priests. But in using only the resources of the Constitution, I shall undoubtedly be obliged to lend myself to all the measures of justice and obvious necessity, indicated by circumstances, to back up the policy which I have adopted of creating for myself a force out of the favour of the people, who for the most part, still want the Constitution and fear a counter-revolution which is all too obviously the aim of the émigrés.

Louis XVI to Breteuil, 14 December 1791.

- D** *Gensonné, a Jacobin lawyer who was later executed as a Girondin, advocates the appointment of a 'patriot ministry'.*

Why does the King not choose his ministers, from those most strongly pronounced in favour of the Revolution? Why, when things are most critical, is he surrounded only by men who are unknown or suspect? Would one act otherwise if one were deliberately trying to increase distrust or provoke the people to insurrection?....

A really patriotic ministry, then, would be one of the great instruments which the King could employ to regain confidence. . .

There is further complaint that the decree disbanding the general staff of the National Guard has not received the royal assent. These repeated refusals to sanction legislative provisions. . . . throw into question the constitutionality of the veto when applied to emergency legislation . . . .

Armand Gensonné, *memorandum*, July 1792.

- E** *A modern historian comments on the breakdown of the revolutionary consensus.*

When, later in the Revolution, or well into the next century, men spoke approvingly of the principles of 1789, they meant those accepted by Louis XVI in 1791, before the Revolution went to extremes. Yet the seeds of these later extremes had already been sown, and the Constituent Assembly was responsible for them. By forcing the clergy to choose between Church and State it had split the country. The religious schism made it impossible to give the new order their whole-hearted support – beginning with the King himself. Only those who dared not think anything else believed, by September 1791, that Louis XVI's acceptance of the constitution was sincere.

William Doyle, *The Oxford History of the French Revolution*, published 1989.

- (a)** How far are the King's views as expressed in Document A corroborated by the conversation recorded in Document B? [10]
- (b)** How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that the Constitution of 1791 was doomed to failure from the outset?

In making your evaluation you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as all the documents in this set (A-E). [20]

**Answer one of the following questions.** *Where appropriate your essay should make use of any relevant documents you have studied as well as contextual knowledge.*

- 2** How serious were the problems facing the French Crown between 1785 and the summoning of the Estates-General in August 1788. [30]
- 3** Assess the importance of the part played in revolutionary events by the Parisian crowd in the period 1789–1794. [30]
- 4** Why was Robespierre able to triumph over his political opponents, yet be overthrown himself in July 1794? [30]

**BLANK PAGE**

---

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

University of Cambridge International Examinations is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/05F**

Paper 5f Special Subject: The French Revolution, 1774–1794

**For Examination in 2010**

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

**2 hours**

---

**MAXIMUM MARK: 60**

---

This document consists of **6** printed pages.



- 1 (a) How far are the King's views as expressed in Document A corroborated by the conversation recorded in Document B? [10]

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues should be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation.

Candidates should make use of the content of the headings and attributions as well as the text of the documents. Document **A** demonstrates a clear concern on the King's part for the future of France and identifies stark alternatives – force or reconciliation. He demonstrates a sense of duty and makes a firm resolution to effect 'the junction of my will to the principles of the Constitution'. In **B** Louis XVI expresses a similar sentiment that he has 'sworn to maintain it' and will be 'strictly faithful to my oath'. Document **A** might be seen as an amalgam of principle and pragmatism and there are small echoes of this in **B**. Further evidence for the King's sense of duty is provided by his attitude towards the émigrés. This issue and the King's awareness of popular support are not reflected in **B**. Meanwhile, **B** makes it clear that the King sees grave faults in the Constitution and that he would have sought amendments had he been able to do so. Document **A** does not address this issue but candidates will know from contextual knowledge that this was the case. **B** does not reflect the sense of crisis demonstrated in **A** – the perils of war (both civil and foreign perhaps), the dangers presented by the émigrés and the determination of the revolutionaries. In evaluating the sources candidates should be aware of such issues as provenance, purpose and reliability. It is significant that **A** represents Louis XVI's own thoughts, it is secret and addressed to his brothers. **B** is a conversation (possibly or probably confidential) between the King and a loyal confidant. Molleville had been the Intendant of Brittany before the Revolution.

**(b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that the Constitution of 1791 was doomed to failure from the outset? [20]**

The answer should treat the documents as a set and should make effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It should be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material should be handled confidently with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument should be well constructed. Historical concepts and vocabulary should be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected.

From contextual knowledge candidates should be aware of context and broader issues, some of which are reflected in the documents. The King accepted the Constitution on the 14 September 1791. On 10 August 1792 the Tuileries was invaded and the monarchy suspended. The life of the Constitution was effectively short but was it 'doomed from the start'? How far, for example, was any chance of a settlement undermined by the Civil Constitution of the Clergy of July 1790 (referred to in **E**)? Candidates might also explore the following: the King's errors and actions including the Flight to Varennes and the failure to appoint a patriot ministry (**D**); the decision to exclude the deputies of the National Assembly from the Legislative Assembly; the King's use of the veto (**C**) in particular over refractory priests and émigrés; the growth of revolutionary fervour and extremism (**A** and **E**); the tension leading up to foreign war (for example, the Declaration of Pillnitz, August 1791) and declaration of war against Austria in April 1792; the divisions between Feuillants and Jacobins. It might be argued that the King was determined to uphold the Constitution, or at least was reconciled to it. This is demonstrated in **A** and **B** whilst in **A** and **C**, Louis recognises the importance of the support of the people and the popularity of the Constitution. Nevertheless, in **A** the King is aware of political divisions where he refers to 'partisan divisions' and **D** draws attention to the same problem. However, whilst the King expresses his support for the Constitution he did much to undermine it by his use of the veto (**C**) and his failure to appoint a patriot ministry (**D**). The threat of war and the connected problem of the émigrés, which both represented dangers to the Constitution are recognised in **A** and **C**. In spite of the King's objections to the laws against émigrés and priests (in **C**) he still sees himself as a force for justice and reconciliation. His reservations about these and other issues (in **C**) have a reflection in **B**. Document **E** stresses the destructive effects of extremes (seen also in **A** and perhaps **D**) and of the religious schism (echoed in **C**).

**2 How serious were the problems facing the French Crown between 1785 and the summoning of the Estates General in August 1788? [30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Due attention to the chronology is required, although some contextual material from before 1785 would be helpful. Candidates are required to assess the seriousness of the problems facing the French Crown and narrative accounts of the events of the period will not take candidates very far. In order to put the problems of 1785 – August 1788 into perspective some indication of longer-term structural issues – social, economic, political and financial – will be necessary although this might well be brief. The question of social or class privileges pervades the period under consideration. There is good evidence of a deteriorating economy and the 1770s and 1780s were years dominated by bad harvests. Above all, perhaps, the most prominent issue was that of the Crown's finances. At the end of the Seven Years War the deficit was 50 million livres. This had risen to 120 million by 1786. Of the Crown's annual income of 600 million, half serviced the debt. The period 1785 – August 1788 demonstrated serious governmental problems. Government had become complex as had international relations and the problem of greater pressure on the system of central and local government showed up the inadequacies of personal/absolutist monarchy as still embraced by Louis XVI. The Parlement of Paris showed itself to be a powerful force and, at the same time, prevented reform yet claimed to represent the Nation. Its criticism of the royal government led to an impasse between it and the Crown. Calonne, appointed Controller-General of Finance in 1783, failed, or was not allowed, to reform the tax system and his dismissal in February 1787 was a sharp indication of crisis. The Assembly of Notables (called in February 1787) demonstrated a determination to hold on to privileges and its opposition amounted to a revolt of the nobility. Calonne's successor and critic, Brienne, failed to convince the Assembly of the need for any substantial reform. The solution of calling the Estates-General aroused new tensions over its organisation and powers. Candidates might argue then that the French Crown found itself unable to tackle the problems that faced it, that the ancien regime was fractured beyond repair and was increasingly at odds with Enlightenment concepts of 'society', 'citizens', 'civil rights' and 'the Nation'.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here, candidates should demonstrate an especially sharp evaluation of the seriousness of the problems of the period 1785–August 1788. Further questions to be addressed might be as follows. Was some sort of revolution unavoidable by August 1788? Or was an upheaval already in prospect before the period under consideration? How much relative weight should be given to longer- and shorter-term factors? How far did the calling of the Estates-General serve to escalate the problems?

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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.

**3 Assess the importance of the part played in revolutionary events by the Parisian crowd in the period 1789–1794. [30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Narrative accounts of revolutionary events/journees will meet the requirements of the question to only a limited extent; assessment of their importance is essential for successful answers. The chronology, as stated, should be adhered to and although coverage need not be exhaustive a good range should be expected. Candidates should demonstrate some sense of the wider context: the size of Paris and its influence on national events; social structures, demography and living conditions in the city; the ‘dynamics’ of the crowd; the fact that the representative institutions of the nation, and the Royal Court after October 1789, met under the eyes of Paris; the interaction between politicians and the Clubs on the one hand and the crowds and institutions of Paris on the other; the importance of the city as a centre of information, newspapers, public speeches and pamphlets; the interaction of price levels (especially of bread) and revolutionary activity. Candidates may be expected to deal with at least a good range of the following revolutionary events. The Reveillon Riots of April 1789, the first popular outbreak of the revolutionary period. July 1789 – the fall of the Bastille and associated activity which together saved the National Assembly, led to the disintegration of the Court party and to the setting up of the City Council under Bailly and the National Guard under Lafayette. The march of the Parisians on Versailles (October 1789) which confirmed the achievements of July and brought the King and Court to Paris. The Massacre of the Champ de Mars (July 1791) which marked an important stage in the struggle for power between Feuillants and Jacobins. The activity of 1792, including the first invasion of the Tuileries (June), the second invasion (August) and the September Massacres. Together, these events strengthened the popular movement, advanced the careers of radical revolutionary leaders, overthrew the monarchy, destroyed the internal enemy and strengthened resistance to external foes, thus constituting a second revolution. The purging of the Convention (June 1793) amounted to a third revolution – the triumph of the Montagnards and the revolution moved in yet more radical directions. September 1793, the largely spontaneous Hebertist rising which brought about a range of radical policies with Terror becoming ‘the order of the day’.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here candidates might explore the occasions when the absence of crowd action brought about or assisted in important events such as, for example, the fall of Hebert and Danton and, above all, the fall of Robespierre. Candidates may well explore the controversial issue of the extent to which the politicians manipulated the crowd or how far the crowd drove the policies of the politicians and determined their fate. Did the crowd and the sans-culottes have a dynamic of their own with a specific and discrete revolutionary agenda?

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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.

**4 Why was Robespierre able to triumph over his political opponents, yet be overthrown himself in July 1794? [30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required with the emphasis upon explanation, argument and analysis. Unadorned narrative will meet the demands of the question to only a limited extent although a narrative framework with explanation, argument and analysis within it could be well rewarded. A good balance of coverage between Robespierre's 'triumph' and his 'fall' is essential for the higher mark bands. Robespierre's triumph over his enemies can be explained in both general and specific terms. He joined the Committee of Public Safety (CPS) on 26 July; some of whose members were already his associates and others joined later. Not only did Robespierre become the Committee's leading member but he also dominated the Convention. At an early stage Robespierre won the confidence of the sans-culottes and the militants in the Clubs and Sections. The laws of the maximum had a wide appeal in Paris. Robespierre's political opponents may be identified as Brissot and the Girondins, the Hebertists and the Dantonists. Robespierre had opposed the foreign war and reaped benefits when it went badly. This was a key factor in the overthrow of Brissot and the Girondins as was their equivocal relationship with the King. The Paris Sections were of crucial importance in the purging of the Convention in June 1793. Robespierre was able to bring about the fall of the Hebertists by representing their views as too extreme and raising concerns about deChristianisation. Danton and his friends were left dangerously exposed after the fall of the Hebertists and could be accused of being too moderate and of harbouring plans to negotiate with the foreign enemy. The overthrow of Robespierre can be explained in large part by the break-up of the alliance between the Montagnards and the sans-culottes and Sections. The government was not able to operate the Law of the Maximum efficiently and the limitation on wages was unpopular. Meanwhile, there was growing opposition to the extremes of the Terror and military victory at Fleurus (20 June 1794) made it seem less necessary. Difficulties were exacerbated by the rivalry between the CPS and the Committee of General Security and by tensions within the CPS itself. For a month before his fall Robespierre had been absent from the CPS and Convention and was showing signs of ill health and strain. Robespierre's speech in the Convention (26 July) about new conspiracies brought about an alliance of those who feared for themselves (for example, Fouché, Tallien and Billaud-Varenne) and a coup was carried out. At the last, Hanriot failed to mobilise the armed forces of Paris in support of Robespierre.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates might make connections between some of the issues explaining both Robespierre's triumphs and fall. His great power, for example, created fears amongst his colleagues. The overthrow of the Hebertists and Dantonists left Robespierre dangerously exposed. Again, candidates might address the issue of the extent to which Robespierre's triumph and fall depended on the support, or otherwise, of Paris and the sans-culottes in particular. There are also opportunities for evaluating the relative importance of the reasons for both triumph and fall.

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/05G**

Paper 5g Special Subject:  
The Origins and Causes of the American Civil War, c. 1820–61  
SPECIMEN PAPER

**For Examination from 2010**

**2 hours**

---

**READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST**

Answer Question 1 and **one** other question.

The number of marks is given in brackets [ ] at the end of each question or part question.

You are reminded of the need for analysis and critical evaluation in your answers to questions. You should also show, where appropriate, an awareness of links and comparisons between different countries and different periods.

---

This document consists of **4** printed pages.



**Answer the following question.****Nominated topic: The road to secession**

**1** Study all of the following documents and answer all the questions which follow. In evaluating and commenting upon the documents, it is essential to set them alongside, and to make use of, your own knowledge.

**A** *A leading Republican, later Lincoln's Secretary of State, gives his view of the slavery issue two and a half years before the outbreak of civil war.*

The issue of slavery will lead to an inevitable conflict between opposing forces. It means that the United States must and will, sooner or later, become either entirely a slaveholding nation, or entirely a free-labour nation. It is the failure to understand this great truth that induces so many unsuccessful attempts at final compromise between the slave and the free states. It is the existence of this great fact that renders all such pretended compromises, when made, futile and short-lived. They all fail at some point.

William H. Seward, speech in Rochester, New York, October 1858.

**B** *A Northern newspaper blames Northern attitudes for the seriousness of the sectional crisis that had developed.*

We find good reason why the South should be serious in its present fear when it is remembered how steadily the public mind in the North has been educated in the idea that slavery is an evil and a crime; how for many years this idea has been driven home by schools and churches; how all moral propaganda in the North has to a greater or less degree been turned to the same object of seeing slavery as wicked; and that at last political parties have come to campaign loudly on the sectional and geographical grounds.

*The New York Herald*, 13 November 1860.

**C** *After seven states declared their intention to leave the Union and establish the Confederate States of America, proposals to preserve the Union and avoid war were put forward by the representatives of twenty one states.*

In all land of the United States, that is to the north of the line defined by Congress at the Parallel 36 degrees 30 minutes north, slavery, except in punishment of crime, is prohibited. In all land to the south of that defined line, the status of persons held in slavery as it now exists, shall not be changed; nor shall any new law be passed by Congress or by a Territorial Legislature to hinder or prevent the taking of such persons from any of the States of this Union to any Territory in this Union. These we propose firmly and fully.

*Proposals of the Washington Peace Conference*, February 1861.

- D** The former President of the Confederate States, reflecting later on events, defends the decision of the Southern States to secede from the Union after Lincoln's election.

What possibility for justice – what assurance of tranquillity – what guarantee of safety – remained for the South? Still hoping, still striving for peace and union, we waited quietly until a sectional president, nominated by a sectional convention, elected by a sectional vote – and that the vote of a minority of the people – was about to assume office. We had been warned by Lincoln's own distinct announcement that the Union could not permanently endure 'half slave and half free'. He meant by this that the Union could not continue to exist in its original condition when the Constitution had first been adopted. No alternative remained for the South then, except to seek the security outside the Union the States had vainly tried to obtain within it.

Jefferson Davis, *The Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government*, 1881.

- E** *A modern historian analyses the attempt at compromise in 1861.*

All previous crises of the Union had ended with some final effort at compromise which succeeded. Although the state of affairs in the early months of 1861 was much graver than it had been in 1850 or in 1820, many hoped and others worked in 1861 for a last-minute compromise solution acceptable to both parties. Hopes were raised because the American system of government was now expert at resolving such conflict. That contemporaries expected reconciliation to succeed and save the Union in 1861 is not surprising. Whether such proposals were workable in 1861 is, however, quite another matter. Much had changed over time and differences had grown great.

Brian Holden Reid, *The Origins of the American Civil War*, 1996.

- (a)** How far does Document B corroborate Document A in explaining the causes of sectional crisis? [10]
- (b)** How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that reconciliation was impossible by 1860, let alone by 1861.

In making your evaluation you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as all the documents in this set (A–E). [20]

**Answer one of the following questions.** *Where appropriate, your essay should make use of any relevant documents you have studied as well as contextual knowledge.*

- 2 'Andrew Jackson was remarkably successful in dampening down sectionalism.' How far do you agree? [30]
- 3 Assess the importance of slavery to the Southern economy in this period. [30]
- 4 Why were relations between the North and the South so strained in the 1850s? [30]

---

*Copyright Acknowledgements:*

Source E © Brian Holden Reid; *The Origins of the American Civil War*; Longman; 1996.

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

University of Cambridge International Examinations is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/05G**

Paper 5g Special Subject:  
The Origins and Causes of the American Civil War, c. 1820–61

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

**2 hours**

---

**MAXIMUM MARK: 60**

---

This document consists of **6** printed pages.



1 (a) How far does Document B corroborate Document A in explaining the causes of sectional crisis? [10]

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues should be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation. Comments on tone, language, reliability and typicality may well help here in evaluation but the key needs are engagement with the provenances and so contents. The dates as well as authorship of Documents **A** and **B** need comment, the gap of two years being significant. **A** sees tensions deep-rooted, well embedded by 1858, while **B** reinforces this view later on, by when conflict was very imminent. Both see slavery as a core issue. To the author of **A**, this is why compromises fail. In **B**, emphasis is placed on how far propaganda in the North had created a climate of mistrust and fear in the south. **B** is somewhat conciliatory in its tone, blaming the North rather than the South for the current situation and crisis; **A** is more balanced perhaps, seeing slavery as bound to result in a conflict. **A** places slavery in a broader context while **B** puts it as central. **A** dwells on a prevailing climate and mood, **B** on propaganda and education as the cause of sectionalised, partisan feelings. The nature of the two sources – a speech in public, a newspaper article – can be considered also; so, too, the politician in **A**.

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that reconciliation was impossible by 1860, let alone by 1861?

In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as all the documents in this set (A–E). [20]

The answer should treat the documents as a set and should make effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It should be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material should be handled confidently with strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument should be well constructed. Historical concepts and vocabulary should be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected. A good focus on the terms of the question and the argument advanced there is important here. Focus on 1860–1 is expected; some reference to prior events, features and trends is in order as well, but the final breakdown in any form of consensus is at core here. Document **E** provides a valuable overview, short- and long-term. It can be linked to the compromise attempt outlined in Document **C**, that failed; Document **A** can be linked to **E**, with Document **B** being significantly balanced and linking to some of views of **A** and certainly of **D**, representing as it does a statement of entrenched Southern opinion by early 1861. The fact that both **A** and **B** come from the North can be considered, though they do present different facets. Document **E** takes the view that previous crises had been successfully resolved and that many expected that the seriousness of the present situation would force a late compromise, but **A**, **B** and **D** set out why that did not happen. **A** presents a measured view of the crisis, as does **B** in its balanced attitude; it could be argued that these two represent an attempt at reconciliation, albeit with that pessimism evident in both, above all **A**. **C** represents a serious reconciliation attempt, attended as it was by delegates from most of the States; it lasted 3 weeks and encouraged the hope that a settlement over the key issue of slavery could be attained. Reference can be made to the Crittenden Proposals. **E** points out that previous disputes (1820, 1850) had seemed insoluble yet they were resolved. Nor had the major crisis over the Kansas-Nebraska Act ended in civil war. Blood was shed, though, and tensions heightened. The Documents can be linked to topic knowledge, as above and embracing party political changes and big events as in 1857 and 1859. But there is also evidence in the Documents that some contemporaries did not expect a successful outcome in 1858, let alone 1860. **A** anticipates conflict; reconciliation is not expected; **B** links to that, two years later, pointing out that parties have aligned along ‘slave’ and ‘free’ lines. **D**, written twenty years after the start of the War, sets out to justify secession and emphasises a lack of accord; it reflects what most Southerners thought by 1860–1. It makes use of Lincoln’s own words, reinforcing the view that his election was a decisive moment. Again, topic knowledge can be used: the divisive election of 1860; the splits in the Democrat party; Buchanan’s role (key to some); attempts at talks, secession assemblies and outcomes; the downward spiral of events, February to April 1861.

**2 'Andrew Jackson was remarkably successful in dampening down sectionalism.' How far do you agree? [30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. This is not a survey of Jackson's Presidency and a narrative of such will not gain reward, unless there is some attempt at linkage to the Question. Analysis and evaluation are required, with the focus upon sectionalism. The latter requires some definition: political-economic, social, economic. Jackson worked within the context of the effects of the 1820 Compromise, even if that foreshadowed future sectional conflicts. He took a strong stance on nationalism and on states' rights; the Nullification Crisis of 1832 will feature prominently. Good analysis is expected. The handling of the Tariff Crisis leading to the 'Bank War' may also be considered here. He was sensitive to state and local feelings; he harnessed popular feelings and opinion; he made full use of his Presidential powers. It could be argued that the attitude towards minority groups helped here. His origins in the South-West frontier regions may have aided his style and impact. Slavery continued in the South; economic differences of North and South grew; there was unease over tariffs and related matters. The issues of territorial expansion and so slave or free status of new lands were not pressed, perhaps through the force of his personality. His populist and populist policies could be considered as enabling him to overcome sectional tensions.

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. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question formulation opens up argument and counter-argument. There is debate. Candidates need to address the words used 'remarkably successful', 'dampening down' and explain the issues of sectionalism. Jackson has a very high reputation and some believe that a President of his stature would have prevented the great crisis of 1860–1 ending in a civil war. They point to his handling of South Carolina in 1832 as an example of what was possible (at least at that time).

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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.

**3 Assess the importance of slavery to the Southern economy in this period.****[30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A description of slavery and its features will not gain much reward. Analysis and evaluation of those features are required. The cotton gin and the spread of cotton cultivation from around 3,000 bales in 1790 to 400,000 in 1820 and nearly 4 million by 1860 revitalised slavery, making it the lynchpin of the Southern economy. The breeding of slaves and internal slave trade meant that the ban on importing slaves only affected their price. Around 500,000 slaves lived in cities and towns and were employed in a variety of trades (e.g. mines, factories). Then there were the plantation slaves. Although the South had other crops (e.g. tobacco, rice), in effect it was a monocrop culture. By the 1850s it is possible that slavery was at or beyond its peak but it was seen as central still, within a stratified and hierarchical social structure. The feeling in the South was that it was an essential feature, a vital necessity, to be upheld at all costs, even if it could not be extended into new lands. Cotton, and by extension slavery, sustained high rates of growth and a generally good economic performance for Southern States. Returns on investment in slaves were greatest in agriculture and this skewed Southern economic development, affecting wealth and income and economic relations amongst whites.

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. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. ‘Assess ...’ invites a sense of relative importance, ordering and prioritising, while making links between factors. There is debate over slavery’s literal value to the Southern economy. Some believe it had peaked well before the 1850s; others believe it still had a central role to play. Certainly, a powerful group amongst the Southern elite were ready to defend this ‘peculiar institution’. There has been a lively debate over the nature of the Southern economy and its performance levels, its commercial and modern aspects and the real efficiency of slave agriculture.

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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.

**4 Why were relations between the North and the South so strained in the 1850s? [30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of the North-South relations will not score well, unless there is explanation embedded. Analysis and evaluation of key features, events and trends are required. Growing tensions were evident, no matter the hard work put into the 1850 Compromise. Over the decade it began to falter and fail, not least as previous ‘middle ground’ consensus and compromise preferences fell away (in part as key figures aged or died). The Compromise can be outlined as to content and used as a reference point. It bought time, no more. It papered over the issues; neither side was satisfied. The North was uneasy over the new fugitive Slave Act, the South felt that other provisions favoured the North. Westward development meant the issue of new lands, new states, their status and admission to the Union. Douglas’ new idea of popular sovereignty proved untenable as shown in the furore over the Kansas-Nebraska Bill. The role of Presidents Pierce and Buchanan (‘blundering politicians’) can be assessed as can the rapidly changing party political landscape: the Whigs were destroyed as a national force; the Democrats split along sectional lines, the sectional Republican Party emerged. Buchanan has been seen as weak and indecisive, susceptible to Southern influences. Tensions in Congress and especially the Senate, the growing issue of States’ rights, propaganda, the growth of strident Abolitionists set against Defenders of slavery, the Dred Scott Case, the John Brown Raid and consequences, all can be considered. Perceptions on both sides, misunderstandings, misreadings of actions and words all played their part as did personality conflicts.

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. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. ‘Why ...’ opens up debate, argument, the ordering in relative importance of a series of causal factors, but with intimate links seen. The words ‘so strained’ need comment and evaluation. There is debate here: how serious the strains and tensions were; the importance of 1854–6 events; the sense of polarisation by the end of the 1850s; the diminution of the previous spirit of compromise and ‘middle ground’ consensus.

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/05H**

Paper 5h Special Subject: Gladstone and Disraeli

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN PAPER

**2 hours**

---

**READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST**

Answer Question 1 and **one** other question.

The number of marks is given in brackets [ ] at the end of each question or part question.

You are reminded of the need for analysis and critical evaluation in your answers to questions. You should also show, where appropriate, an awareness of links and comparisons between different countries and different periods.

---

This document consists of **3** printed pages and **1** blank pages.



**Answer the following question.**

**Nominated Topic: Gladstone's Ministries of 1868–74, 1880–1885, 1886**

- 1 Study all of the following documents and answer the questions which follow. In evaluating and commenting upon the documents, it is essential to set them alongside and to make use of your own contextual knowledge.

- A** *A brewer explains why so many in his trade support the Tories in the general election of 1874*

When the [Licensing] Bill came down to the House of Commons [in 1872]... the 'beer interest' pointed out...many hardships and anomalies...notably the elastic clause empowering magistrates to vary the hours of opening and closing the [beer] houses.... We found the United Kingdom Alliance and other teetotal organizations making rapid progress in the House of Commons, especially on the Liberal side, by engendering a feeling against our trade. This, more than any other one thing, has caused the 'beer interest' to unite... At this election, every candidate...has been 'interviewed' with the object of pointing out the hardships in the Licensing Act, 1872, and asking his support to certain amendments. We have invariably found that the Conservative candidate has more readily admitted the justness of our complaints.

Letter from the Secretary of the Metropolitan Beer and Wine Trade Protection Society to  
*The Times newspaper*, 10 February 1874.

- B** *William Gladstone explains the Liberal defeat*

We have been borne down in a torrent of gin and beer. Next to this has been the action of the Education Act of 1870, and the subsequent controversies. Many of the Roman Catholics have voted against us because we are not denominational; and many of the Nonconformists have at least abstained [from voting] because we are. Doubtless, there have been other minor agencies; but these are the chief ones.

A letter written by W. E. Gladstone to his brother, February 1874.

- C** *A leading Liberal politician comments on his party's difficulties*

He [Harcourt] thought it would be unfair to lay the defeat of the Liberal Party wholly at the door of the late Administration. He thought they were quite as much the victims as the authors of this disaster. They were harassed by the demands of discordant sections [of the Liberal party], each...insisting upon measures upon which the Party were not agreed, and to which the nation would not consent. The Liberal Party had suffered, not from the good things it had done – and they were many – but from the nonsense which was talked for it by those who had assumed, with mighty little authority, to speak in its name.

Sir William Harcourt, Speech given in Oxford, 21 December 1874.

**D** *Disraeli attacks the Liberal government*

Her Majesty's...Ministers proceeded in their career like a body of men under the influence of some delirious drug. Not satiated with the spoliation and anarchy of Ireland, they began to attack every institution and every interest, every class and calling in the country...As time advanced, it was not difficult to perceive that extravagance was being substituted for energy by the Government....You behold a range of exhausted volcanoes. Not a flame flickers... I rejoice to see Conservatives as numerous and united as they have been tonight... I do not think that we shall hear much more for some time to come of that favourite theory with a certain class of Liberal politicians that the Conservative working man has no existence except in the imagination of political partisans. Gentlemen, there are rumours... that before any great length of time has passed we may again be engaged in the lively occupation of a general election.... Of this I am sure, the Conservative party of Lancashire need not fear a trial of its strength. Never were they more united; never have they been more powerful.

Benjamin Disraeli, Speech at Manchester, 2 April 1872.

**E** *A historian analyses the effects of Liberal policies*

It was fear of disestablishment [of the Church of England] and of radical educational reform which constituted the most effective Conservative weapon throughout Britain as a whole – as their candidates in concentrating on the issues were aware. It was these policies which, in the eyes of the average voter, would have the most obvious and severe consequences. The education question was doubly controversial, because it could be exploited in tandem with another issue, voters' dislike of high rates. To suggest adding to the ratepayer's load in order to fund the building of board schools was unpopular not only in rural areas but in many small towns.

J. P. Parry, *Democracy and Religion: Gladstone and the Liberal Party, 1867–75*, 1986.

- (a) How far are the views of the representative of the brewing industry, as expressed in Document A, corroborated by the views of Gladstone in Document B? [10]
- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents that, by their policies 1868–74, the Liberal government was the author of its own downfall in the general election of 1874?

In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E). [20]

**Answer one of the following questions.** *Where appropriate, your essay should make use of any of the relevant documents you have studied as well as contextual knowledge.*

- 2 How innovative were Disraeli's political ideas as leader of the Conservative party? [30]
- 3 Why did Irish issues occupy so much of the time of the United Kingdom parliament in the years 1867–86? [30]
- 4 'Superficially antagonistic but in surprising fundamental agreement.' How far do you accept this judgement on the foreign and imperial policy objectives of Gladstone and Disraeli in the years 1867–80? [30]

**BLANK PAGE**

---

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

University of Cambridge International Examinations is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/05H**

Paper 5h Special Subject: Gladstone and Disraeli

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

**2 hours**

---

**MAXIMUM MARK: 60**

---

This document consists of **10** printed pages.



- 1 (a) How far are the views of the representative of the brewing industry, as expressed in Document A, corroborated by the views of Gladstone in Document B? [10]

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be sharply aware of similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues should be made across the documents, rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborated each other and/or differ, and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation. Candidates should make use of the content of the headings and attributions, as well as the text, of the documents.

Document **A** makes clear that the brewing industry was concerned at the impact of the Liberals' licensing legislation. It specifically refers to the powers which magistrates now had to reduce drinking hours and to the clear evidence of an anti-drink pressure group within the ranks of Liberal MPs. The action which the brewers have taken in order to counteract this influence is described in the second half of the document. Candidates should be able to infer both that the brewers were attempting to screw the courage of Conservative candidates to the pro-drink sticking place and that this tactic has been successful. Candidates can readily infer from the second half of the Document that its writer believes this tactic to have been successful. The first sentence of Document **B** makes quite clear Gladstone's belief that the drink issue was primarily responsible for the outcome of the election. All candidates should be able to make effective use of the second half of Document **B** to indicate that Gladstone refers to other reasons for Liberal defeat. These are primarily religious. Dissatisfaction from both Roman Catholics and Nonconformists (normally strong Liberal supporters) is specifically mentioned along with 'other minor agencies'. It is, therefore, possible to argue that **B** corroborates **A** only to an extent. Both seem to agree that drink is the most important factor. However, **B** offers other reasons. Good candidates may note that Document **A** does not, in so many words, claim that the efforts of the drink lobby explain the Conservative victory, although its author clearly believes his organisation's tactics to have been successful.

In evaluating the sources, candidates should be aware of such issues as provenance, purpose and reliability. Here, it is significant that Document **A** comes from a senior representative of a relevant trade and might, in this letter to a newspaper, be articulating officially agreed policy against the Licensing Act. Candidates might also note that the Document represents the well-known views of an interest group. Document **B** is from a prime minister reflecting on the causes of what was an unexpected defeat in a private letter to a close relative. Thus, although he would have strong, 'insider' knowledge of policies and, probably, of their likely impact on an electorate, Gladstone's judgment might have been skewed. It was made in the immediate aftermath of defeat. It was thus likely to be not be as 'rounded' as one offered in later, and perhaps more reflective, tranquillity.

- (b) **How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents that, by their policies 1868–74, the Liberal government was the author of its own downfall in the general election of 1874?** [20]

The answer should treat the documents as a set and should make effective use of each. Although, depending on the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It should be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material should be handled confidently with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument should be well constructed. Historical concepts and vocabulary should be fully understood.

From contextual knowledge, candidates should be aware of the key elements of Liberal policy in the years 1868–74. Attention is likely to be given to the wide range of administrative reforms, not least in the civil service and in the army. It is relevant to mention Irish policy, particularly the controversial disestablishment of the Irish Church and the only very partially successful Land Act. Candidates might cross-refer here to Document **D**, where Disraeli refers tendentiously to ‘spoliation and anarchy in Ireland’. Disraeli’s reference to attacking every institution and interest could link to candidates’ own knowledge about administrative reforms. Documents **B** and **E** both explicitly refer to the electoral damage done by the Education Act of 1870, not only in terms of sectarian division but in causing local rates to rise in many places. **E** links education with fears of further religious reform as key weapons which the Conservatives used in the general election campaign. Candidates could use Documents **A** and **B** to discuss the importance of the drink question as a factor in the Liberal ‘downfall’. **A** specifically mentions the drink interest’s intention to offer at the general election a Conservative candidature solidly in favour of amending unpopular licensing legislation. Candidates can use contextual knowledge both to point out the very strong historical link between ‘the drink interest’ and the Conservative party and also to judge how important this was. Clearly, in the short-term at least, the malign influence of drink question had persuaded Gladstone (**B**) of its significance. From their own knowledge, candidates could add the perception that the Licensing Act was very popular with many nonconformists and, perhaps necessary to keeping the Liberal party a united force in the early 1870s.

Perhaps the most direct evidence from the Documents concerning the Liberals as authors of their own downfall comes from **C**. Here Harcourt specifically argues that electoral defeat was not the fault of the ‘Administration’ as such. It was ‘discordant sections’ of the Liberal party which produced the main difficulties. In particular, the party was not united on some of the initiatives into which, candidates might well infer, Harcourt believed the government had been hustled by its own backbenchers. Candidates can use contextual knowledge to say how far they agree with this view. Candidates can use Document **D** to argue that the Liberals were beginning to lose their previously almost monopolistically secure hold on the support of working men. They can use wider contextual knowledge to confirm that, as in 1868, the Conservatives did better in 1874 in Lancashire than any other industrial county. Document **D** can also be used to demonstrate the effectiveness of Disraeli’s oratory and his mastery of the presentation of policy. It is likely that many candidates will have other examples of this to which they can refer and which they might consider suggest that it was the effectiveness of Tory leadership, rather than Liberal weaknesses or difficulties, which did more to determine the outcome of the 1874 election.

Candidates have much to go on from Documents which, between them, cover most of the key issues in domestic policy. They are entitled, of course, to refer to foreign policy, which occasioned considerable criticism, not least of the costly resolution of the Alabama incident in 1873. Some candidates may know that Disraeli devoted a section (not included as part of the source pack) of his Manchester speech of 1872 (**D**) to foreign policy. In deciding on whether the Liberals were indeed the authors of their own downfall, candidates will wish to consider whether policies which proved unpopular could, or should, have been avoided or presented differently. They will also wish to consider the extent to which Conservative advance among sections of the working classes could have been counter-acted. Did the Liberals assume continued working-class loyalty whereas, as events indicated, they could claim continued loyalty disproportionately from skilled and unionised workers? They might also weigh the value of Harcourt's evidence (**C**). How effectively did the government link the divergent interests of the nonconformist and 'Whig' wings of the party? If not effectively, how important was either disunity or what Harcourt clearly saw as backbench 'harassing' to the outcome of the election?

Where appropriate, an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected. Here, candidates may be aware that Gladstone's famous short-term judgement about 'gin and beer' (**B**) is generally rejected as too simple, ignoring as it does not only many other factors but also the fact that the Liberals did reasonably well in midland and northern towns. Document **E** can also be used as a hook on which to argue the merits of different interpretations, since Parry isolates disestablishment fears and the fall-out from the Education Act as central reasons for Tory revival. A convincing explanation of the 'downfall' needs to note a strong degree of regional specificity with the Conservatives, in effect cleaning up, in the counties and the market towns of southern England and also in the capital. The debate on the extent to which the Liberal government was 'the author of its own downfall' remains open. Clearly, candidates can argue either way. They might wish to conclude that a strong reforming agenda linked to ample evidence of high administrative competence is no guarantee of electoral success.

## 2 How innovative were Disraeli's political ideas as leader of the Conservative party? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of Disraeli's political ideas in the period 1868–81. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Here the focus requires the making of a historical judgement on the extent to which Disraeli's political ideas were innovative. Candidates are likely to emphasise the following 'political ideas' or, perhaps, guiding principles: the need to broaden the base of the Conservative party in order to make it first electable and then more consistently popular with the electorate; policies designed to attract the lower middle classes and especially the working classes in urban constituencies. Disraeli's seemed committed to policies of social reform, designed to improve 'the health of the people' – e.g. Artisans Dwellings Act, Sale of Food and Drugs Act, Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act (allowing peaceful picketing) etc. Disraeli showed his 'trust in the people', being willing to countenance a larger increase in the electorate in 1867 than Gladstone and the Liberals would have done. Disraeli also supported the reorganisation of the party (with the help of John Eldon Gorst and others). A key aspect of Disraeli's policy was support for the Church of England, which he believed played a key role in securing the stability of the nation. Some candidates might also note Disraeli's pretty consistent strain of anti-Catholicism. He also supported the existing constitution, including, perhaps especially, the monarchy (candidates may wish to refer to his especially close relationship with Queen Victoria and her admiration of his enlightened leadership). He advocated patriotism and articulated the importance of stressing a national identity – grounded in encouraging citizens to celebrate their country and, especially, its growing world leadership through a policy of imperialism. Imperialism, he believed, had a civilising as well as an expansionist role. Despite Disraeli's abandonment of protection long before he became Conservative leader, he retained a consistent commitment to the landed interest, which he saw as an essential bulwark of social cohesion. Good candidates should appreciate that the focus of the information provided in the answer should be on Disraeli's ideas rather than on his policies, except in so far as these illuminate his ideas.

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 judgment about Disraeli's ideas, and particularly the extent to which they were innovative.

Candidates may wish to argue that, in his support for the landed interest and his desire to spike the guns of radical politicians, Disraeli was not innovative at all; rather, he was following standard Tory policies. Similarly, anti-Catholicism had played a key part in Tory politics for at least half a century before Disraeli became leader and his support for Protestantism (one of the strongest policy commitments he made) was anything but innovatory. Significantly, it paid electoral dividends in areas with strong Catholic communities, such as Lancashire and parts of London. The centrality of the imperial ideal for Disraeli and also of his attempt to place patriotism and awareness of national identity and pride might be considered as broadly innovative, although both stem from well-established ideas. Also in his pronounced reluctance to theorise but to seek to solve practical problems, when this could be achieved with political advantage, he might be seen as broadly traditional. Only in the particular way in which he articulated ideas, with his special interest in attracting new voters in a substantially expanded electorate, might he be considered 'innovatory'. How many of his political ideas, some may ask, were window-dressing and populist, rather than genuinely innovatory? On the other hand, candidates could argue that in his attempt to develop more 'popular' policies, and in his much more explicit embracing of imperialist ideas, he was breaking with Tory traditions. They might also point to his carefully cultivated image – especially in the Commons – as representing a new style of leadership based on his debating ability and his ability to present himself as the effective solver of key problems. On the other hand, his style was much more in evidence in the Commons than in the country, where Gladstone made much the greater impact. Disraeli's Manchester speech of 1872 might be

seen as an atypical foray into the constituencies. Candidates could also argue whether 'ideas' rather than 'tactics' were really Disraeli's *forte*. He was not university-educated and he would hardly be likely to take on his greatest parliamentary antagonist in a field where he had such commanding pre-eminence. Thus, a valid argument could be that he adapted established Tory ideas, presenting them in attractively innovative ways to secure tactical advantage.

Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of debates on the extent to which Disraeli was committed to anything resembling 'Tory democracy'. The idea of Disraeli as a committed 'man of the people' is now accepted by few historians and probably belongs more in the realms of Conservative mythology. Some candidates may also know that historians have been confounded by attempts to stick straightforward labels on Disraeli either as an innovative politician or as a traditional Tory, albeit in distinctly untraditional garb.

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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 penalized for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

**3 Why did Irish issues occupy so much of the time of the United Kingdom parliament in the years 1867–86? [30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of Irish issues and their impact on UK politics. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Here the focus is on the reasons why Irish issues bulked so large in UK politics during the stated period. It is also difficult to contest the proposition that Irish issues grew in their importance for Westminster politicians over the period covered by the question. The key issues on which candidates are likely to concentrate include: the abiding unpopularity of the Union of 1800 and the growth of violence as a means of shaking it. The so-called Fenian Outrages in Manchester and London (1867) might be a starting point for many, representing as they do the attempt to bring violence to Britain rather than keeping it in Ireland; the extent to which Fenianism ‘raised consciousness’ in Britain and perhaps convinced Gladstone that his ‘mission’ really had to be to pacify Ireland; Disestablishment of Irish Church (1869); Land Act (1870) designed to protect Irish tenancies; foundation of the Home Rule League (1873) and its early success; the roles of Butt and Parnell; Irish Land League founded (1879) and the role of Michael Davitt; policy of ‘Boycotting’; Coercion Act (1881); Land Act (1881); Kilmainham Treaty (1882) as an attempt to end violence in Ireland; The Phoenix Park Murders (1882); the impact of the Reform and Redistribution Acts (1884–5); Gladstone’s commitment to Home Rule and its short-term impact (1885–6). Candidates should use this and similar evidence to indicate that Ireland *did* play a central role in UK politics in this period. The relationship between initiatives, impact and consequence should be clearly identified in answers.

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 centrality of Irish issues in a UK parliament. Key reasons which candidates are likely to identify, and perhaps adjudicate between, will include the following. The impact of violence: how far were Westminster initiatives (whether ‘liberal’ as with the Land Acts or ‘repressive’ as with the Coercion Act) driven by the fear that Ireland was becoming ungovernable and/or that the majority community there was being systematically disadvantaged? The emergence of Irish nationalists as a significant independent force at Westminster, rather than a small, and sometimes deferential, minority within a previously dominant Liberal coalition. In 1874, Nationalists won 58 seats; in 1880, 65 and in 1885, after redistribution, 86 of the 101 Irish seats. Thus, while political opinion within Ireland was overwhelmingly in favour of nationalist solutions, the nationalists elected to Westminster were also becoming capable of denying Liberals and Conservatives a majority and could use their political powers directly. The impact of the Home Rule and Land League: these organisations helped make the Irish question more critical. Policies of ‘boycotting’ and ‘filibustering’ led some to reflect that the Westminster parliament was being prevented from acting as an efficient legislature while Irish issues remained unresolved. The Phoenix Park murders, while producing widespread revulsion, convinced many that the Irish issue was not going to go away. Irish issues contributed to the growing division between parties. Although many Liberals were uneasy about ‘concessions’ to the Catholics, the Tory party was overwhelmingly Protestant and determined to support the Protestant interest, particularly in the North. Some candidates might say that Gladstone, almost single-handedly, was responsible for keeping Ireland on the agenda. He had been the first leading British politician to think radically in terms of legislation designed to provide relief for Irish Catholics. His journey through the thickets of Irish politics had convinced him that Home Rule (in domestic affairs) was the only viable solution. This decision led to his removal from office, split his party and ensured that, in 1885–6, Ireland was *the* key issue of the day. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of debates about Gladstone’s personal commitment to Irish questions and to arguments about the relative importance of the various factors. Was Ireland so

important because of perceptions in Westminster about the depth of Irish problems? Or were the leadership, tactics of, and clear majority support for, Irish nationalist leaders more important?

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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 penalized for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

4 **‘Superficially antagonistic but in surprising fundamental agreement.’ How far do you accept this judgment on the foreign and imperial policy objectives of Gladstone and Disraeli in the years 1867–80? [30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge about the aims of British foreign and imperial policy. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Here the focus requires the making of a historical judgement on the extent to which the fundamental foreign and imperial policy objectives of Gladstone and Disraeli’s governments in the stated period were congruent. It is important that candidates confine themselves to the period specified and do not deal (very brief comparative references apart) with Gladstone’s 1880–85 administration. In terms of ‘superficially antagonistic’, candidates might note the obvious character and attitude differences between the two prime ministers: Gladstone apparently activated by higher moral purposes and concerned about the rights of those seeking independent nationhood. He also supported the idea of a ‘Concert of Europe’ to settle disputes peacefully and believed that Britain should strive to sustain a balance of power in Europe. His ‘internationalist’ attitudes are shown in his government’s agreement to have an independent international tribunal settle the amount of compensation for the Alabama incident. Gladstone was also apparently more ‘pacifist’. His ministry of 1868–74 was far less active in imperial affairs than Disraeli’s would be. By contrast, foreign policy appears to be at the heart of Disraeli’s agenda in 1874–80: his concern to block off the Russian expansionist threat in South-East Europe (when Gladstone brought himself back into the political mainstream, inveighing against ‘Bulgarian atrocities’ and attacking the Turks – who should leave ‘bag and baggage’). This policy involved support for the Ottoman Empire and an apparent willingness to go to war to curb Russian ambitions. It also brought the acquisition of Cyprus in 1878. The British Empire bulked very large in Disraeli’s propaganda; the Royal Titles Act (1876) can be seen as symbolic of this. Also they might note his Crystal Palace Speech (1872) – with its assertion that defence of its Empire is central to Britain’s role and standing in the world. The government’s purchase of Suez Canal Shares (1875) also had at least symbolic importance for Britain’s status as a trading nation with interests in India and the Far East.

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 similarity, or difference, of the objectives of Gladstone and of Disraeli in foreign and imperial policy. Good candidates will wish to debate whether, if they believe that there was ‘fundamental agreement’, such agreement was indeed ‘surprising’. On the face of it, any selection from the evidence listed under AO1 above seems to suggest that candidates should reject at least the second half of the quotation. There is no doubt that Gladstone was the more ‘internationalist’ and that Disraeli made much more use of imperial messages. It is also difficult to see a Gladstone-led government threatening war over Russian expansionist activity in 1877–78. The differences, therefore, are clear but candidates have to decide whether they were more than superficial. If they argue that the differences were indeed mostly superficial, then they might wish to suggest that the biggest issues saw a considerable degree of agreement. Both administrations placed the expansion, and the defence, of British trading interest at the heart of policy. Both were also sensitive to the differences in the European balance of power created by the emergence of a large, and potentially very powerful, independent German state in 1871. Britain wished to sustain a balance of power in Europe throughout the 1870s. Most candidates, though, will probably argue that the differences were more than superficial. If they do so, then in addition to the obvious differences in emphasis, they are likely to stress Disraeli’s imperially-orientated foreign policy – with an element of sabre-rattling to it – in contrast to Gladstone’s clear preference for international agreements and also for a foreign policy in support of nationalist objectives (especially in south-east Europe) which was linked to the defence of ‘Christian peoples’ against alleged Ottoman aggression. By contrast,

Disraeli was more concerned about threats to the balance of power and more influenced by considerations of *realpolitik* than of high principle.

Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work on Gladstone's moralism which perhaps warped his wider political judgment. Also, some historians question whether Disraeli's commitment to the Empire was made for more than tactical reasons, especially those related to domestic politics and cementing those who would later be called 'Angels in Marble' to the Conservative cause.

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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 penalized for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/05I**

Paper 5i Special Subject:  
The Campaign for Female Suffrage, c. 1880–1928  
SPECIMEN PAPER

**For Examination from 2010**

**2 hours**

---

**READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST**

Answer Question 1 and **one** other question.

The number of marks is given in brackets [ ] at the end of each question or part question.

You are reminded of the need for analysis and critical evaluation in your answers to questions. You should also show, where appropriate, an awareness of links and comparisons between different countries and different periods.

---

This document consists of **3** printed pages and **1** blank page.



**Answer the following question.**

**Nominated topic: Attitudes towards female suffrage before 1914**

- 1 Study all of the following documents and answer all the questions which follow. In evaluating and commenting upon the documents, it is essential to set them alongside and to make use of your own contextual knowledge.

**A** *A contemporary journal sets out commonly held views about society.*

We want the fullest possible development of the powers, energies, and education of women. However, we believe that their work for the State, and their responsibilities towards it, must always be different from those of men. To men belong the struggles of debate and legislation in Parliament; the hard and exhausting labour involved in running national industries, and the conduct of foreign policy. We want women to have their full share in that higher State which rests on thought, conscience and moral influence. But we protest against women having power in a political State that is based on force. The State in its administrative, military and financial aspects is where the physical capacity of men ought to prevail.

*The Nineteenth Century magazine*, published 1889.

**B** *A Liberal MP explains his position on the issue of women's place in society.*

The mass of women do not have, and never will have, the opportunities that men, even the roughest, have to study politics. Men usually work together, visit clubs or public houses, and discuss the events of the day. Women cannot undertake this without destroying their domestic life. A good wife and mother cannot leave her home to attend clubs and public meetings, and if she does, she will soon cease to be a good wife and mother. Most men rapidly and easily take to politics; most women will never do so because the Creator has made them different.

Samuel Smiles, Liberal MP, writing in 1891.

**C** *A prominent figure in the female suffrage movement and subsequent Suffragist sets out her position.*

The difference between men and women is the strongest possible reason for giving us the vote. We want the home and the domestic side of things to count for more in politics than they do at present. We want to know how various laws have an effect on the home and on domestic life. We want to force our legislators to consider the domestic as well as the political results of any legislation they are debating. I call for the extension of the franchise to women because I wish to strengthen true womanliness in women, and because I want to see the womanly and domestic side of things weigh more and count for more in all public concerns.

Millicent Fawcett, *Home and Politics*, 1894.

**D** *A leading newspaper puts the issue of female suffrage into perspective.*

While our political machinery is so imperfect, while hundreds of thousands of adult men are still outside the franchise and are taxed and rated without being represented, it would be wise on the part of the Liberal leaders to concern themselves first with these pressing grievances. So many special women's grievances have been dealt with since the time when the suffrage was demanded, that there is no violent hurry for settling this question. However, there is known to be a difference of opinion inside the Liberal Party on this subject.

*The Daily Chronicle*, March 1897.

**E** *A prominent Suffragette leader advocates the use of violence.*

Those of you who can express your militancy by joining us in our anti-Government by-election policy – do so. Those of you who can break windows – break them. Those of you who can still further attack the god of property so as to make the government realise that it is as greatly endangered by Women’s Suffrage as it was by the Chartists of old – do so. And my last word to the Government: I incite this meeting to rebellion. You have not dared to take the leaders of Ulster for their incitement to rebellion, take me if you dare.

Emmeline Pankhurst, October 1912.

**(a)** How far does Document E corroborate Document C in explaining female responses to the failure to gain the vote? [10]

**(b)** How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that women had no chance of success in their campaigns to gain the vote in the period c. 1880–1914?

In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as all the documents in this set (A–E). [20]

**Answer one of the following questions.** *Where appropriate, your essay should make use of any relevant documents you have studied as well as contextual knowledge.*

**2** Assess the importance of the economic and social gains made by women in the period c. 1880–1900. [30]

**3** ‘Women supported the suffrage movement above all to secure greater equality of opportunity.’ How far do you agree? [30]

**4** Why was the vote extended to some, but not all, women in 1918? [30]

**BLANK PAGE**

---

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

University of Cambridge International Examinations is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/05I**

Paper 5i Special Subject:  
The Campaign for Female Suffrage, c. 1880–1928

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

**2 hours**

---

**MAXIMUM MARK: 60**

---

This document consists of **5** printed pages and **1** blank page.



- 1 (a) **How far does Document E corroborate Document C in explaining female responses to the failure to gain the vote?** [10]

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues should be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation. Comments on tone, language, reliability and typicality will aid evaluation, with the emphasis being upon provenances and their links to contents. Here the dates and authors help much. Document C sets out what may be viewed as the classic constitutionalist approach, expressed (in measured terms) by the prospective leader of the NUWSS, while Document E expresses forcefully the tactics of the WSPU set out by one of the key leaders at a time of much militant action. The tone of C emphasises the links of social and political issues, seeking to apply pressure on the Government by conventional means, while that of E urges, indeed incites, major protest ('rebellion').

- (b) **How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that women had no chance of success in their campaigns to gain the vote in the period c. 1880–1914?**

**In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as all the documents in this set (A–E).** [20]

The answer should treat the documents as a set and should make effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It should be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material should be handled confidently with strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument should be well constructed. Historical concepts and vocabulary should be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected. A good focus on the terms of the question and the argument put forward is required here. Given a long time span, context knowledge will need to be selective. Argument and counter-argument (there was no chance, there was a chance) can be advanced. Document E provides a helpful overview, with links to all the other Documents. Documents A and B certainly support the proposition, with Documents C and D at least implying a lack of progress. Documents C and D, though full of obvious differences as to methods, do imply that there was a chance of changing male-parliamentary attitudes. The dates of the Documents should be taken into account, especially the gap between C and D. In A, B and C references are made to the prevalent male attitude towards the extension of the vote, namely politics was the preserve of men; A and B are very explicit on this. C seeks to contextualise the political issue into a broader pattern of needs. D can be used to explain why any campaign was unlikely to succeed, if it resorted to militancy. Then again, other (if related) factors can be adduced. E links with all at several levels, showing some progress but also limitations and reflecting the arguments there are over the position by 1914. The tone of most of the Documents can be considered in evaluating the proposition, E and D can be linked. Topic knowledge can be used in support: male attitudes; key arguments used against extending the franchise; the impact of the NUWSS and WSPU; attitudes of party leaders and rank-and-file MPs; the fate of Private Members' Bills (etc). Broad contextual knowledge (place and role of women, economic and social; class differences; nature of the workplace) can be related to the Documents, not least A and B.

**2 Assess the importance of the economic and social gains made by women in the period c. 1880–1900. [30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A description of such gains will need elements of explanation to secure reward. Analysis and evaluation are required: an estimation of scale, nature, character and so significance. Economic will embrace employment, wages, status; social will cover wider areas, including legal, property. The issues are indeed extent of gains and, by implication, how far these made more prominent political issues and the question of the vote. An awareness of class issues – the working-class, middle-class divide – will inform good answers as will a sense of context ('separate spheres', married versus single, broad educational and economic changes). A range of areas can be explored: employment opportunities, status, wages and salaries; legal status and protection; broad rights; arguments over domesticity and respectability, the dangers of waged work, the impact on home and motherhood; issues of divorce, domestic violence, perceived or actual inequalities. The range of opportunities in the professions (e.g. medicine, education, the civil service) can be explored. Reference can be made to (e.g.) inspector and commissioner status in some areas (factories, sanitation, labour), property rights, matrimonial causes, guardianship, the repeal of the Contagious Diseases Act, all legislated within these years.

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. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'Assess ...' invites a sense of ordering, of relative importance of factors, while seeing links between such. Equal attention to economic and social is not required; many will link them closely, though a sense of distinction is important here. There is debate here. As stated in AO1, economic and social gains have been evaluated as to real scale and significance and set against the lack of political gains. Some argue that women were keen to achieve a broad range of gains, not least educational, legal and economic. But some view these as specifically middle-class women. Others argue that women were happy with what gains were made or else were more focused on the political arena (some women saw such as the route to more gains elsewhere).

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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.

**3 'Women supported the suffrage movement above all to secure greater equality of opportunity.' How far do you agree? [30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. This is a relatively broad question and candidates will approach it as such. No terminal dates are given, though it is likely that answers may run from c. 1880 to 1914, or possibly focus on a narrow period (e.g. c. 1900–14). This is not a question on the NUWSS or WSPU as such, but a question on support levels and reasons. Reference to both and indeed to earlier suffrage movements and ideas as well as to offshoots after 1905 is acceptable if related well to the needs of the question. Factors that can be explored: reasons for demanding the vote, ethical, moral, philosophical, social; links made to the wider 'women's question' and so to social and economic issues; political activism as a means of progression (including membership of Party units and agencies); the role of the WFL in its demands for equal opportunities; class-based issues of attitude, outlook, objectives (see also AO2). In essence there is likely to be argument over a narrowness of goal and approach set against broader goals: political against more socio-economic and legal.

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. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The formulation sets up argument and counter-argument: suffrage was backed as a means to achieve more social (and economic, etc) status or it was a different, distinct issue. There is a debate here. The words 'above all' invite discussion of reasons for support. Some argue that support came very much for political reasons and in search of desired political outcomes. Others argue that supporters often saw the suffrage issue as but a start on a road to much wider and fuller gains in civil society. There is debate about the place and development of feminism here (coined in the 1890s, more used as a term after 1900) as well as about the class-based nature of the suffrage movement. In the latter area, some argue that working-class women had no real interest in the vote, perhaps not even in equality of opportunity arguments; some believe there was an interest in the latter. Middle-class women are seen as a critical group, but with splits in their views (not all backed the NUWSS, WSPU; many were neutral or even backed the Anti-Suffrage movement).

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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.

**4 Why was the vote extended to some, but not all, women in 1918?****[30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of women’s work in the First World War is not required. Rather analysis and evaluation are required here, using that knowledge to illustrate changed attitudes but also awareness of the arguments of the 1917 Speaker’s Conference and in subsequent Parliamentary debate. In 1918 women over 30, who were householders, got the vote; those under 30 had to wait until 1928; the property qualification was seen as important. The very description of the Act – Parliament (Qualification of Women) – may be viewed as itself significant. As has been remarked, this was the ghostly perpetuation of household suffrage, meaning that, like men excluded before 1918, those excluded were young and single, generally living with parents: household suffrage and housewife suffrage. The gains of 1918 were unspectacular and did not ‘reward’ many women under 30 and of working class background who had participated in the war effort. In 1918, in effect, the vote was restricted; women could still be seen as second-class citizens in many ways; this reflected a view of many men that they should remain in the ‘private sphere’. There was a fear of ‘swamping’ the electorate if all women over 21 got the vote, creating imbalance and producing uncertain political configurations. That said, there was a breakthrough. Reference can be made to the social, cultural and emotional impact of the War; the nature of wartime participation by many women, especially after 1915; the changed stance of the WSPU leadership (though some breakaway groups protested still) and the overall attitude of women’s suffrage groups; the more conciliatory attitude of male politicians (including Asquith) and the arrival of Coalition Government, above all under Lloyd George; the balance in Parliament favouring a measure of enfranchisement; the broad concern with the enlargement of the electorate; international trends; aspects of war work, employment, participation and input by women.

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. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. ‘Why ...’ sets up an examination of factors, causal, linked, even if a sense of relative importance may be present. The distinction made between women over 30 and over 21 was important. There is some debate as to the explanation of this distinction (as there is over its importance). Some see the lingering issues of property qualifications as well as of the true ‘fitness’ of women to vote as significant here, no matter women’s role and place in the War effort. Some see other motives at work: the broad issue of rewarding the war efforts of men and women; the linkage of female to male suffrage; the desire to ward off a return to possible militancy. There is argument also over a fear of a ‘swamping’ effect (as above). Caution was evident and the restrictions important, albeit there was a feeling that the vote would be extended further before long. Some argue that the extension was already there, at least in theory, in 1913–14 but for WSPU activity, others argue that the nature of the War was the key.

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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.





UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/05J**

Paper 5j Special Subject: Russia in Revolution, 1905–1924

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN PAPER

**2 hours**

---

**READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST**

Answer Question 1 and **one** other question.

The number of marks is given in brackets [ ] at the end of each question or part question.

You are reminded of the need for analysis and critical evaluation in your answers to questions. You should also show, where appropriate, an awareness of links and comparisons between different countries and different periods.

---

This document consists of **4** printed pages.



**Answer the following question.**

**Nominated topic: The Civil War of 1918–21**

- 1 Study all of the following documents and answer all the questions which follow. In evaluating and commenting upon the documents, it is essential to set them alongside and to make use of your own contextual knowledge.

**A** *Lenin announces the formation of the Red Army.*

There has arisen the need for a new army as the mainstay of Soviet power at present and the basis for replacing the regular army by the arming of the whole people in the near future, and as a support for the coming socialist revolution in Europe.

- (i) The Council of People's Commissars resolves to organise a new army. . . . on the following principles:
- (1) The Workers' and Peasants' Red Army is built up from the most conscious and organised elements of the working people.
  - (2) Joining the ranks of the Red Army requires characteristics from army committees or democratic public organisations standing on the platform of Soviet power, Party or trade union organisations, or at least two members of these organisations.
- (ii) (1) The Workers' and Peasants' Red Army soldiers are fully maintained by the State and receive, on top of that, 50 rubles monthly.
- (2) Invalid members of the families of Red Army soldiers who formerly were their dependants are provided with everything necessary according to the local consumer quotas, in keeping with the decisions of the local bodies of Soviet power.

*First Decrees of Soviet Power, 28 January 1918.*

**B** *Trotsky, writing as Chairman of the Military Revolutionary Council, emphasises the needs of supplying food and materials and imposing discipline.*

It is essential to organise a large detachment, consisting of, roughly, one reliable Cheka battalion, several hundred Baltic Fleet sailors who have the getting of coal and bread at heart, a supply detachment of Moscow. . . . workers and some thirty senior Party workers, for the purpose of obtaining supplies of bread and coal from the Mariupol area and disciplining Makhno's anarchist bands.

*Letter written to Sklyansky, in Moscow, for the attention of Lenin on 22 May 1919.*

**C** *A leading local Bolshevik, the subject of Trotsky's comments in B, defends himself.*

Regardless of the fact that I and the insurgents fought exclusively against the White Guard gangs of Denikin, preaching to the people only love for freedom and independent help, the whole official Soviet press have been spreading false information about me.

I consider it an inalienable right of the workers and peasants, won by the revolution for themselves, to convene congresses to discuss and decide private as well as public affairs. Therefore the banning of such congresses by the central power is a direct and barefaced violation of the rights of the workers.

The hostile and recently aggressive conduct of the central authority towards insurgency is leading, with fatal inevitability, to the creation of a special internal front, on both sides of which will be the toiling masses, which believe in the revolution.

*Makhno, writing a general letter to the Soviet leadership on 9 June 1919, from the village of Gyaichur.*

- D** *Trotsky explains the role and purpose of military commissars and the importance of military discipline.*

Someone, somewhere, thought that commissars were only necessary where there were 'military specialists'. A gross delusion! There ought to be a commissar in every regiment. But supervision of certain commanders, who in their own words are 'extremely revolutionary', is just as necessary as supervision of doubtful 'military specialists'.

*Letter, 18 July 1919.*

- E** *Denikin, a leading White general, sets out his agenda.*

- 5 Every kind of support for the families of soldiers:

Organs of supply are to pass over finally to independent activity, utilising all the resources of the country which are still rich and not counting exclusively on help from outside.

Procure uniforms and supplies from the well-to-do.

Provide the army with an adequate quantity of money, preferably in the presence of everyone.

- 6 Internal policy:

Manifestation of solicitude for the population without distinction. . . . Assist social organisations. . . . (co-operatives, trade unions, etc.).

Suppress the anti-state activity of certain of these, not hesitating to adopt extreme measures.

Aid the press which is with us, tolerate the dissenting press, annihilate the destructive press.

No class privileges, no preferential support, administrative financial or moral.

Do not only frighten people with threats of severe measures for mutiny, the leadership of anarchical movements, speculation, robbery, bribe-taking, desertion, and other moral sins, but carry out these measures. The death penalty is the most fitting punishment.

- 7 Restore the morale of the front and the military rear by the work of specially appointed generals with wide powers, by field courts martial and by the use of extreme repressive measures.

*Proclamation issued at Taganrog, 14 December 1919.*

- (a)** How far does Document C corroborate Document B in showing the ruthless tactics employed by the Bolsheviks? [10]
- (b)** How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that the Bolsheviks, in winning the Civil War, abandoned all the principles of the October Revolution?

In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as all the documents in this set (A-E). [20]

**Answer one of the following questions.** *Where appropriate, your essay should make use of any relevant documents you have studied as well as contextual knowledge.*

- 2 'Tsarist autocracy was far stronger in 1914 than in 1906.' Discuss. [30]
- 3 To what extent can it be argued that the incompetence of Nicholas II as war leader was the major reason for Russian military defeats between 1914 and 1917? [30]
- 4 Why was the Provisional Government of 1917 unable to survive? [30]

---

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

University of Cambridge International Examinations is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/05J**

Paper 5j Special Subject: Russia in Revolution, 1905–24

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

**2 hours**

---

**MAXIMUM MARK: 60**

---

This document consists of **6** printed pages.



- 1 (a) How far does Document C corroborate Document B in showing the ruthless tactics employed by the Bolsheviks? [10]

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues should be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation. Comments on tone, language, reliability and typicality may well help evaluation, though the main focus will be upon provenances and their effect on contents. Both Documents deal with the same individual, incident and context but offer different views. In Document **B** Trotsky is determined to deploy all available resources to secure supplies and bring discipline to an apparently lawless area; in **C**, the author defends himself and the rights of the masses, workers and peasants to have a voice in decision-making, arguing for the suppression of such a voice by the Bolshevik leadership. **C** reflects popular and some internal Party concerns over the direction of policy and the war while **B** is open about the methods used. Comparison of the methods outlined in **B** and **C**, when put in context, would suggest ruthless tactics were to the fore. In **B** Trotsky is concerned to centralise and control supplies, making free use of the Cheka while in **C** the impact of such rigid central control is conveyed and criticised.

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that the Bolsheviks, in winning the civil war, abandoned all the principles of the October Revolution?

In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as all the documents in this set (A–E). [20]

The answer should treat the documents as a set and should make effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It should be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material should be handled confidently with strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument should be well constructed. Historical concepts and vocabulary should be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected. Good focus on the terms of the question and its argument is needed here. This is a question less about how the Reds won the civil War than about their approach to the high-minded principles of the Revolution. Some coverage of the former area is acceptable but the latter area is the key here and linkage has to be demonstrated. Document **E** offers some overview of issues; there is, of course, much debate on this proposition (did Lenin betray the Revolution?). Documents **A**, **B**, **C** and **D** all point to the tactics and methods used by the Reds' leadership to win a war vital to their survival and to their interpretation of the Revolution; links can be made to Document **E**. The latter and much of Document **C** point to the 'win-at-all-costs' mentality and the widespread feeling (cf. Kronstadt, 1921) that the Revolution was being betrayed. Implied in Document **E**, **A** shows Lenin's resolve to establish a central core of reliable, properly paid soldier-workers while **B** puts forward Trotsky's determination to act to both protect Reds' needs and show ruthlessness of response, and in **D** Trotsky offers a brief but strong defence of political controls. Document **C** accuses the Bolshevik leaders of betraying local democracy and of imposing rule from above, destroying potential rivals on the Left, using the excuse of insurgency and so exacerbating the war as a consequence. The Bolshevik Document implicitly corroborates this, revealing that the interests of the peasants were soon overridden, a popular militia abandoned in favour of a (Trotsky's preferred) stratified army. Context knowledge can be used to support this as can Document **E**. Brief reference to the key promises of October 1917 (bread, land, peace, power to the Soviets, Socialist autonomy, localised democracy) will help in evaluation: the ideals of 1917 were many – principles of Revolution – but many would argue that these were betrayed (Makhno is but a representative view here), either deliberately or otherwise in the context of the Civil War. Then again, much of what Lenin did in those years was inherent in his pre-revolutionary thinking. But there could be said to be mitigating circumstances (e.g. the need to 'save' the Revolution, the nature of the war) and peasant land ownership, for example, did resurface in the N.E.P. Lenin and the Bolshevik leadership need to be put into the context of a brutal and vicious Civil War (did Lenin force this?) and areas for discussion may well include: the issue of one party rule; dictatorial methods and pronouncements (as in several Documents, including **E**); the Cheka; the curtailment of the power of the soviets; the implications of Green unrest and of Kronstadt; War Communism (**E**); Red Terror (**E**), the concessions of the N.E.P. (not reflected in the political arena).

**2 'Tsarist autocracy was far stronger in 1914 than in 1906.' How far do you agree? Discuss. [30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of the period 1906–14 will not secure much reward unless there is explanation. Analysis and evaluation are required with a strong focus on strength (or weakness). The legacy of the 1905 Revolution, not least the promulgation of the Fundamental Laws, can be used, though the question is about its aftermath not the Revolution. Nicholas II's stance on the preservation of autocracy and rejection of constitutional monarchy forms can be assessed. The Duma experiment and Duma politics, the nature of the parties represented there as of the electorate and electoral laws can be considered as can attempts to defend and promote Tsarist policies in that forum and beyond. Duma attempts to influence economic and political rights and to introduce social and judicial reforms were negated by the reactionary policies of the Tsar and Conservative advisers. Stolypin's time as Prime Minister can be considered and how far his policies may have aided the Tsarist position. Factors apart from political-constitutional that can be assessed: the state of the economy; the levels of unrest (peasant revolts, worker strikes); the extent of controls exercised by the Okhrana and censorship; the unity or otherwise of different groups demanding reforms and changes. The contextual evidence is important for analysis of the political arena. There is much evidence of industrial and agrarian problems, divisions between employers and employees, landlords and peasants, town and countryside (did these worsen, especially c. 1911–14?). Candidates might also consider possible revolutionary implications of such divisions (were workers and peasants becoming more politicised, even revolutionary?). The interpretations are mixed and, as a result, the political standing of the Tsar is open to much debate. Nicholas II's personality and his competence or ineptitude will feature, no doubt, with plenty of examples of both to hand, though a broader institutional-structural context (above) is required also.

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. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question formulation sets up argument and counter-argument, reflecting debate areas. Some view the Tsarist system as robust, able to recover from the unrest of 1905–6, popular and entrenched in 1913–14. Others believe that security was superficial, indeed transient, with major underlying structural tensions and problems. Nicholas II's position may have depended on the disunity of critics and opponents; he may have underestimated such. Then again, the upturn of the economy and popular demonstrations and events in 1913 at the 300th anniversary of the dynasty may have helped. Some believe that the outcome of 1905–6 events merely postponed a massive challenge. Others view the controls exerted and the unity on the declaration of war in 1914 in a more positive light.

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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.

**3 To what extent was the incompetence of Nicholas II as war leader the major reason for Russian military defeats between 1914 and 1917? [30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of the war, especially defeats, will not answer the question, unless there is some explanation. Analysis and evaluation are required here. Nicholas' competence or otherwise once he assumed command of the forces in 1915 needs to be tested by reference to the conduct of campaigns, overall strategy and tactics. Defeats there were but also periods of upturn, as in 1916. Much depended on the duration of conflict. A short war was expected; a long one was undeniably bad. Reference can be made to command and control, resources, munitions shortages, transport problems, the quality of officers and NCOs, logistics, morale, evidence of mutinies, politicisation of elements of the army and the quality of German opposition. The broader structural and institutional factors also need to be considered: the make-up of the forces, their leadership; the quality of conscripts; the state of the economy (inflation, food crises); social unrest levels; political activity; the role of the Duma. Ultimately, much revolved around Nicholas and the nature of wartime government at a distance from the capital. It would be acceptable to assess such elements as the balance between forces under and outside the Tsar's control, provided they are related to the above statement: for example, under his control, the Tsar, Imperial Government as a functioning system, the nature of appointments and advice offered; outside his control, the progressive Bloc, intelligentsia attitude; trade unions, political groups, the elites' doubts by early 1917.

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. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'To what extent ...' opens up debate, argument and counter-argument, with perhaps a sense of relative importance of factors; links need to be appreciated also. Some would argue that Nicholas II proved his incompetence from 1915 and was the key reason for the problems encountered, leading to his overthrow. Others argue that there were wide problems, structural, institutional, long-term, made worse by the fact that a short war was needed. A protracted conflict served only to demonstrate those problems. Some believe that it was only in 1916 that the problems became manifest.

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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.

**4 Why was the Provisional Government of 1917 unable to survive?****[30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of the events of 1917 between February-March and October will need good explanation – causal narrative – to answer the question. Analysis and evaluation are required. Many factors can be considered here. Reference to the growing challenge of Lenin and the Bolsheviks can be made as can reference to the October coup, but the Provisional Government itself needs to be well-featured. Its Leadership, notably Kerensky, and make-up need to be examined. Its policies and promises were important. The June offensive and continuation of the war proved deeply unpopular; social and economic (not least land) reforms stalled; there was inflation, a food crisis: tensions between rural and urban and within areas were manifest; promised elections were not held. The Governments had moments of popularity and support (the ‘July Days’ could be assessed, for example) but the nature of the war and the significant Kornilov Affair damaged its credibility and parties began to withdraw or at least consider continued support. Kerensky could well feature strongly (he could be said to have stabilised the Government but then to have undermined it) but broader structural and institutional factors should be assessed.

The prosecution of War could be seen as decisive – Kerensky involved there, of course – with arguments over the need to keep in the War (supplies, credit, what would be demanded if peace were negotiated) and the problems created (war weariness at the front and at home, Petrograd Soviet-Provisional Government disagreements, failure to achieve victory, reluctance to deal with major social and economic problems, the uses made by the Bolsheviks of all this – Peace, Land, Bread, etc). As stated, key events can be used for illustration (e.g. Order No. 1, June Offensive, its impact at home in the ‘July Days’, various resignations and changing coalitions, slogans and propaganda of its critics).

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. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. ‘Why ...’ opens up debate, argument and counter-argument. A sense of factors, relative importance, ordering of such – but with awareness of links – need to be conveyed here. Some believe that the Provisional Government made so many mistakes that its fall was inevitable. Others believe that no government at that time could have been sure of success and survival, given the chaos and crises of 1917. Although Lenin and the Bolsheviks were involved (some would say majorly), the focus needs to be on the Provisional Government itself. As stated in AO1, Kerensky can be blamed for the failure of the Government. Many have blamed him. But others see wider issues, while the role of Lenin and his skills are seen by some as decisive.

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/05K**

Paper 5k Winston Churchill, 1914–1946

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN PAPER

**2 hours**

---

**READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST**

Answer Question 1 and **one** other question.

The number of marks is given in brackets [ ] at the end of each question or part question.

You are reminded of the need for analysis and critical evaluation in your answers to questions. You should also show, where appropriate, an awareness of links and comparisons between different countries and different periods.

---

This document consists of **3** printed pages and **1** blank page.



**Answer the following question.**

**Nominated topic: War leadership 1940–44**

- 1 Study all the following documents and answer all the questions which follow. In evaluating and commenting upon the documents it is essential to set them alongside and to make use of your own contextual knowledge.

- A** *In two speeches in the House of Commons, at the beginning of his wartime prime ministership, Churchill seeks to rally Parliament and the nation.*

You ask, What is our policy? I will say: It is to wage war, by sea, land and air, with all our might and with all the strength that God can give us: to wage war against a monstrous tyranny, never surpassed in the dark, lamentable catalogue of human crime. That is our policy. You ask, What is our aim? I can answer in one word: Victory – victory at all costs, victory in spite of all terror; victory, however long and hard the road may be; for without victory there is no survival.

Speech, 13 May 1940.

We shall go onto the end, we shall fight in France, we shall fight on the seas and oceans, we shall fight with growing confidence and growing strength in the air, we shall defend our island, whatever the cost may be, we shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills; we shall never surrender.

Speech, 4 June 1940.

- B** *An Independent Member of Parliament recalls his impressions of Churchill's speech in the House of Commons on 4 June 1940.*

Most of us were thinking ... 'How on earth are we going to do it? And what happens if France falls, as Mr. Churchill clearly fears?' The greatness of that speech was that it filled in, with simple vivid strokes, a picture of the impossible made possible. Every man saw himself in that picture somewhere, fighting 'on the beaches, in the streets, in the hills' and we all went out refreshed and resolute to do our best. If Churchill saw a way out of this mess.... That was good enough for us.

A. P. Herbert, *Winston Spencer Churchill: Servant of Crown and Commonwealth*, 1954.

- C** *The wartime Chief of the Imperial General Staff records an incident at a meeting of the Chiefs of Staff. Here, Churchill's proposal to send ten squadrons of aircraft to the aid of Stalin was opposed.*

This produced the most awful outburst of temper, we were told that we did nothing but obstruct his intentions, we had no ideas of our own, and whenever he produced ideas we produced nothing but objections. Attlee pacified him once, but he broke out again, then Anthony Eden soothed him temporarily, but to no avail. Finally he looked at his papers, then slammed them together, closed the meeting, then walked out of the room! It was entirely unnecessary. We were only trying to keep him from making definite promises which he might find hard to keep. It is all the result of overworking himself. Such a pity. God knows where we would be without him, but God knows where we shall go with him!

Viscount Alanbrooke, *Diaries*, entry for 4 December 1941.

- D** *After the Second World War, at an unveiling of a portrait of Churchill, Alanbrooke recalls his impressions of Churchill as a wartime leader.*

As I look back on those five years of close contact with the greatest war leader of modern times, I carry away in my memory deeply engraved impressions of unbounded genius, unrelenting energy, dogged determination, a refusal to accept defeat in any shape or form, vast personal courage, a deep sense of humour, and an uncanny faculty of inspiring respect, admiration, loyalty, and deep affection in the hearts of all those fortunate enough to work in close touch with him. With that memory as a background I shall to my dying day thank God for the great privilege of having been associated with him during those momentous years.

Speech, 19 December 1950.

- E** *A modern historian comments upon Churchill's overall direction of the Second World War.*

In the British sphere, Churchill had continued to be the great animator of the war. He was constantly spurring or coaxing ministers, officials and generals to greater activity and quicker progress. Yet his own account leaves the analytical reader with the impression that his actual influence was much less than is commonly supposed. It is astonishing to find how often he failed to get his views accepted by the chiefs of staff, even when his views were most clearly right. His account also reveals a hesitation to insist on what he considered right, and a deference to officialdom that ran contrary to the popular picture of his dominating personality.

Although he had himself been slow to recognise some of the decisive new trends of warfare – with unfortunate effect on the earlier course of the war – his minutes from 1940 on show him as being usually in advance of his official military advisers and executives.

It may seem strange that he did not push his advisers along faster, or replace them by more forward-thinking men. He himself remarks in one place: 'The reader must not forget that I never wielded autocratic powers, and always had to move with and focus political and professional opinions'. That view of his own limited powers corresponds to reality, as created by his prestige and ascendancy after 1940.

Basil Liddell Hart, *Churchill: Four Faces and the Man: the Military Strategist*, 1969.

- (a)** How far, and why, do the impressions of Churchill as conveyed in Documents C and D differ? [10]
- (b)** How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents that Churchill's reputation as a great wartime leader has been exaggerated? [20]

**Answer one of the following questions.** *Where appropriate your essay should make use of any relevant documents you have studied as well as contextual knowledge.*

- 2** How much responsibility should Churchill bear for the failure of the Dardanelles campaign? [30]
- 3** Assess the importance of Churchill's role in the Conservative government of 1924–9. [30]
- 4** Why did Churchill find himself 'in the wilderness' in the period 1929–38? [30]

**BLANK PAGE**

---

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

University of Cambridge International Examinations is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/05K**

Paper 5k Winston Churchill, 1914–1946

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

**2 hours**

---

**MAXIMUM MARK: 60**

---

This document consists of **6** printed pages.



- 1 (a) How far, and why, do the impressions of Churchill as conveyed in Documents C and D differ? [10]

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues should be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation. Candidates are invited to focus on the differences and this is the most obvious point of comparison. However, the question asks 'how far' and some sort of balance must be sought. Document **D**, having identified Churchill as 'the greatest war leader of modern times' then takes two main lines. First, it praises Churchill's qualities of courage, energy and sense of humour. Second, it remarks upon the capacity Churchill had to inspire loyalty and affection and, perhaps, by implication his ability to work with colleagues and subordinates. **C** presents a very different picture, at least at first sight. Here Churchill is shown to be opinionated, bad tempered and given to making a scene. Nevertheless, **C** finishes on a note which corroborates the impression of Churchill as the indispensable leader at a time of great peril. There is also in **C** a sense of sympathetic understanding in that Churchill's outburst is seen as the result of overwork, a point which has echoes in **D** with its mention of 'unrelenting energy'. In dealing with the issue 'why' candidates may be expected to refer to the nature and type of the two sources, to chronology and to context.

**(b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents that Churchill's reputation as a great war leader has been exaggerated? [20]**

The answer should treat the documents as a set and should make effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It should be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material should be handled confidently with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument should be well constructed. Historical concepts and vocabulary should be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected. In the main, it might be argued, historians recognise Churchill's greatness but, again for the most part, see his flaws. Some are more critical than others and John Charmley might be cited as an example. This set of documents cannot tell the whole story or cover every aspect of Churchill's war leadership so candidates will need to call upon contextual knowledge to provide a balanced and well supported answer. Taken together, the two speeches which make up Document **A** give a clear impression of the wide, ambitious sweep of Churchill's aims and policies, at a time when defeat seemed imminent, as well as defiance and the capacity to inspire resistance and lift morale. The effectiveness of these particular qualities of leadership is demonstrated by **B**. Document **D**, a speech by one of the foremost military leaders of the period, is unequivocal in its praise of Churchill's qualities which marked him out as 'the greatest war leader of modern times'. By contrast **C** shows a leader who was prone to pursue policies, adventures even, which had not been thought through or were mistaken or irresponsible. Candidates may find other examples such as the plan to send Spitfires to France after its fall was certain or the withdrawal of forces from North Africa to combat the Axis advance in Greece. This document might also be used as an example of a leader who blustered rather than persuaded. Document **E** presents rather a mixed view of Churchill. The impression is given of a leader constantly pressing others into action but also failing to get his own views accepted (reference back to **C** might be made here). Liddell Hart also deals with Churchill's perception of himself; that he did not have dictatorial powers but points out the undoubted 'prestige and ascendancy' he enjoyed after 1940 (cross reference might be made here to **A** and **B**). A possible limitation of the document is that it deals with 'the British sphere' and the direction of the war from, for example, meetings of the War Cabinet and Chiefs of Staff and from Whitehall. To give balance candidates may well use contextual knowledge to deal with such matters as grand strategy (North Africa, Italy, the war at sea, D-Day), the appointment of commanders and relationships with Roosevelt, Stalin and the Free French.

## 2 How much responsibility should Churchill bear for the failure of the Dardanelles campaign? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. A narrative account of the campaign will not score highly, although a short contextual framework would be helpful. Churchill was First Lord of the Admiralty and Admiral Lord Fisher First Sea Lord. The plan was to force the Dardanelles to sail British warships to Constantinople and to compel Turkey to surrender. The campaign began as a purely naval operation (March 1915), went on to amphibious landings (April) and dragged on until January 1916 before withdrawal after heavy losses. Fisher and Churchill both resigned in May 1915. The central issue is the extent to which responsibility should be shared and in what proportions. At the same time candidates may well demonstrate that there were matters beyond the control of the planners and raise issues about the decision making of commanders on the spot and the part played by chance. As early as December 1914 Churchill had suggested to Asquith that there should be an alternative to the Western Front but he was not entirely responsible for the idea that it should be the Dardanelles. The joint responsibility for the project should be shared largely by Churchill and Fisher but they were not alone in supporting it. If anything Fisher was the more enthusiastic. The ‘ships alone’ strategy was supported by him whilst Churchill would have preferred a combined operation from the start. Nevertheless, it was Churchill who sold the plan of forcing the Dardanelles to the Cabinet. As First Lord of the Admiralty since October 1911 Churchill must shoulder a large share of the responsibility for the failure of the naval operation. Some of the ships employed were old and losses to mines and Turkish torpedo boats were heavy. The appointment of Fisher as First Sea Lord in 1914 (when he was already seventy five) had been controversial. Churchill had supported it in the face of opposition from the King and the Prime Minister. However, Churchill was not responsible for the planning and execution of the land operation.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may be expected to sharpen the argument and weigh up differing interpretations and have a particular focus on the proportions of the shared responsibility. How wise, in the first place, was the strategic case for an advance on Constantinople via the Dardanelles? Even if achieved would it have significantly changed the balance of the War? How significant was the element of chance to the failure of the naval operation? What were the effects and importance of the breakdown in relations between Churchill and Fisher? How far was Churchill’s responsibility exaggerated by his numerous opponents?

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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.

**3 Assess the importance of Churchill's role in the Conservative government of 1924–9. [30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is, Churchill's role in the Conservative government 1924–9. A narrative account of Churchill's actions and policies cannot be highly rewarded, although a chronological framework with assessment, argument and analysis could do well. Churchill officially rejoined the Conservative party in October 1924 and his appointment as Chancellor of the Exchequer brought a major figure and highly experienced minister into the Cabinet. This could be seen as an asset as could his good relationship with the Prime Minister, Baldwin. In assessing the importance of Churchill's role candidates are likely to explore the following: his energetic conduct and running of the Treasury; the strengths and weaknesses of his budgets; his policies towards taxation and old age pensions; the extent of his responsibility for the economic revival of the period (falling unemployment and rising production); the return to the Gold Standard, widely regarded as the greatest mistake of the government and for which Churchill should take the blame; his attempt to prevent a crisis in the mining industry by proposing a Commission (Samuel); but his part in the General Strike and his running of the British Gazette. On almost all these issues there were arguments either way as to the extent of success/failure and the contribution to the overall performance of the 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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may argue that finance was not Churchill's real strength and that, for the most part, his budgets were flawed. Further, his aggressive style caused conflict with other ministers. It might be contended that his upholding of classic economics flew in the face of the compelling arguments of Keynesian theory and was damaging (see Keynes 'The Economic Consequences of Mr. Churchill'). However, there is a view that the Gold Standard was not as damaging as it has been represented. Furthermore, in any case, should Churchill take the whole blame for its perceived damaging nature?

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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.

**4 Why did Churchill find himself ‘in the wilderness’ in the period 1929–38?****[30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is upon explanation rather than descriptive narrative. Answers should be very largely within the specified chronology but some flexibility should be allowed in explaining the context of Churchill’s career before 1929. Candidates should recognise that ‘in the wilderness’ is a reference to Churchill being out of office throughout this period (in spite of a Conservative majority in the Commons after 1931) and, more generally, being politically isolated. First, of course, the Conservatives lost the General Election of 1929 and Churchill lost office. That Churchill did not return to government until 1939 can be explained, in part, by reference to his earlier political career. He had changed parties, he was seen as an opportunist and as being unsound. His reputation for failure in the Dardanelles campaign continued to haunt him and, increasingly, his period as Chancellor of the Exchequer came also to be seen as a failure. He had political enemies, not least Neville Chamberlain, in his own party. His failure to regain office and his political isolation stemmed in large part from his opposition to an extension of local government in India (later contained in the India Act of 1935) and the manner in which he conducted his campaign against it including the issue of his resignation from the Shadow Cabinet. Churchill certainly moved to the right on imperial policy and came to be in a small ‘die-hard’ group. The length of this campaign increased his isolation and also distanced him from Baldwin. This helps to explain his continued exclusion from office after 1935. His criticism of the policy of appeasement and his revelations about German rearmament embarrassed the government, made him unpopular with Conservatives and led to further isolation. He was further damaged by his stance on the Abdication.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. There are good opportunities here for exploration of the historiography. For example, Robert Rhodes James has dubbed Churchill’s career before 1940 as ‘a study in failure’. How far is this view determined by the ‘wilderness years’? Did the ‘wilderness years’ effectively destroy Churchill’s career only for it to be revived by the Munich crisis and subsequent events? Candidates may also sharpen the argument by attempting to place some kind of hierarchy of importance upon the factors which kept Churchill out of office and isolated in this period.

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/05L**

Paper 51 Special Subject: Germany, 1919–45

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN PAPER

**2 hours**

---

**READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST**

Answer Question 1 and **one** other question.

The number of marks is given in brackets [ ] at the end of each question or part question.

You are reminded of the need for analysis and critical evaluation in your answers to questions. You should also show, where appropriate, an awareness of links and comparisons between different countries and different periods.

---

This document consists of **4** printed pages.



**Answer the following question.**

**Nominated topic: Economic and social policies and the creation of the Volksgemeinschaft – Nazi economic policy, 1933–39**

- 1 Study all the following documents and answer all the questions which follow. In evaluating and commenting upon the documents, it is essential to set them alongside and to make use of your own knowledge.

**A** *A director of the Reichsbank makes a statement about rearmament financing at the post-War Nuremberg Tribunal.*

Dr Schacht proposed the use of 'mefo' bills to provide a substantial portion of the funds needed for the rearmament programme ...

The 'mefo' bills were used exclusively for financing rearmament, and when in March 1938 a new finance programme discontinuing the use of 'mefo' bills was announced by Dr Schacht, there was a total volume outstanding of twelve billion marks of 'mefo' bills which had been issued to finance rearmament.

Emil Puhl, speaking at the Nuremberg Tribunal, 1946.

**B** *The Director of the Economics Department within the Foreign Office outlines anticipated economic strategies.*

In future, all German imports will be regulated and they will be controlled by Supervisory Offices [which] will issue foreign currency permits to importers before transactions are concluded. These foreign currency permits ensure priority for foreign exchange allotments under the New Plan ... the issue of foreign currency permits will be restricted to vital foodstuffs as well as to raw materials and semi-manufactured goods.

Dr Karl Ritter, writing to all German embassies, 1934.

**C** *Hitler sets out key economic priorities at a critical stage of economic recovery.*

It is, however, impossible to use foreign exchange allocated for the purchase of raw materials to import foodstuffs without inflicting a heavy and perhaps fatal blow on the rest. *But above all it is absolutely impossible to do this at the expense of national rearmament ...* I therefore draw up the following programme for a final provision of our vital needs:

- (i) Parallel with the military and political rearmament and mobilisation of our nation must go its economic rearmament and mobilisation ... There is ... only one view, the bringing of Germany to the point of political and economic self-sufficiency.
- (ii) For this purpose, foreign exchange must be saved in all those areas where our needs can be satisfied by German production ...
- (iii) Accordingly, German fuel production must now be stepped up with the utmost speed ...
- (iv) The mass production of synthetic rubber must also be organised and achieved with the same urgency ...
- (v) The question of the cost of producing these raw materials is also quite irrelevant ...

In short, I consider it necessary that now ... a 100 per cent self-sufficiency should be attained in every sphere where it is feasible ...

I thus set the following tasks:

- (i) The German armed forces must be operational within four years.
- (ii) The German economy must be fit for war within four years.

Adolf Hitler, *Memorandum on the Four Year Plan*, August 1936.

- D** *A member of SOPADE (the SPD party in exile) makes a report on economic conditions inside Germany.*

The Nazis try to persuade the nation that the problem of economic constraints is nothing but a foreign exchange problem, whereas in reality it is a problem of the capacity of the economy and of the nation's willingness to make sacrifices. What the superficial observer normally notices, however, is the constraining effect of the foreign exchange shortage. It seems at first sight – and that is what the Nazis try and persuade people – as if the blame lies in Germany's one-sided dependence on foreign countries, which finds technical expression in the shortage of foreign exchange.

This superficial view makes the false theory of autarky (economic self-sufficiency) popular in Germany ... this theory completely conceals and falsifies the true situation ...

If German foreign trade cannot recover, the cause lies primarily in the enormous demands placed on the German economy by rearmament ...

This shortage of foreign exchange is, therefore, in reality only a reflection of the overloading of Germany's economic strength through rearmament and the autarky programme ...

An SPD analyst, July 1938.

- E** *A modern historian comments on the impact of the Four Year Plan.*

The resolution of the immediate crisis – though it stored up future massive economic problems for the regime – was the introduction of the Four Year Plan, announced at the party rally in September 1936 and setting Germany on an accelerated rearmament and autarkic policy as preparation for war. It was a decision in which politics and economics, ideology and material interest, were inextricably intermeshed.

In the wake of the forced rearmament policy from 1936 onwards, Germany's economic problems – chronic shortages of foreign exchange, raw materials, and labour, strains, blockages, over-heating, balance of payments difficulties, inflationary tendencies – mounted alarmingly. Expansionism as the only solution to Germany's otherwise gloomy economic prospects was a central theme of Hitler's monologue to the leaders of the armed forces in November 1937. Hitler repeated his remarks on the threatening economic pressures in a speech to the armed forces' commanders in August 1939, days before the attack on Poland, when he stated that for Germany it was easy to make decisions: 'We have nothing to lose; we have everything to gain. Because of our restrictions, our economic situation is such that we can only hold out for a few more years. Göring can confirm this. We have no other choice, we must act'.

*Sir Ian Kershaw, The Nazi Dictatorship, 2000*

- (a)** How far does Document D corroborate Document C in explaining the direction of Nazi economic policy? [10]
- (b)** How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that Nazi economic policy from 1933 to 1939 was driven mainly by a desire to create a 'defence economy'?

In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as all the documents in this set (A–E). [20]

**Answer one of the following questions.** *Where appropriate, your essay should make use of any relevant documents you have studied as well as contextual knowledge.*

- 2 Why was the NSDAP more successful as a political movement from 1926 to 1930 than it had been from 1920 to 1925? [30]
- 3 'The weakness of the opposition is the strength of the regime.' Discuss this contemporary view with reference to **either** the period 1933–39 **or** the period 1939–45. [30]
- 4 To what extent was the SS responsible for the increasingly radical nature of Nazi anti-semitic policies from 1938 to 1945? [30]

---

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

University of Cambridge International Examinations is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/05L**

Paper 51 Special Subject: Germany, 1919–45

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

**2 hours**

---

**MAXIMUM MARK: 60**

---

This document consists of **6** printed pages.



1 (a) How far does Document D corroborate Document C in explaining the direction of Nazi economic policy? [10]

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues should be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation. Comments on tone, language, reliability and typicality may well help here in evaluation. Provenance needs to be addressed, accounting as it does for the views. Candidates will see some broad lines of overlap but will focus on the difference, explaining these in the contexts of provenances. The latter will drive forward the response here: Hitler's views set against those of an agent of prominent critics and opponents. Both focus on autarky (self-sufficiency) but differ in interpretation and understanding, with the fact that Document **D** is written almost two years after the inception of the Four Year Plan being important to analysis. There are clear differences over self-sufficiency, over foreign exchange shortages and the causes. In **C**, Hitler is insistent on economic self-sufficiency (until the key goal of Lebensraum can be achieved) to combat the shortage of foreign exchange for imports to sustain rearmament levels; he demands German production wherever possible. But in **D**, the SPD analyst sees self-sufficiency as a 'false theory' and the condition of the German economy was best explained by the demands of the rearmament programme, inducing a range of serious problems.

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that Nazi economic policy from 1933 to 1939 was driven mainly by a desire to create a 'defence economy'?

In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as all the documents in this set (A–E). [20]

The answer should treat the documents as a set and should make effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It should be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material should be handled confidently with strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument should be well constructed. Historical concepts and vocabulary should be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected. Good focus on the terms of the question and the argument offered will be important. A definition of 'defence economy' is needed as is an assessment of motivation behind such a policy; 'mainly' is to be noted here, opening up other possibilities. Answers should consider that there was more to economic policy than this: economic recovery; stabilisation; preparations for war (short- or long-term – there is continuing debate). The Documents provide much about the place and role of rearmament, though consideration needs to be given to policy priorities in 1933–4 (Document **A** and **B**) and later, above all after the Four Year Plan (**C**, **D** and **E**). Indeed, an argument exists over the different phases and features of Nazi economic policy, with 1936–7 generally seen as a key period. **A** and **B** focus on the financing of rearmament in the early years; own knowledge can be added, not least Schacht's genius and role. At that stage, economic recovery was based less on rearmament than on big public works schemes and deficit financing, plus natural recovery. That recovery continued at speed but a crisis over foreign exchange and related matters in 1935–6 led on to the Four Year Plan, featured in **C**, and seen as a decisive moment in Hitler's economic strategy. Military needs lay behind this, with a desire to accelerate rearmament; autarky was seen as a crucial goal. Own knowledge can supply detail of Hitler's vision of 1936 and of subsequent developments, as the economy shifted from civilian to military needs and much more state control and direction (enunciated by Göring in a major speech in May 1937). **E** can be used here as a part commentary on developments either side of **C**, and **D** supplies one contemporary assessment of the effectiveness of the Plan, albeit from a hostile stance. Indeed the tenor or the arguments in **D** has occasioned much debate, both about the impact of the Four Year Plan and the possible 'over-heating' of the economy. The latter has led to some view that Hitler was driven into war in 1939 to correct this. Not all agree, however. There are links, then, to the issues of a 'defence economy' (some might prefer 'command economy') and of how far the economy was militarised sufficiently to sustain war in and after 1939 ('Blitzkrieg' versus 'total war'). Document **E** picks up on some of this. Candidates can make use of own knowledge here: the issue of rearmament 'at any cost'; autarkic goals in key economic areas; deficit financing; public works to solve high unemployment and kick-start the economy; the place of *Lebensraum*; the balance or imbalance of consumer and military needs; the ideological and strategic scope of the 'defence economy'; the role of planning (e.g. Reinhardt Plans, New Plan, Four Year Plan); possible or likely war plans and the needs of total economic mobilisation; the nature of the economy in 1938–9 (e.g. a 'plunder economy'); the role of the state in directing the economy.

**2 Why was the NSDAP more successful as a political movement from 1926 to 1930 than it had been from 1920 to 1925? [30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of events and developments will need embedded explanation to secure reward; rather analysis and evaluation are required, with a sense of comparative analysis. The perceptive might point out that certain things were the same before and after: the Party programme, the leader, Depression. The possible lines of analysis are numerous: the decision to go for power via the polls, the restructuring of the party (but was it actually well organised?) on a national basis, the ‘new’ SA, the change of electoral strategy in late 1927 and broad, cross-sectional appeal, seeing off the left-wing of the party, the path of legality, the breakdown of workable parliamentary government under the pressure of recession, and success in the September 1930 election. The failed Putsch of 1923, the trial, publicity and imprisonment of 1924–5, will probably be seen as significant, if not a definite turning point. Even then, electoral and political support remained low until 1929–30, save for the gains made in the discontented, disaffected rural North. The changes of strategy and tactics, the reorganisation of the party, the assertion of the leadership principle and the diversified message and social appeal were all based on the lessons of failure prior to 1925. Analysis of the electoral picture will help, including regional as well as national, making links to Hitler’s message, the Nazi electoral constituency (who voted for the Nazis and why), the interaction with the economic and political structures of the Weimar state. The distinction which some make between Hitlerism and Nazism and the concept of a ‘Hitler party’ would be useful areas of evaluation.

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. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question formulation requires an assessment of factors, with some sense of relative importance and ordering, though also awareness of links. Success levels may be disputed, at least until 1930, but most would argue that Hitler became a key factor here, above all after the national publicity of the trial. Some would point to structural factors, above all c. 1928–30. Most would argue that Hitler’s appeal and message grew at the very end, in increasingly troubled times. The lessons of the failed Putsch were applied with some vigour.

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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.

**3 'The weakness of the opposition is the strength of the regime.' Discuss this contemporary view with reference to either the period 1933–39 or the period 1939–45. [30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A description or narrative here will not suffice. Analysis and explanation are needed, evaluating factors involved. The quotation invites a critique of both opposition weaknesses and the regime's strengths with the focus mainly on the former. These might include: ideological and organisation weaknesses, fear of a return to the past and a disinterest in each other's problems, atomisation, fragmentation and depoliticisation, institutional self-interest and failure to provide a broad moral front, support for the regime's anti-Bolshevism, the attitude of the Left and of the workers and popular acclaim. The regime also had its own strengths: fear (the myth of the Gestapo ...); propaganda, etc; popular policies and appeal, not least of Hitler. Reference can be made to the nature of opposition and the arguments over 'opposition' or 'resistance'. Features here can include: the presence of much very low-level opposition (grumbings, whispering campaigns, jokes, graffiti); the absence of much physical opposition, certainly resistance until c. 1943–44, save occasional and limited plots; the position of the Left (KPD, SPD, SOPADE) and of the Right (conservative nationalists, the emergent Kreisau Circle); the role of the Churches, leadership and clergy (Confessing Church, brave but isolated acts by a few bishops and pastors or priests); youth elements ('swing kids', Edelweiss Pirates); strike action and the general stance of the working classes and ex-union members; the Army (after the 1934 oaths; Halder and Beck; wartime generals); the eventual Bomb Plot of 1944. All such can be set in the context of Hitler's popularity, the presence of a successful terror and police apparatus (Gestapo, SD, Camps, etc); the absence of external encouragement, both in peacetime and even more in the war years.

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. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question formulation opens up debate, with the chance to argue and counter-argue. Some would emphasise inherent weaknesses, divisions, disunity. Others would emphasise the very nature of the Nazi state and of Nazi society, Hitler's wide appeal, the security apparatus. Of course, there are links here and overlaps of argument: control of the instruments of power and terror enabled the Nazis to contour much of society; willing compliance and conformity. Consensual support enabled them to succeed, perhaps far beyond their initial expectations.

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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.

**4 To what extent was the SS responsible for the increasingly radical nature of Nazi anti-semitic policies from 1938 to 1945? [30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of the unfolding of events after 1938 (a year of radicalisation of anti-semitism in the wake of the Anschluss and Kristallnacht) will not secure much reward, unless there is explanation. Analysis and evaluation are required. The period is chosen with the increased role of the SS in 1938 in mind – Austria (Eichmann and department II/112: the organisation of emigration from Austria); the power struggle for control of Jewish policy. Candidates might argue that Reichskristallnacht was instigated by Goebbels (with Hitler's approval); and that Göring tried to reassert his control by excluding Jews from economic life. The conference of 12 November 1938 also reflects the power struggle. The fact that the SS had more or less won the battle for control of Jewish policy by 1939 was significant, as were Hitler's occasional utterances. And while emigration was still the preferred solution, a more radical approach unfolded after 1939 (ghettoisation, deportation, etc). It was the SS to whom Göring turned in 1941. It could be argued that the war against the USSR was responsible, or Hitler. Whatever, the 'intentionalists' and 'structuralists' should have some prominence (see AO2). It is envisaged that candidates will look at Heydrich's role and that of the SS in the Final Solution. Analysis and strength of argument are to be rewarded. Himmler, Heydrich and the SS organisation plus racial thinking will be assessed, alongside Hitler's place and role, other Nazis, broad public opinion, the radicalisation of anti-semitism ('cumulative radicalisation'), propaganda, the effects of the invasion of Poland (ghettoisation, the Government-General area), Eichmann's Madagascar Plan, the importance of the attack on the USSR and its aftermath, the Wannsee Conference, The Death Camps and the organisation of the Final Solution (transport, bureaucracy, willing support from some occupied areas). The genesis of the Final Solution and its likely authorisation (summer-autumn 1941?) can be assessed but must be placed in the context of the needs of this question.

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. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question invites debate, argument and counter-argument. Some would see the growing SS involvement as pivotal. Some would see broader issues involved, structural, social, strategic and, of course, deeply racial. Most would see Hitler as central but some argue for Himmler's role as major. Here there is the debate between 'intentionalist' and 'structuralist' historians. This can be reflected and indeed used but it should not predominate at the expense of analysis of developments. Rather, such references should be linked closely to the issues raised.

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/05M**

Paper 5m Special Subject: China under Mao Zedong, 1949–1976

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN PAPER

**2 hours**

---

**READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST**

Answer Question 1 and **one** other question.

The number of marks is given in brackets [ ] at the end of each question or part question.

You are reminded of the need for analysis and critical evaluation in your answers to questions. You should also show, where appropriate, an awareness of links and comparisons between different countries and different periods.

---

This document consists of **4** printed pages.



**Answer the following question.**

**Nominated topic: The Hundred Flowers Campaign and the Great Leap Forward of 1958–62**

1 Study all the following documents and answer all the questions which follow. In evaluating and commenting upon the documents it is essential to set them alongside and use your own knowledge.

**A** *The Chinese leader offers reasons for major economic change which will lead to the Great Leap Forward.*

Some comrades fail to understand that socialist industrialization cannot be carried out in isolation from the cooperative transformation of agriculture. In the first place, as everyone knows: China's current level of production of grain and raw materials for industry is low; whereas the state's need for them is growing every year. If we cannot basically solve the problem of agricultural cooperation within roughly three five year plans – that is to say, if we cannot make the leap from small-scale farming with animal-drawn implements to large scale mechanized farming, then we shall run into formidable difficulties in our socialist industrialization and fail to complete it. There will be a contradiction between ever-increasing demand for food and raw materials and a low output of staple crops.

Mao Zedong, speech to the Chinese Communist Party, 1955.

**B** *Propaganda encourages support for the Great Leap Forward. The phoenix of agriculture joins with the dragon of steel production.*



Poster, Chinese Communist Party, 1958.

- C** *This declaration was issued on behalf of Mao and suggests the huge social benefits of the Great Leap Forward.*

The people have taken to organizing themselves along military lines, working with militant enthusiasm and leading to a collective life. This has raised the political awareness of the 500 million peasants still further. Community dining rooms, kindergartens, sewing groups, public baths, happy homes for the aged, agricultural schools are leading the peasants towards a happier collective life and further fostering the ideals of collectivism among them. The establishment of people's communes with all-round management of industry, agriculture, forestry, animal husbandry, trade, culture, education and military affairs will merge all these elements into one. This will complete the building of socialism and carry out the general transition to communism.

Declaration of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, Summer 1958.

- D** *Born in 1952, Jung Chang is the daughter of a Communist official in Sichuan. The book is an account of her family's experience in the context of Mao's China.*

Although I did not understand why, I knew that Chairman Mao had ordered the nation to make a lot of steel. In my school big vats replaced some of our cooking woks and were sitting on the stove in the kitchen. All our scrap iron was fed in. It was at that time that Mao gave full vent to his half baked dream of turning China into a first-class industrial power. It was officially estimated that 100 million peasants were pulled out of agricultural work and into steel production. The output amounted to what most people called 'cattle droppings' – useless lumps. This absurd situation reflected not only Mao's ignorance of how an economy worked, but a disregard for reality; Mao's policy had been fuelled by his recent experience in Russia, convinced that Russia was abandoning socialism. He saw China as the only true believer. In Chengdu, the monthly food ration was reduced to 19 pounds of rice, 3.5 ounces of cooking oil and 3.5 ounces of meat. Scarcely anything else was available. Many people were affected by edema; because of malnutrition the patient turns yellow and swells up. Famine was raging all around me.

'Wild Swans', Jung Chang, 1992.

- E** *A modern historian offers a defence of the Great Leap Forward.*

Mao made clear that, from the start, the policies of the Great Leap Forward were about China developing a more independent economic policy. China's alternative to reliance on the USSR was a program for developing agriculture alongside the development of industry. In so doing, Mao wanted to use the resources that China could muster in abundance—labour and popular enthusiasm. The use of these resources would make up for the lack of capital and advanced technology.

Although problems and reversals occurred in the Great Leap Forward, it is fair to say that it had a very important role in the ongoing development of agriculture. Measures such as water conservancy and irrigation allowed for sustained increases in agricultural production, once the period of bad harvests was over. They also helped the countryside to deal with the problem of drought.

As well as the steel furnaces, many other workshops and factories were opened in the countryside. The idea was that rural industry would meet the needs of the local population. Rural workshops supported efforts by the communes to modernize agricultural work methods. Rural workshops were very effective in providing the communes with fertilizer, tools, other agricultural equipment and cement (needed for water conservation schemes). Compared to the rigid, centralized economic system that tended to prevail in the Soviet Union, the Great Leap Forward was a supreme act of lateral thinking.

Joseph Ball, 'Did Mao Really Kill Millions in the Great Leap Forward?', 2006.

- (a) How far is Mao's understanding of China's economic needs in Document A corroborated by the views expressed in Document D? [10]
- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents that the Great Leap Forward was not the disaster that it has been claimed to be?

In making your evaluation you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as all the documents in this set (A–E). [20]

**Answer one of the following questions.** *Where appropriate, your essay should make use of any relevant documents you have studied as well as contextual knowledge.*

- 2 How far did Mao's success in gaining control in China depend on the weakness of his enemies? [30]
- 3 Assess the view that the Cultural Revolution came about mainly because of Mao's desire for greater personal power. [30]
- 4 Account for the changing relations between China and India from 1949 to 1976. [30]

---

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

University of Cambridge International Examinations is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/05M**

Paper 5m Special Subject: China under Mao Zedong, 1949–1976

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

**2 hours**

---

**MAXIMUM MARK: 60**

---

This document consists of **6** printed pages.



1 (a) How far is Mao's understanding of China's economic needs in Document A corroborated by the views expressed in Document D? [10]

Mao in **A** sees the rationale behind the Great leap forward as being the need to provide capital for industrialisation on a socialist level – in massive state controlled capital goods and iron and steel. Agriculture and industry are linked in a supposedly rational macro-economic view. The policy is based on a statistically based analysis of demand for food and raw materials and currently low industrial output. The impression is of planning and policy based on clear understanding of the current economic situation and future development. **D** on the other hand offers a critical view of the understanding as being 'half-baked'. In micro-economic terms there was a failure of understanding as the steel output was poor quality – 'cattle droppings'. Far from the rationality of **A**, the policy is said to be based on ignorance and misunderstanding. It was based on not a profound statistical analysis but a desire to be different from de-Stalinisation in Russia. Agriculture, far from being developed, was so disrupted that the population suffered from lack of food supplies, so would not have been able to finance industrial growth.

The two documents are written at different times. Mao in 1955 was looking forward to possible change; Jung Chang was writing from the perspective of 1992, when the Great Leap Forward was seen as one of the country's greatest failures and China's economy was being transformed in an entirely different way. Also, her family suffered considerably under Mao which gives the source a different perspective from the seemingly unemotional and rational **A**. In reality **A** gives insight into Mao's understanding of the situation but not the solutions he adopted to deal with the supposed problem of industrialisation. (The need for massive heavy industry was dictated by ideology more than practicalities.) **D** however is too focused on the practical effects of the policy to give Mao any credit for understanding that there was an imbalance between agriculture and industry and that there was some need to encourage production.

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents that the Great Leap Forward was not the disaster that it has been claimed to be?

In making your evaluation you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as all the documents in this set (A–E). [20]

The debate here is whether the Great Leap forward might have been based on an accurate analysis of China's needs – economically and as a power under threat from the West and needing to develop her defences – or on irrational and over-optimistic nostrums of social and economic development in a new way that would earn Mao a place in history. **A** suggests calm analysis and leadership; **B** suggests that the plan is a success as industry and agriculture are united in a rebirth of economic life. **C** confirms this by considering the social cohesion and improvement brought about. **D** is deeply critical of the practicalities of the policy while **E** offers an unusual justification by a historian.

The 'case for' disaster here is represented by **D** – peasants were taken from the land, disrupting agriculture; scraps of metal were taken for political rather than economic purposes and the new furnaces were ineffective; the disruption caused shortages of food and ill-health. This could be augmented by own knowledge. The new communes were hastily established. Planning was often faulty with peasants being ordered to grow crops unsuitable to the land. The 'backyard' furnaces were inadequate, and the level of technical expertise to establish these linked industrial and agricultural communes was lacking. Party interference was too often based on theory and not practice. Propaganda exaggerated success. Also despite **A**, the massive project was based more on political considerations than economic reality and may have been typical of Mao's whole career in that personal power and prestige were important elements in the policy making.

The case 'against' has more support in the set of documents here. Mao's analysis in **A** does have truth, but it is predicated on the need for the sort of industrial growth that Stalin had achieved in the 1930s and was being attempted in contemporary India. The implications of this in terms of agricultural disruption (or neglect in India's case) were not considered because of ideological considerations which glorified industry. However, Mao was right in analysing imbalance. The propaganda documents **B** and **C** offer visions of harmony between agriculture and industry, and of social developments. Contextual knowledge can challenge this by examining what happened in practice and looking at figures for population loss and examples of mismanagement and disruption. Statistical analysis offers a different picture, but both sources, to be fair are looking at possibilities and some candidates may wish to sympathise – evidence suggests that where conditions permitted there was some local success. Generally, commentators have agreed more with the critical view in **D**. **E** is an exception. The view that Mao had to use the resources available – which were large reserves of labour and the political power of 'enthusiasm' or perhaps the discipline and control which the party exercised – can be defended. After the war with Japan, civil war, the disruption of the establishment of Communist rule, Japan was short of capital, technical expertise and large scale industry but had population growth. The countryside did need access to industrial products and did need large scale schemes like irrigation. A community-based industrialisation was an alternative model to the Soviet gigantism. However, few will accept the rather limited view of the down side 'problems and reversals occurred' and this could be seen as a considerable under estimation of the failures and costs of what many see as unrealistic social engineering.

**2 How far did Mao's success in gaining control in China depend on the weakness of his enemies? [30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of events will not answer the question. Analysis and evaluation are required, with a focus on the extent of change.

Mao's party offered certain strengths, an appeal to the peasantry, a reputation for opposing the Japanese (though in practice, this was debatable), a strong propaganda machine, discipline and an ability to focus on the discontent of the rural population. Mao had the heroic image of the Long March and was a national figure. There was also the prestige of the USSR and the seeming success of Communism in the Second World War. However against this was the failure of Nationalists to offer an attractive alternative and the association of the GMD with foreign powers, particularly the USA together with the military failures of the campaign against the Communists. Candidates may also consider the failures of Mao's internal enemies within the Communist party to challenge his leadership.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Good answers will evaluate the relative importance of the explanations and may be aware that what the CCP seemed to offer and their actual track record, for example in fighting the Japanese, were at odds. The question does allow for some discussion of how Mao exploited the weaknesses of both internal and external enemies, but there is no requirement for this.

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**3 Assess the view that the Cultural Revolution came about mainly because of Mao's desire for greater personal power. [30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of events will not answer the question. Analysis and evaluation are required, with a focus on the explanations for the changes. The roots of the Cultural Revolution go back to the failure of the Great Leap Forward which led to Mao's position being weakened. The emergence of the Cultural Revolution may have been linked to a counter attack by Mao on Liu Shaoqin and Deng Xioping. Beginning in 1966 and peaking in 1968 there was a huge Cult of Personality masterminded by Lin Biao which elevated Mao to a cult figure. The elimination of rivals and the deliberate creation of the Red Guard to harness the young in support of Mao, together with Mao's bowing to army pressure seem to indicate that the basis of the Cultural Revolution lay in power struggles. However it was portrayed as a rejuvenation and given ideological justification by the campaign against the four olds – Old Custom, Old Culture, Old Habits and Old Ideas and there was a strong element of idealism in the activities of the Red Guard and the desire to create a new society, and there was a massive debate which might indicate that at local level there was more at stake than purely political power.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Good answers will evaluate the relative importance of the explanations. Explanations which focus entirely on Mao's desire for power will not be as strong as those which consider the influence of others in the party like Lin Biao and the Gang of Four who used the image of Mao, nor of the conflicts at local level in which new and dynamic parts of the movements sought to dislodge entrenched administrators whom they saw as a new bourgeoisie. The economic problems brought about by the failure of the Great Leap Forward have to be considered as elements which motivated change – was the failure seen as a result of an incomplete revolution? The view might well be taken that Mao's desire for power did lay at the heart of the Cultural Revolution, but the question does invite an evaluation.

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.

**4 Account for the changing relations between China and India 1949–1976.****[30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A narrative of events will not answer the question. Analysis and evaluation are required, with a focus on the different reasons for change. Nehru expected good relations between India and China as both had broken free of imperialism. Nehru's internal policies reflected an admiration for Chinese-style planning. India recognised Communist China in 1950 and Nehru hoped that the dispute over Tibet would resolve itself. China had established control in 1950 but had not accepted the boundary with India. There was an agreement in 1954 and the general hope that 'India and China would be brothers'. However, China built a road through territory in Aksai Chin, officially Indian but claimed by China, which India discovered in 1959. India was driven by public outrage to a war in October-November 1962. India grew closer to the USSR and China to Pakistan, thus broader conflicts coalesced. China supported Pakistan in the war with India in 1965 and built a road linking China and Pakistan to India's fury. Economic contacts were severed and there were more border clashes in 1967.

Internal unrest in Tibet was aided by China and Marxist activity in Indian Naxalbari was supported by China (1967 peasant revolt). There was fighting again in 1967. China supported Pakistan again in 1971. Not until the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 was there an attempt to return to the good relations of the 1950s.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Good answers will evaluate the relative importance of the explanations. The core of the conflict was Tibet and the Chinese rejection of the McMahon line established in 1914 – part of China's rejection of the imperialist past. The fact that this did not emerge as a major factor before 1959 has to do with Nehru's rosy view of China and China's preoccupation with domestic developments. So domestic factors have to be considered, as does the wider context. India was concerned about any links between China and Pakistan and these made resolution of conflict difficult before 1979. China was concerned by good relations between India and the USSR which prompted continuing clashes. Good answers will balance purely territorial conflicts with the wider context of both internal pressures and external alignments.

AO3 [not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/05N**

Paper 5n Special Subject:  
The Civil Rights Movement in the USA, 1954–1980  
SPECIMEN PAPER

**For Examination from 2010**

**2 hours**

---

**READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST**

Answer Question 1 and **one** other question.  
The number of marks is given in brackets [ ] at the end of each question or part question.

You are reminded of the need for analysis and critical evaluation in your answers to questions. You should also show, where appropriate, an awareness of links and comparisons between different countries and different periods.

---

This document consists of **3** printed pages and **1** blank page.



**Answer the following question.**

**Nominated topic: Direct Action and Major Events**

- 1 Study all of the following documents and answer all the questions which follow. In evaluating and commenting upon the documents, it is essential to set them alongside and to make use of your own contextual knowledge.

**A** President Eisenhower, *'Address on Little Rock'*, September 25, 1957.

In the South, as elsewhere, citizens are keenly aware of the tremendous disservice that has been done to the people of Arkansas in the eyes of the nation, and that has been done to the nation in the eyes of the world. At a time when we face grave situations abroad because of the hatred that communism bears towards a system of government based on human rights, it would be difficult to exaggerate the harm that is being done to the prestige and influence, and indeed the safety, of our nation and the world. Our enemies are gloating over this incident and using it everywhere to misrepresent our whole nation.

**B** Rosa Parks *'Recollections'*, published in *'My Soul is Rested'* (1977) by H. Raines.

A few minutes later, two policemen got on the bus, and they approached me and asked if the driver had asked me to stand up, and I said yes, and they wanted to know why I didn't. I told them I didn't think I should have to stand up. After I had paid my fare and occupied a seat, I didn't think I should have to give it up. They placed me under arrest then and had me get into the police car, and I was taken to jail and booked on suspicion, I believe. The questions were asked, the usual questions they ask a prisoner or somebody under arrest. They had to determine whether the driver wanted to press charges, which he did.

**C** Ella Baker, *'Bigger than a Hamburger'*, an article in *Southern Patriot*, vol. 18 (1960).

The Student Leadership Conference made it crystal clear that current sit-ins and other demonstrations are concerned with something much bigger than a hamburger or even a giant sized coke. Whatever may be the difference in approach to their goal, the Negro and white students, North and South, are seeking to rid America of the scourge of racial segregation and discrimination – not only at the lunch counters, but in every aspect of life. In reports, casual conversations, discussion groups and speeches, the sense and the spirit of the following statement that appeared in the initial newsletter of the students at Barber-Scotia College, Concord, N.C., were re-echoed time and again:

"We want the world to know that we no longer accept the inferior position of second class citizenship. We are willing to go to jail, be ridiculed, spat upon and even suffer physical violence to obtain First Class Citizenship."

**D** Dr Martin Luther King, *Letter from Birmingham Jail*, June 1963.

We know through painful experience that freedom is never voluntarily given by the oppressor; it must be demanded by the oppressed. Frankly, I have yet to engage in a direct action campaign that was 'well timed' in the view of those who have not suffered unduly from the disease of segregation. For years now I have heard the word 'wait'. It rings in the ear of every Negro with piercing familiarity. This 'wait' has almost always meant 'never'. We must come to see, with one of our distinguished jurists, that 'justice too long delayed is justice denied.'

**E** President L.B. Johnson, Address before a joint session of Congress, March 15, 1965.

The real hero of this struggle is the American Negro. His actions and protests, his courage to risk safety and even to risk his life, have awakened the conscience of the nation. His demonstrations have been designed to call our attention to injustice, designed to provoke change, designed to stir reform. He has called upon us to make good the promise of America. And who among us can say that we would have made the same progress if not for his persistent bravery and his faith in democracy.

**(a)** How far does Document E corroborate Document D in suggesting that the attainment of Civil Rights would not happen without direct action campaigns? [10]

**(b)** How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that the Civil Rights movement only succeeded because it was able to provoke an excessive use of force against it? [20]

In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as the documents in this set (A–E).

**Answer one of the following questions.** Where appropriate, your essay should make use of any relevant documents you have studied as well as contextual knowledge.

**2** To what extent should the leadership of Dr. King be seen as the most important reason for the success of the Civil Rights movement between 1954 and 1965? [30]

**3** How far should Eisenhower and Kennedy be seen as supporters of the Civil Rights movement? [30]

**4** Why did African-American political movements achieve relatively little after 1965? [30]

**BLANK PAGE**

---

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

University of Cambridge International Examinations is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/05N**

Paper 5n Special Subject:  
The Civil Rights Movement in the USA, 1954–1980

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

**2 hours**

---

**MAXIMUM MARK: 60**

---

This document consists of **5** printed pages and **1** blank page.



- 1 (a) **How far does Document E corroborate Document D in suggesting that the attainment of Civil Rights would not happen without direct action campaigns?** [10]

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues should be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation.

Candidates should make use of the content of the headings and attributions as well as the text of the documents. Document D clearly expresses frustration with the lack of progress and sees direct action as the only way to force the 'oppressor' to concede full freedom. This is largely corroborated in Document E. Candidates should draw out the ways in which Johnson seems to accept the logic of King's earlier argument. Johnson makes numerous references to the way in which 'protests' have led to change and these should be mentioned. In particular, at the end of Document E there is a crucial passage in which Johnson wonders if progress would have been made without the 'persistent bravery' of the 'American Negro'. This would seem to corroborate King's view about Freedom never being 'voluntarily given.'

There are some slight differences, however. Strong candidates will exploit the slight difference in the dates of the two sources. Arguably Johnson's more optimistic tone stems from the fact that he is speaking after the Civil Rights Act had already passed into law and in the same year as the Voting Rights Act. King by contrast was languishing in prison. It might also be noted that Johnson sees Congress as an important part of the process, its 'conscience' having been awoken. King makes no specific reference to this. Strong candidates will use knowledge to define 'direct action' in the process of answering the question.

- (b) **How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that the Civil Rights movement only succeeded because it was able to provoke an excessive use of force against it?** [20]

The answer should treat the documents as a set and should make effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It should be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material should be handled confidently with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. Historical concepts and vocabulary should be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected.

All of the documents, in different ways, can be used to support the assertion. It may be that what constitutes 'excessive' will need some discussion but that is not a pre-requisite of a strong answer. Clearly Eisenhower, in Document A, was responding to the force used against the Little Rock 9. His intervention was a kind of success for the Civil Rights Movement. Document B arguably shows 'excessive force' in that two policemen arrested Rosa Parks, although this is a debateable point. Document C implies that excessive force is likely to be the outcome of direct action methods. Document D could also be used to support the assertion, though it might be necessary to use contextual knowledge of Birmingham at this time. Document E also implies that force used against African Americans has helped to bring about the change.

Although these documents can be made to lend weight to the assertion, they can also be used to question it. Strong candidates will draw out the ways in which other interpretations are also possible. A key word in the question is 'only', which suggests that other factors are not relevant. The sources can be used to question this by bringing out some of the other factors, such as the role of presidents Eisenhower and Johnson, the role of Youth and Dr. King's powers of oratory. All sorts of conclusions are possible but the stronger candidates will focus sharply on the precise words in the question in order to shape their final judgement.

**2 To what extent should the leadership of Dr. King be seen as the most important reason for the success of the Civil Rights movement between 1954 and 1965? [30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A good factual knowledge of King's methods and campaigns must be demonstrated which would involve references to the Montgomery Bus Boycott, the setting up of SCLC, the Albany and Birmingham campaigns and his various speeches. It will be important to explain just what his contribution was. This would involve explanation of his non-violent methods and his powerful oratory. His weaknesses should also be touched upon. To counter the view that King was 'the most important reason' for the success of the movement, some of the other factors will have to be explained. This could involve an examination of the presidents, the Supreme Court, the role of youth, other organisations and the general mood of the era.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations, although not required, may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. It will be important to explain key concepts, such as non-violent action and how that could be effective. The importance of the moral battle may need to be touched upon. Strong candidates will bring in wider factors, such as the context of the Cold War and how that affected the issues. Notions such as charisma may also be important to any discussion of leadership.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of 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.

**3 How far should Eisenhower and Kennedy be seen as supporters of the Civil Rights movement? [30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Eisenhower's actions during the Little Rock Crisis will need to be explored. His reluctance to get involved should be stressed and this will probably be the overall theme. His regret about the appointment of Warren to the Supreme Court, the feeble Civil Rights Acts of his administration could also be brought into show him as, at best, a faint hearted reformer. Kennedy is often depicted as more of an enthusiast, but and it should be pointed out, he had begun the process of drafting a Civil Rights bill before he was assassinated. However, strong candidates will balance this fact against his hesitancy in the first years of his government. Arguably, his hand was forced by events in places like Birmingham. Strong candidates will explain the complexity of the calculations that Kennedy had to make about the consequences for him and his party in taking such a big step. Kennedy only narrowly won the 1960 election and the next election was always on his mind.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations, although not required, may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Strong candidates will demonstrate a good knowledge of the working of the American political system. For example the doctrine of States' Rights might well be used to explain why Eisenhower was reluctant to impose himself on Arkansas. The separate role of the Supreme Court will also need to be understood. The culture of the South and the role of the 'Dixiecrats' might also need explanation.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of 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.

**4 Why did African-American political movements achieve so little after 1965?****[30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. There is much factual content that could be touched upon but strong candidates would be expected to show awareness of much of the following: the impact of the assassinations of Dr. King and Malcolm X; the development of a more radical approach in the Black power movement; Nixon's response; the rise of more pressing or distracting issues, such as the Vietnam war. King's attempt to focus on more socio-economic issues should also be explored and the reasons for his failure given.

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 arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations, although not required, may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

Conceptually, there are some ideas that stronger candidates will draw out. It could be argued that the Civil rights movement was the victim of its earlier success. It could also be said that the protest movement of the sixties fragmented into a number of smaller protests, such as the anti-war movement, the feminist movement and the emergence of 'gay rights'. The alienation of white liberals by 'Black Power' is also an interesting theme. The distinction between 'de jure' and 'de facto' discrimination is also very pertinent, as the latter entails some discussion of the socio-economic system.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of 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.





UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate  
Principal Subject

---

**HISTORY**

**9769**

**For Examination from 2010**

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

---

**MAXIMUM MARK: 300**

*The banding definitions which follow should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.*

---

This document consists of **11** printed pages and **1** blank page.



## Outlines Essays

*These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2 and 4.*

### 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.

### 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. In short, answers in this Band will partake of most of the features of Band 1 but they will be demonstrated in a less mature fashion and deployed less persistently.

**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.

**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.

## Special Subjects: Document Question

*These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2, 3 and 4.*

### Introduction

This question is designed largely to test skills in the handling and evaluation of source material but it is axiomatic that answers should be informed by and firmly grounded in wider contextual knowledge.

Examiners should be aware that the topic on which this question has been based has been notified to candidates in advance who, therefore, have had the opportunity of studying, using and evaluating the relevant documents.

The Band in which an answer is placed depends upon a range of criteria. As a result not all answers 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.

In marking an answer 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.

### Question (a)

#### Band 1: 8–10

The answer will make full use of both documents and will be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues will be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation.

#### Band 2: 4–7

The response will make good use of both documents and will pick up the main features of the thrust of the argument (depending upon whether similarity or difference is asked) with some attention to the alternative. Direct comparison of content, themes and issues is to be expected although, at the lower end of the Band, there may be a tendency to treat the documents separately with most or all of the comparison and analysis being left to the end. Again, towards the lower end, there may be some paraphrasing. Clear explanation of how the documents agree or differ is to be expected but insights into why are less likely. A sound critical sense is to be expected especially at the upper end of the Band.

#### Band 3: 0–3

Treatment of the documents will be partial, certainly incomplete and possibly fragmentary. Only the most obvious differences/similarities will be detected and there will be a considerable imbalance (differences may be picked up but not similarities and vice versa). Little is to be expected by way of explanation of how the documents show differences/similarities, and the work will be characterised by largely uncritical paraphrasing.

**Question (b)****Band 1: 16–20**

The answer will treat the documents as a set and will make very effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It will be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material will be handled confidently with strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge will be demonstrated. The material deployed will be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument will be well structured. Historical concepts and vocabulary will be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected. English will be fluent, clear and virtually error-free.

**Band 2: 11–15**

The answer will treat the documents as a set and make good use of them although, depending on the form of the question, not necessarily in equal detail. There may, however, be some omissions and gaps. A good understanding of the question will be demonstrated. There will be a good sense of argument and analysis within a secure and planned structure. Supporting use of contextual knowledge is to be expected and will be deployed in appropriate range and depth. Some clear signs of a critical sense will be on show although critical evaluation of the documents may not always be especially well developed and may well be absent at the lower end of the Band. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations may be expected. The answer will demonstrate a good understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary and will be expressed in clear, accurate English.

**Band 3: 6–10**

There will be some regard to the documents as a set and a fair coverage, although there will be gaps and one or two documents may be unaccountably neglected, or especially at the lower end of the Band, ignored altogether. The demands of the question will be understood at least in good part and an argument will be attempted. This may well be undeveloped and/or insufficiently supported in places, analysis will be at a modest level and narrative is likely to take over in places with a consequent lack of focus. Some of the work will not go beyond paraphrasing. Supporting contextual knowledge will be deployed but unevenly. Any critical sense will be limited; formal critical evaluation is rarely to be expected; use of historical concepts will be unsophisticated. Although use of English should be generally clear there may well be some errors.

**Band 4: 0–5**

The answer will treat the documents as a set only to a limited extent. Coverage will be very uneven; there will be considerable omissions with whole sections left unconsidered. Some understanding of the question will be demonstrated but any argument will be undeveloped and poorly supported. Analysis will appear rarely, narrative will predominate and focus will be very blurred. In large part the answer will depend upon unadorned paraphrasing. Critical sense and evaluation, even at an elementary level, is unlikely whilst understanding of historical concepts will be at a low level. The answer may well be slight, fragmentary or even unfinished. English will lack real clarity and fluency and there will be errors.

## Special Subject Essays

*These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2 and 4.*

### 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.

### 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.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the other criteria for this Band, limited or no use of such sources should not preclude it from being placed in this Band.

**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. In short, answers in this Band will partake of most of the features of Band 1 but they will be demonstrated in a less mature fashion and deployed less persistently.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to at least some relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the criteria for this Band, very limited or no use of these sources should not preclude it from being placed in this Band.

**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.

Use of relevant primary sources is a possibility. Candidates should be credited for having used such sources rather than penalised for not having done so.

**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.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

**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.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is highly unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

## Personal Investigation

*These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2, 3 and 4.*

### Introduction

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.

The Band in which an essay is placed depends on a range of criteria. As a result, not all Investigations 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.

In marking an Investigation, 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.

Since the Investigation is a reflective piece of work and not written under time restraints, greater emphasis than in other components of the examination is placed upon such matters as the use of a wide range of sources, the demonstration of a critical sense, high standards of presentation and use of English.

### Band 1: 49–60

Whilst not being perfect the answer will be the best that a candidate can be expected to achieve at this level. The answer will be strongly argued and sharply analytical in approach. 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 particular 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. Candidates at this level must demonstrate a sophisticated awareness of links and comparisons to other countries and periods. The answer will make use of a wide range of sources. These will normally be largely secondary but some acquaintance with primary sources is to be expected at this level. Sources and historical interpretations will be treated critically and there should be a good grasp of formal critical evaluation with reference to such issues as provenance, dating and context, corroboration and difference, utility and reliability. Critical sense and critical evaluation can be applied to sources and/or interpretations. Where formal critical evaluation is not demonstrated, but where the answer is strong in all or most of the criteria relevant to this Band, the paucity or lack of this element should not prevent it being placed in this Band. English will be clear and fluent with excellent vocabulary.

**Band 2: 37–48**

The answer will be characterised by a markedly analytical and argued approach, although there may be occasional passages which do 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 work will be coherent and well-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. The material will be fully understood, confidently deployed and well controlled. Historical explanations will be clear and well developed and there will be a sound understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary. Candidates will demonstrate an awareness of links and comparisons to other countries and periods. The answer will make use of a good range of sources. These will probably be largely or entirely secondary, although some acquaintance with primary sources may be expected. Sources and historical interpretations will be treated critically and there should be some attempt at formal critical evaluation but at a lower level, and with a more restricted range, than that indicated for Band 1. Critical sense and formal critical evaluation can be applied to sources and/or interpretations. Although a sound critical sense is normally to be expected at this level a lack of formal critical evaluation should not preclude the award of a mark in this Band. Use of English will be highly competent, clear, generally fluent and very largely error-free. In short, answers in this Band will contain most of the features of Band 1 but they will be demonstrated in a less sophisticated fashion and deployed less persistently.

**Band 3: 25–36**

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 sound sense of argument. The material will be clearly understood and organisation very competent. There will be a conscious attempt to draw conclusions and form judgements and these will be adequately supported. Candidates will demonstrate some awareness of links and comparisons to other countries and periods. The answer will make use of a fair range of sources, although these are likely to be confined to secondary sources. Some critical sense in dealing with sources and interpretations is to be expected, although this may well be limited or undeveloped, especially in the lower range of the Band. Formal critical evaluation as detailed in Bands 1 and 2 is, again, likely to be limited or may not appear at all, although there may be attempts at cross-referencing. 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 very competent, clear and very largely free of serious errors.

**Band 4: 13–24**

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. Critical sense will be limited. Candidates may attempt to show an awareness of links and comparisons to other countries and periods. There may be some awareness of differing interpretations and some attempt at evaluating sources and interpretations but this is not generally to be expected at this level and such skills, where deployed, will be unsophisticated. Some errors of English may be present but written style should be clear although lacking in real fluency.

**Band 5: 0–12**

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. Uncritical narrative will predominate. 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. Critical sense will be very limited whilst awareness of differing interpretations and the evaluation of sources is not to be expected. Candidates are unlikely to demonstrate an awareness of links and comparisons to other countries and periods. The answer may well be fragmentary and slight. Significant errors of spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax may well hamper a proper understanding of the script.





University of Cambridge International Examinations  
1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU, United Kingdom  
Tel: +44 1223 553554 Fax: +44 1223 553558  
Email: [international@cie.org.uk](mailto:international@cie.org.uk) Website: [www.cie.org.uk](http://www.cie.org.uk)

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2007

