

**A LEVEL**  
*Candidate Style Answers*

# HISTORY A

H505  
For first teaching in 2015

## Unit 2 Part I Comparison Question

Version 1



## Contents

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Y201 The Rise of Islam</b>	<b>5</b>
High level answer	5
Medium level answer	6
<b>Y202 Charlemagne</b>	<b>7</b>
High level answer	7
Medium level answer	8
<b>Y203 The Crusades and the Crusader States 1095-1192</b>	<b>9</b>
High level answer	9
Medium level answer	10
<b>Y204 Genghis Khan and the explosion from the Steppes</b>	<b>11</b>
High level answer	11
Medium level answer	12
<b>Y205 Exploration</b>	<b>13</b>
High level answer	13
Medium level answer	14
<b>Y206 Spain 1469-1556</b>	<b>15</b>
High level answer	15
Medium level answer	16
<b>Y207 The German Reformation and the rule of Charles V 1500-1559</b>	<b>17</b>
High level answer	17
Medium level answer	18
<b>Y208 Philip II</b>	<b>19</b>
High level answer	19
Medium level answer	20
<b>Y210 Russia 1645-1741</b>	<b>21</b>
High level answer	21
Medium level answer	22
<b>Y211 The Rise and Decline of the Mughal Empire in India 1526-1739</b>	<b>23</b>
High level answer	23
Medium level answer	24

<b>Y212 American Revolution</b>	<b>25</b>
High level answer	25
Medium level answer	26
<b>Y213 The French Revolution and the rule of Napoleon 1774-1815</b>	<b>27</b>
High level answer	27
Medium level answer	28
<b>Y214 France 1814-1870</b>	<b>29</b>
High level answer	29
Medium level answer	30
<b>Y215 Italy and Unification 1789-1896</b>	<b>31</b>
High level answer	31
Medium level answer	32
<b>Y216 America in the Nineteenth Century</b>	<b>33</b>
High level answer	33
Medium level answer	34
<b>Y217 Japan 1853-1937</b>	<b>35</b>
High level answer	35
Medium level answer	36
<b>Y218 – International relations 1890-1941</b>	<b>37</b>
High level answer	37
Medium level answer	38
<b>Y219 – Russia 1894-1941</b>	<b>39</b>
High level answer	39
Medium level answer	40
<b>Y220 – Italy 1896-1943</b>	<b>41</b>
High level answer	41
Medium level answer	42
<b>Y221 – Democracy and Dictatorships in Germany 1919-63</b>	<b>43</b>
High level answer	43
Medium level answer	44
<b>Y222 – The Cold War in Asia</b>	<b>45</b>
High level answer	45
Medium level answer	46
<b>Y223 The Cold War in Europe question (a)</b>	<b>47</b>
High level answer	47
Medium level answer	48

## Introduction

OCR has produced these candidate style answers to support teachers in interpreting the assessment criteria for the new GCE History A specification and to bridge the gap between new specification release and availability of exemplar candidate work.

This content has been produced by senior OCR examiners, with the support of the Subject Specialist, to illustrate how the sample assessment questions might be answered and provide some commentary on what factors contribute to an overall grading. The candidate style answers are not written in a way that is intended to replicate student work but to demonstrate what a **'HIGH LEVEL'** or **'MEDIUM LEVEL'** response might include, supported by examiner commentary and conclusions.

As these responses have not been through full moderation and do not replicate student work, they have not been graded and are instead, banded to give an indication of the level of each response.

Please note that this resource is provided for advice and guidance only and does not in any way constitute an indication of grade boundaries or endorsed answers.

## Y201 The Rise of Islam

Which of the following was of greater importance in Abu Bakr's victory in the Ridda Wars?

- (i) The strength of the Muslim forces
- (ii) The weakness of Abu Bakr's enemies

Explain your answer with reference to both (i) and (ii).

### High level answer

Abu Bakr was victorious in the Ridda or 'Wars of Apostasy' for a number of reasons. The most important reason for his victory was the continuing loyalty of the people of the Hijaz, both city dwellers and nomads, to the umma or community. They remained united, unlike their enemies and this allowed them, given their organization to be victorious. Abu Bakr was able to divide his forces into eleven columns and each one was sent to deal with a particular region, he was particularly fortunate to have the military leadership of Khalid b al-Walid. However, it was not just the power of Bakr's forces that ensured he was victorious, but they were backed by the powerful ideology of the new religion. They were also aided by the breakdown of the Persian Empire under the attacks of Heraclius as these groups now looked for new allies and found them in the expanding and dynamic umma, which simply served to add to the strength of the Muslim forces. This was increased further because of the opportunities that joining the umma appeared to offer encouraged more to join. The war provided an opportunity to abandon the old Bedouin life and join the Islamic community and many were willing to leave their tribal homelands for this opportunity, which further strengthened Bakr's army and allowed it to be victorious.

On the other hand Bakr's opponents were divided. There were a series of tribal divisions that meant that there were internal feuds in all areas, even among the Hanifa of Yamama there were factions who wanted to secure an alliance with the Muslims in order to secure their local position. The aims of Bakr's opponents were also varied and this did not help unity or provide the strong bond that Islam did. Only the Hanifa appear to have had a strong objection to Islam, elsewhere the objections appear to have been based on an attachment to old traditions, local independence and mostly a reluctance to pay taxes to Medina. There were also large Christian elements in some areas but they made no effort to unite against Islam, further weakening opposition. The divisions within Bakr's opponents meant that they were unable to launch a concerted and united attack, which allowed to Bakr to deal with different groups in isolation.

The loyalty of the people provided Bakr with the strength to win the war and they were able to exploit the divisions within the opposition. Bakr's forces were united in their aims, whereas the opposition were not and lacked a common ideology which again Bakr's forces possessed. The new Muslim community offered opportunities which many were willing to seize and this allowed him to assemble a force that could conquer Arabia.

### Examiner commentary

- The response analyses the role of both factors in Bakr's victory in the Ridda Wars.
- It attempts to link together the factors when discussing both the strengths of the Muslim forces and the weakness of the opposition to show how the factors interact.
- The argument is supported by precise knowledge and there is a clear understanding of some of the concepts associated with the topic.
- There is a developed judgement, in which the factors are evaluated and an overall view is reached.

### Medium level answer

The Ridda Wars were fought in Arabia under the Caliph Abu Bakr in the years 632 and 633, which was soon after the Prophet Muhammad had died and they resulted in the conquest of the region. The rebels argued that they had submitted to Muhammad but did not owe any allegiance to Abu Bakr. He was victorious because he was able to gather together a large force which was able to defeat the opposition because it was united and the opposition was divided. Abu Bakr was able to assemble a large force and had strong commanders, which were better than the opposition. Abu Bakr was a strong leader and so were his commanders and this was important. His forces were united as they were fighting for Islam. The Muslim forces were strong and able to go on the attack and defeat the enemy, most notably at Aqraba, where many of the opposition were killed. Those who survived then accepted the rule of Medina. Similarly, in other parts of Arabia, the Muslim armies were victorious.

The opposition to Abu Bakr was quite weak in many areas. They were divided and not united by their belief in Islam. They opposed Bakr for a number of reasons and this weakened them, many simply objected to paying taxes to Medina, but were not always opposed to Islam. Whilst forces remained loyal to Islam, many of the initial opposition saw that the Islamic community offered them new opportunities and therefore abandoned their opposition. These weaknesses meant that the opposition was not able to launch a united attack.

It was both the strength of the Muslim forces and the weakness of the opposition which allowed Abu Bakr to win the Ridda Wars.

### Examiner commentary

- The answer attempts to deal with both factors and there is some general explanation of the role of both.
- The argument is supported, but the material is rather generalized and lacks the precise examples, except for the naming of the battle, needed to make the argument convincing.
- The judgement is little more than an assertion and is not developed.

## Y202 Charlemagne

Which of the following was of greater importance in shaping Charlemagne's image as 'Emperor of the Christian West' by the end of his reign?

- (i) Victory over the Saxons
- (ii) His coronation in 800

Explain your answer with reference to both (i) and (ii).

### High level answer

Charlemagne's victory over the Saxons did much for his reputation and certainly helped to shape his image. In the first place he gained much respect because of the difficulty in conquering the Saxons. They were particularly ferocious and difficult opponents and the military victories that Charlemagne gained over them in the period from 772 added to his reputation. However, it was not just the military victories he also converted their leader Widukind and them to Christianity, which did much to confirm his reputation and this was further enhanced by the building of Paderborn, numerous churches and monasteries in Saxony even before he had received the imperial title in 800. In light of the two achievements Charlemagne was therefore already seen as the protector of Christianity and worthy of the imperial title even before he had received it.

In many ways his coronation simply confirmed the reputation he had already built up through victories, such as those against the Saxons and his defence and furtherance of Christianity by the conversion of heathen peoples. However, his coronation was significant as it conveyed the idea of Charlemagne as the protector of the Church and this was further linked to the concept of a Christian and 'universal' Emperor. The coronation was certainly important in reviving the concept of at least a western Roman Empire. Moreover, the coronation had a symbolic element as the consecration of the role ensured that the revived 'western' Empire could not be separated from the mission of Rome. It meant as well that Charlemagne was seen as 'King of the Franks, Lombards and Patrician of Rome.'

The victory over the Saxons was a practical expression of his power and his role in converting heathen peoples, whereas the coronation was more symbolic and was a reflection on his achievements and conquests. The coronation allowed an imperial style to be developed, but without the conquests it would have been somewhat hollow. The coronation might also have been significant in affecting relations with Byzantium as after marriage proposals to the Empress in the east relations deteriorated and there were clashes in the Adriatic, therefore his coronation may have had a negative impact in the east. However, his coronation did provide an extra ideological dimension which the Franks and the Pope exploited in terms of authority and precedents of earlier Roman Christian emperors.

### Examiner commentary

- The importance of the two events are discussed and analysed.
- There is supporting detail to back up the analysis and evaluation.
- The judgement that is reached is supported and developed and based on the material in the main body of the response.

### Medium level answer

Charlemagne defeated the Saxons after a long struggle which began in 772 and lasted until after his coronation, when rebellions were finally crushed after 18 major battles. It did result in the Saxon leader being baptized and therefore this enhanced Charlemagne's reputation. The number of battles that had to be fought shows how strongly the Saxons resisted but in the end the leader did swear an oath of fealty to Charlemagne, which was a notable achievement for him. Charlemagne also built a number of churches and monasteries in Saxony which also added to his reputation. In defeating the Saxons and building the churches and monasteries Charlemagne showed that he was worthy of the title and his victories over such ferocious opponents showed that he was worthy of the title.

The coronation was an important event as it formally recognized his position. He was crowned on Christmas day in St Peter's by Leo III and this made him emperor of the Romans, which must have helped his image in the west. He was now seen as leader of the west and now had the impressive title to go with his status. It was important as after 800 there developed an imperial style and confirmed his relations with the Pope. He also proposed marriage to the Empress in the east but demanded that they recognize his title.

Charlemagne's image was important and both helped. The victory in the wars showed he was powerful and gained him respect and the title gained him respect as well.

### Examiner commentary

- The answer does explain why the events were important, although is less strong on the coronation, where some understanding of the symbolism and theoretical importance of the imperial ideal would have helped.
- The factual support is a little general.
- There is some analysis and attempt at evaluation but this needs developing and the judgement is also underdeveloped and tends to assert.

## Y203 The Crusades and the Crusader States 1095-1192

Which of the following was of greater importance in the survival of the Crusader States in the 12th Century?

- (i) Aid from the west
- (ii) Muslim disunity

Explain your answer with reference to both (i) and (ii).

### High level answer

Aid from the west in the twelfth century came in a variety of forms. In general, particularly after the failure of the Second Crusade both men and money from the west was in short supply. Aid was sporadic and the number of settlers, who were needed if the area was to be colonized was never large enough to be able to colonise the region and this was even more of a problem in the second half of the period. However, this can be contrasted with the support, military help and money that was given to the Military Orders of the Knights Templars and Hospitallers who played a vital role in the survival of the Crusader States. The aid given to them was important as the Orders were feared by the Muslims, who saw them as their fiercest enemies and their resources and manpower helped in the survival of the states. However, the states were always short of manpower and this was reflected in the general determination to avoid battle whenever possible. Moreover, links with the west were weak and despite appeals for more manpower this did not materialize and weakened the states in the second half of the period.

Muslim disunity was more important in the survival of the Crusader states. It had played a crucial role in the victory of the west in the Crusade, with divisions between Sunnis and Shias, which continued into the twelfth century for at least a further fifty years. The Fatimid Sunni Muslims of Egypt did not have a common cause with Shia of Aleppo and Damascus and they had no common cause with the Seljuk Turks. As a result, some of the Crusader States were able to form alliances with Muslim tribes. In 1114, for example Roger of Antioch fought alongside Tughtigin of Damascus and Ighazi of Mardin to fight off the commander of the Sultan's army. These alliances were obviously crucial because once the Muslims were united, under the leadership of Saladin, they were able to defeat the Crusader States and the armies that were sent from the West to help them. The lack of unity meant that the Crusader states never faced a full-scale attack from Muslim forces until near the end of the period and allowed the small number of settlers to maintain their lands as they were not overwhelmed by a large Muslim army.

Muslim disunity was more important than aid from the west as aid was so limited, and the breakdown in relations with Byzantium limited it further. Muslim disunity was more important because once the Muslims were united they were able to defeat the Crusader States as was seen by Saladin's invasion of the kingdom of Jerusalem in 1187. This can be contrasted with earlier in the century when Muslim disunity made it much easier for the Crusader states to seize land in the period from 1100 to 1144. Although the shortage of manpower was eased by the aid given to the military orders, this was not enough to resist the Muslim forces when they were united at the end of the period, showing that Muslim disunity was the more important factor.

### Examiner commentary

- The role of both factors is analysed thoroughly.
- The relative importance of each factor is discussed and a developed judgement is reached.
- The knowledge is detailed, particularly on Muslim disunity, and is accurate and relevant.

### Medium level answer

Aid given to the Crusader States in the twelfth century was money and men. They were both needed for the Crusader States to survive. The number of people who went to the States was not enough and aid that was given did decrease. The west did give aid to the military orders. The orders helped the states as they built castles and looked after travellers who went to the Holy Land; this was important as it helped their survival. The orders also fought some battles for the Crusader States and this helped them survive.

The Muslims were disunited and this made it easier for the Crusader states to survive. The Muslims were divided between two different religious groups and some would often fight on the side of the Crusaders which meant they did not have to fight against all the Muslims, who would have easily outnumbered them. The Muslims did become united at the end of the period with Saladin and they captured Jerusalem; this shows that when they were united they could win, but when they were divided they lost the First Crusade.

Muslim disunity was more important as it allowed the Crusader states to be set up and some Muslims helped the states fight against other Muslims. The aid from the west was less important as there was not very much of it.

### Examiner commentary

- There is some explanation of both factors.
- The knowledge is very general.
- There is some limited evaluation of the importance of the two factors in the final paragraph, but attempts at evaluation are often little more than assertion.
- The roles of both factors are not fully developed.

## Y204 Genghis Khan and the explosion from the Steppes

Which of the following was of greater importance in shaping Christian and Muslim views of the Mongols by the late thirteenth century?

- (i) The invasion of Hungary (1241-1242)
- (ii) The fall of Baghdad (1258)

Explain your answer with reference to both (i) and (ii)

### High level answer

The defeat of Hungarian forces, along with some allies, in the Battle of Mohi in April 1241 had a massive impact, not just of Hungary but also Europe. It resulted in the deaths of probably half the population of Hungary, which resulted in the spreading of stories of Mongol violence and destruction. It also saw a very significant population displacement as many inhabitants who escaped the slaughter moved or simply hid. The Hungarians, despite being warned of the Mongol advance by Russian boyars who had been given asylum were still shocked at the invasion and the defeat and therefore it left scars on both Hungary and other areas of Europe. However, the withdrawal of Mongol forces following the death of the Khan meant that the area was not occupied in the long term, some have argued that Hungarian resistance which continued saved western Europe from invasion, but it appears it was more likely Mongol withdrawal. Therefore the greatest impact in the long term was the shock for Europe, but in the short term the destruction of the population was immense.

The capture of Baghdad was of great significance. This was not just because of the capture and sacking of the city, but also because of the long term Mongol presence. The sacking of the city had an immense impact as it saw the destruction of buildings such as the House of Wisdom and the Grand Library, as well as numerous mosques and palaces. It was not just buildings that were destroyed but many of the population were killed with numbers ranging from 90,000 to a million, therefore depopulating much of the area, similar to events in Hungary. Moreover, it also led to the death of the Caliph and his family. Some have therefore argued that the fall brought an end to the Islamic Golden Age. It also, according to some accounts destroyed the agricultural system of the region by breaking the irrigation system. The fall caused a great shock because it was a cultural and spiritual centre. Not only did the fall bring about destruction but it also had a psychological impact.

Both events witnessed large scale destruction and had psychological impact. However, the withdrawal of forces for Hungary lessened the long term impact, whereas Baghdad was occupied by Mongol forces and also had an impact on both Muslims and Christians, leading to alliances from the Mongols with latter, whereas the invasion of Hungary only impacted on Christians.

### Examiner commentary

- This is a very full answer, which shows a very good understanding of the significance of both events and had detailed supporting knowledge to back up all the claims.
- Both the events are fully examined and their significance analysed and evaluated.
- This allows a judgement, which is based on earlier material, to be reached and developed.

### Medium level answer

The invasion of Hungary took place in 1241-1242 and resulted in the Hungarian forces being defeated. Large numbers of Hungarians were killed in the battle and afterwards, also many fled the country. This had a large impact on the country. It also had an impact on the rest of Europe which was shocked by the Mongol advance into the continent. It caused fears that the rest of the continent would be invaded and defeated as the Mongols seemed impossible to stop. The ruler of the Mongols died soon after the victory and therefore the Mongol armies withdrew from Hungary and returned home to elect a new leader, this obviously lessened the impact as it was short-lived. They had brought a lot of destruction to the area and killed large numbers, worrying Christians that other areas in Europe would be attacked.

The fall of Baghdad was a shock to the Muslim world and also saw a lot of destruction of important buildings, such as libraries and mosques. The Caliph and his family were killed as were many others. The invasion may also have destroyed the agriculture system. It was a shock to Muslim forces which did not expect to be defeated. They did not expect one of their main cities to fall. The Mongols also occupied Baghdad which meant that their presence was felt for a long time as would have been the memories of the large slaughter which saw many thousands killed, possibly even a million.

As the Mongols stayed in Baghdad but withdrew from Hungary it was the capture of Baghdad that was more important.

## Examiner commentary

- The response does consider both events and does attempt to analyse their significance.
- The supporting material is quite generalized and the judgement is not fully developed, even though it is valid.
- Some precise examples would allow the significance of both events to be fully evaluated and a sustained judgement to be reached.

## Y205 Exploration

Which of the following was of greater importance as a reason for overseas exploration in the period 1445-1570:

- (i) Patronage
- (ii) Religion

Explain your answer with reference to both (i) and (ii).

### High level answer

The cost of overseas exploration and voyages of discovery meant that without patronage the voyages would never have taken place. It was only because of Isabella of Castile's patronage of Christopher Columbus in 1492 that he was able to undertake his voyage that led ultimately to the discovery of the Americas. Similarly, even if the motives for supporting the voyages were religious, it was the financial backing and encouragement given by Henry the Navigator that allowed the early Portuguese voyages to be undertaken, which would result in the later establishment of trading posts. His patronage led to a committee being established to organise trade and acquire collections of maps and charts that made the voyages possible, therefore without this the voyages would never have happened. The patrons were motivated by a variety of reasons but without their initial outlay the voyages would not have taken place, as shown by Columbus' struggle to find a sponsor.

Religion was a motive of some of the patrons, particularly Isabella. Following on from the conquest of the Moors in Spain she was keen to see Christianity spread and Islam defeated, after all she thought Columbus would find a new route to the east to be able to challenge the Ottomans. Even Columbus himself wanted to conquer new lands and find wealth so that he could fund a crusade against Islam. Similarly, Henry the Navigator hoped that his sponsorship would lead to the Portuguese finding the Christian kingdom in Africa under Prester John and this could be a launchpad for further conquests and the pushing back of Islam following the fall of Constantinople in 1453. The Portuguese also hoped to find Christian communities along the coast of North Africa and provide them with support in their struggle against the expansionist Ottomans. The religious factor was further encouraged by the papacy which gave the Spanish monarchs the right to appointments in the New World. The Spaniards also converted large numbers in the Americas, suggesting that religion was important to men such as Cortes and Pizarro, but that would ignore the importance of economic motives for them.

Religion was a very important motive for many of the patrons, but without the patronage, as seen in the example of Columbus, the voyages would never have taken place because of the costs. They were so high that it was usually only members of the royal family who could support these voyages, as seen in the cases of both Spain and Portugal. Therefore, although religion may have been the driving force, without patronage they would not have taken place.

### Examiner commentary

- The role of both factors is explained and analysed, with a link made between them.
- The supporting knowledge is sound with reference to specific events and dates, whilst the conclusion reaches a supported judgement in which the relative importance of the two factors is evaluated.

### Medium level answer

There were a number of reasons for the voyages and this included both patronage and religion. Patronage was the supplying of funds for the voyages, which was important because of the cost of the journeys, which the explorers themselves could not afford. This is why Columbus had to wait until he had found a sponsor, in the form of Isabella of Castile for his voyage to what he thought would be the East Indies. He even had a contract with Isabella and Ferdinand, who also provided him with a letter of introduction to the grand Khan for when he reached the East Indies. In Portugal Henry the Navigator did a great deal to support the early Portuguese voyages, establishing a navigation school and committee to help promote voyages. He played an important role as before his death in 1460 explorers he had sponsored had reached Sierra Leone. He encouraged the explorers to push along the African coast.

Religion was important as Christians were involved in a struggle against Islam, particularly after the fall of Constantinople. It appeared as if Islam was advancing and this worried many people in a very religious age. Spain was fighting the Moors in Granada and this seemed to show the threat of Islam and once it was defeated in Spain many wanted to keep going. There was a wish to push back the Turks and link up with other Christian communities, such as the legendary Prester John in Africa or make links with Christians in North Africa. Isabella was very religious and ensured that priests were taken on Columbus' voyages and large numbers were converted to Christianity in the Americas, showing religion was important. Isabella was also encouraged to do this by the Pope.

### Examiner commentary

- Although both factors are considered and there is some analysis, there is no judgement or evaluation as to their relative importance.
- The answer would be improved by a final paragraph which compared the relative importance.
- Moreover, the factual support could be a little more precise.

## Y206 Spain 1469-1556

Which of the following was of greater importance as a reason for Spanish overseas exploration and conquest during the period 1469-1556?

- (i) Spain's social and economic problems
- (ii) The desire for a Catholic crusade

Explain your answer with reference to both (i) and (ii)

### High level answer

Social and economic problems within Spain were a major factor in encouraging overseas exploration and trade. As with all European economies, there was widespread resentment at the cost of importing spices by land from Asia and one of Columbus' reasons for launching his expeditions was to find a sea route to the east so that Spain could take out the Venetian and Genoese monopoly on the trade. The Spanish were also competing with the Portuguese to control the spice trade and it was this that led to the accidental discovery of the Americas, which then led to Spain exploiting that. The concern over spices was given an even greater incentive because there were fears that the Ottoman Turks would soon monopolise the route and therefore either rise prices further or disrupt the trade. Closely linked to spices was the a general shortage of gold in Europe, most gold came from West Africa and was transported to North Africa where it was sold to merchants, as much of this route was dominated by the Portuguese the Spaniards hoped to find gold in the lands they discovered in the Americas and this played a very important role in the conquests, such as the Aztecs, undertaken during the reign of Charles I. Once Spain had discovered the Americas it gave the opportunity to those who lacked wealth at home to acquire land, but this was more of a consequence of the exploration and discovery than a cause.

Initially it was the desire for a Catholic crusade that drove Spain's involvement in the voyages of discovery. This was because they were already engaged in a struggle with the Moors in Spain, and after defeating them in 1492 they looked to continue the struggle against Islam and spread Christianity, hence Isabella's patronage of Columbus and the presence of priests on his ships. Moreover, Spain also looked to spread Christianity to North Africa, but this failed and the bases at Algiers and Tripoli became little more than trading posts, suggesting that in practice trade became more important. It would also appear that at first the spreading of Christianity in the Americas was more important as large numbers of native Americans were converted by Cortes, however with both Cortes and Pizarro the main objective soon became to find gold, driven by the dream of discovering El Dorado.

Therefore, although there was encouragement from priests at home to continue the struggle against Islam and the missionary zeal that had been ignited by the struggle against the Moors it was usually the economic factors that soon came to dominate. Some individuals, such as Isabella and even Columbus who wanted to find gold to pay for a crusade against Islam, may have had religious motives, but wealth and trade soon became more important to most, seen in the conquest of the Inca empire in Peru, where huge silver mines were opened up at Potosi.

### Examiner commentary

- Both of the factors are analysed and there is a weighing up of the relative importance of each, which leads to balanced and supported judgement as to their relative importance.
- The supporting detail is sound and precise examples are provided to back up the argument put forward.

### Medium level answer

The voyages of exploration and conquest helped Spain to solve some of its social and economic problems. The rising cost of spices was important in motivating the explorers as spices were vital for everyday life to flavour and preserve food. Spain did not want other countries to have control over this trade as it was very profitable. There was also a shortage of gold and silver in Europe and Spain hoped through these voyages and conquests to find a source of these precious metals, as happened with the conquests in South America. There were some explorers who wanted to find the city of El Dorado, whilst others hoped to find silver. This can be seen to be important because the large silver mines were set up in Peru. Some people in Spain were also motivated by a desire to find more profitable land. Much land in Spain was dry and not easy to farm and therefore some hoped that they would be able to acquire land elsewhere which would bring in more money and make them wealthy. They also used the conquests to establish large landed estates called *encomiendas* where huge flocks of sheep or herds of cattle were often kept, and a range of goods were grown – often resulting in the establishment of plantations, which suggests that economic factors were important to many.

Religion was also important. Spain had been fighting a struggle against Islam in Granada, which it had won in 1492 and now wanted to continue this struggle, defeat Islam and spread Christianity to other areas. Columbus' voyages were sponsored by Isabella of Castile who was a very religious woman and she wanted to spread Christianity. Columbus himself hoped to use the voyages to find gold to pay for a war against Islam and spread Christianity. Isabella believed that the people who were conquered should be converted to Christianity, therefore it shows religion was important to her.

### Examiner commentary

- Although both factors are discussed, there is much description rather than analysis of their role in exploration and conquest.
- There is no real evaluation of their relative importance and judgement is absent.
- A conclusion where the two named issues are compared and a judgement is reached is missing.
- The knowledge is sound, but quite general and would benefit from reference to some specific examples.

# Y207 The German Reformation and the rule of Charles V 1500-1559

## Short essay

Which of the following was of greater importance in the survival of Lutheranism in the period 1517-1530?

- (i) The printing press
- (ii) The support of the German princes

Explain your answer with reference to both (i) and (ii).

### High level answer

The development of the printing press was very important in not just the survival, but also the spread, of Luther's ideas. It enabled his ideas to reach a much larger audience and over a much wider area than if the material had been copied by hand. The output from the presses was huge, with over 300,000 of his works printed between 1517 and 1520 and these works would have been read and then passed on, reaching even more people. The printing press was also important because it produced copies of illustrative woodcuts which could spread Luther's message to those who could not read and this meant that the printing press allowed his message to reach both the literate and illiterate. The presses supplied copies of the Bible in German and also the pamphlets, such as 'On the Babylonish Captivity of the Church'. This appealed to many as it argued that all Christians were equal, putting forward the idea of the Priesthood of all Believers. The presses also printed The Address to the Christian Nobility which appealed to the princes in Germany as it encouraged them to take control of religion in their lands. The printing press therefore allowed Luther's message to reach all classes, which helped its survival.

The support of the German princes was vital. This was particularly true at the start of the period as it was Frederick the Wise who protected Luther after the edict of Worms and prevented him from being arrested. Without this act Luther would have been arrested and his ideas would not have been spread. He also refused to take action against Luther until a General Council of the Church was called and this also gave Luther more time to spread his ideas. However, it was not just in the immediate term that the princes were crucial. During the 1520s a number of princes took up the Lutheran cause, including Albrecht of Hohenzollern and Philip of Hesse. In taking up the Lutheran cause they ensured its survival as not only did Lutheranism gain territory, but these princes were able to delay imperial deliberations about Luther and prevent concerted action being taken against him. The support Luther gained from the princes meant that the movement could be destroyed only by civil war and the Emperor Charles had other more pressing concerns, such as the Turks, which meant it was even harder for him to deal with the problem.

Both factors were important in the survival of Lutheranism, but it was the support of the princes, particularly the Elector, which allowed it to survive. Without his protection Lutheranism would have been defeated almost before it began. It was only Frederick's protection at Wartburg Castle which gave Luther the time to produce his writings which would widen the appeal and allow Lutheranism not just to survive but grow.

## Examiner commentary

- The significance of the two factors is clearly explained.
- There is linkage made between the two factors.
- The judgement is developed and supported so that it is more than assertion.
- The two factors are analysed and their importance explained.

### Medium level answer

The printing press helped Luther's message to spread. Before the invention of the printing press books and pamphlets had to be written by hand, which made the process of spreading ideas much slower as it took a long time to copy out a book or pamphlet. The invention meant that things could be produced more cheaply and spread around the country more quickly. Without the printing press Luther's ideas would not have reached as many people. Luther wrote pamphlets which because of the printing press spread his ideas round the country. Large numbers of these were printed and therefore his ideas reached lots of people.

The princes were also important in the survival of Lutheranism. Frederick the Wise protected Luther and helped promote his ideas. Luther was outlawed at Worms and it was Frederick who protected him after that and took him to a castle. Frederick was an important man as he was an elector and therefore the Emperor Charles could not afford to annoy him and Frederick would also not submit to the Pope and continued to protect Luther. The letters that attempted to punish Luther by the Pope were not allowed into Frederick's lands and later he prevented the edict from being enforced in his lands. This all helped Luther to survive the early years and develop and spread his ideas.

Without Frederick's protection Luther would have been arrested and his ideas would not have got very far, therefore Frederick was more important.

## Examiner commentary

- The two factors are explained, but there is also much description of the factors.
- The knowledge is quite general and in dealing with the second factor the answer is limited to one Prince.
- There is a judgement, but it is not developed and the argument as to why it is more important is limited.
- The analysis is not developed and the support for the argument is general.

## Y208 Philip II

Which of the following was of greater importance in causing Spain's financial problems during the reign of Philip II?

- (i) The inherited financial problems
- (ii) Philip's expenditure

Explain your answer with reference to both (i) and (ii).

### High level answer

Finance was probably the single biggest problem that Philip faced as ruler of the Spanish Empire. Much of this problem was the result of the financial position he inherited, most notably a debt of 36 million ducats. This is made most apparent by the fact that, having inherited the throne in 1556, he declared himself bankrupt only one year later and in 1560 he suspended interest payments on his debts. Although it could be argued that this was the result of his being at war with France from 1556 to 1559, it was more the result of the wars of his father's reign. Charles had spent much of his reign at war with either France, in the Habsburg-Valois wars, or with Turkey or the German Protestant princes and these wars had placed a strain on Spain, which was contributing the most to the wars by 1556, which neither the economy nor the revenue from the New World could fund. Moreover, the taxation system that Philip inherited was a further factor in causing financial problems as the nobility were exempt from taxation and thus the wealthiest section of Spanish society were not contributing to crown revenues. There is little doubt that these were significant problems as Charles had already warned his son as early as 1543 to 'attend closely to finances and learn to understand the problems involved.'

Although Philip had inherited a very weak financial position, Philip's policies made the situation worse. He was at war for much of his reign and with the cost of warfare rising he put a burden on the Spanish financial system that could not be met. He was at war with France from 1556 to 1559 and again in the 1590's, with England from 1585 and with the Ottomans and North Africa, as well as having to deal with the Dutch rebels, with the latter costing some 80 million ducats alone. He had added to the problems by spending on his court, art collections and the building of the Escorial, but these costs paled into insignificance when compared with foreign policy – the Armada alone cost 10 million ducats. Moreover, his policy of 'deficit finance' to finance his foreign commitments was a disaster, reflected in bankruptcies in 1575 and 1596.

Philip had inherited a weak financial situation with the scale of the debt, but it was his policies that made the situation worse. He had inherited a debt of 36 million ducats but left a debt of 87 million and that despite exploiting every source of revenue, suggesting that it was his policies, particularly overseas, that were the main cause of his difficulties.

### Examiner commentary

- The response did analyse both factors and reaches a developed and supported judgement.
- It is aware of the role of both factors and the links between them, but argues convincingly that it was Philip's expenditure that was more to blame.
- The argument is supported by very precise factual detail, making the argument more convincing.
- It covers a range of issues and their importance in causing the financial problems is discussed.

### Medium level answer

Philip II came to the throne of Spain in 1556 and faced a serious financial problem. His father Charles V had left him with a large debt of over 30 million ducats. This had been caused by the constant warfare of his reign against the Turks, Protestants in the Holy Roman Empire and France. Philip was therefore forced to declare himself bankrupt shortly after coming to the throne and again a few years later, which suggests his inherited problems were a major factor. The sources of income available to the king were limited as the Spanish economy was not strong and silver from Spain's empire in the Americas was not enough to meet the needs. The situation was not helped by the fact that the nobles did not pay taxes and this limited further the sources of income for the king.

Philip himself also spent a lot of money, particularly on warfare. He fought France, England and the Turks, which cost a lot and this was made worse because the cost of fighting was rising in the sixteenth century. He was also faced with a rebellion in the Netherlands and this also cost a lot of money to try and put down. Philip spent a lot of money on his court so that it appeared impressive to other nations and gave the impression that Spain was powerful, he built up an impressive art collection and built a new palace, the Escorial, just outside Madrid which also cost a lot of money. The cost of ruling Spain was also expensive because of the size of the empire and therefore a lot of money had to be spent on that which only added to the problems. Philip did his best to get as much money as he could from Spain. With revenue from royal lands, the church and from grants from the Spanish Cortes, but the amount was not enough and therefore he went bankrupt again in the latter part of his reign.

The amount that Philip spent, mostly on warfare, was the main reason for Spain's problems and therefore I would argue that it was Philip's expenditure that was the main cause of the problems.

### Examiner commentary

- Although both factors are discussed, the answer tends to be descriptive of the problems.
- There is some limited explanation or argument, but it is supported by generalised knowledge, making the analysis less convincing.
- The response is aware of the main issues but it lacks the depth.
- The judgement in the conclusion is brief and not developed or supported to make it very convincing.

## Y210 Russia 1645-1741

Which of the following was more important in modernising Russia?

- (i) The building of St.Petersburg
- (ii) The formation of the Senate

### High level answer

St Petersburg was built on captured territory as a sign of the success of Peter's policy of strengthening Russia. It was an important symbol of royal power and modernization. It was built in the modern European style and it was intended as part of Peter's policy of opening 'a window on the West' by its situation on the Baltic. It was intended as a contrast to the old fashioned, land locked Moscow. It was city which could be accessible to trade and visitors from the West. Its palaces gave western style dwellings to the aristocrats who came there because it was the seat of the court and government. Its churches were in a modern architectural style showing the change from the old Believers. Its admiralty building showed a belief in sea power, a major feature of the modern West. However, the focus on the modern western based capital meant that there was a gulf between the capital and the provinces that remained a feature of the Tsarist regime. A westernised court had a modern setting but that did not mean that Russia as a whole was westernized or that Peter behaved like a western ruler.

Though important as a symbol, the more ambitious policies needed a different kind of more effective and western-style government so the creation of the Senate had more to do with effective power than the new capital which was more to demonstrate that power. The existing chancelleries were inefficient and had overlapping authorities, so the new Senate took on specific responsibilities each headed by a top official with more clearly defined responsibilities. This remained the system until new ministries were created by Alexander I. The Senate had emerged as a group of officials to look after royal business in the Tsar's absence. It developed into regular supervision of the army, navy, trade and state finances as a permanent body. Thus though it was more 'western' it developed out of the Tsar's personal delegation of his authority. Its scrutiny by other royal officials called fiscals showed the Tsar's lack of trust in any delegation of authority. In theory administration was modernized but there were severe limitations in that the army still collected many taxes and the creation after 1725 of different supervisory bodies, so a permanent efficient system of national government by men trusted by the monarch did not emerge. It might be seen then that the impressive symbolic capital which showed the hopes for westernization was more important as the realities of Russia did not match the image.

### Examiner commentary

- There is clear line of argument here which considers why both might be seen as important but comes to a view based on a critical look at the actual effects of the changes in government.
- There might be more support on the Senate, but there is analysis and judgement and some detailed knowledge.

### Medium level answer

Peter had travelled in Europe and seen the new architecture of the European cities so wanted a new capital in classical style, not the Old Russian ornate and eastern style domes. His new city which was named after him was going to be his 'window on the west' and was built not in the centre of European Russia like Moscow but as a city which faced out towards Europe. It had western style palaces like the Winter Palace and fine boulevards and canals and was like no other Russian city. It encouraged the nobles to build their great houses in the western style, too and foreign diplomats could see a European style city with parks, wide streets and classical buildings and bridges and think that they were dealing with a modern monarch not a Tartar like Asiatic ruler. So the city became a centre for culture and was important as it showed western influences.

The Senate was also important as Peter needed to change the old style Russian way of governing and have a new style where there were officials responsible for every different aspect of government not like in a mediaeval type government where those who administered the state had overlapping duties and there was no clear areas of government. This was important as Peter wanted to build up his army and navy and also to make other important changes in Russia so he needed a modern government such was developing in the west. He had to make sure the senate was supervised but the new government was more modern and effective so it was more important than the capital which was more for show.

### Examiner commentary

- The importance of both elements is shown if in somewhat general terms and a judgement, though not very developed is offered.
- There is some knowledge, though not very detailed and the answer is focused on the question.

# Y211 The Rise and Decline of the Mughal Empire in India 1526-1739

Which contributed more to the difficulties faced by Aurangzeb during his reign from 1658 to 1707?

- (i) His religious policies
- (ii) His campaigns in the Deccan?

## High level answer

In the context of the problems faced by Aurangzeb with his brothers and with other areas which demanded use of his forces, the long campaign in the Deccan weakened his empire and was financially costly, draining resources. Having ordered a successful campaign against the key figure in the Deccan, Shivaji, following his taking of Surat, Aurangzeb wasted an opportunity in 1665 to make terms with him which might well have led to the conquest of Bijapur and Golkonda. This meant forces were diverted from the Punjab but were unable to prevent Shivaji from consolidating his administration and declare himself King in 1674. Aurangzeb had to face a powerful Hindu Maratha state as well as the Shi'ite Muslim states. Aurangzeb's large scale expedition of 1681 was costly. Though Golkonda and Bijapur were conquered and the Martha leader Sambaji captured, there were long and expensive sieges of fortresses. The emperor's absence on campaigns led to corruption and indiscipline in Agra and Delhi; the treasury was exhausted and the conquest of Golkonda and Bijapur weakened the Muslim presence in the south by showing divisions. An extended campaign against the Marathas from 1689-1707 achieved limited success, as the forts were too extensive and strong.

Aurangzeb was an orthodox Sunni Muslim who had promised rigorous policies. His strictness included abolishing astrologers, banned music and pursued an intolerant policy towards other religions, especially Hindus. In 1669 his order to demolish Hindu temples and schools led to unpopularity and unrest. Hindu traders faced discrimination in customs duties which damaged trade and in 1679 the re-imposition of the Jizya and the insistence on conversion to Islam as a condition of being employed in state service put pressure on Hindus. This all led to rebellions from 1669 culminating in the Rajput rising of 1679. It also linked to Hindu resistance in the Deccan and prevented a compromise peace. The Rajput rising gave opportunity for Prince Akbar to join the rebellion. The intolerance caused rebellion, divisions within the royal family and cost in terms of suppressing rebellion and in economic damage caused by interference with trade. As religious intolerance prevented a settlement in the Deccan which was so damaging to the finances of Aurangzeb and was such a major distraction from other issues and it badly divided his empire from within as opposed to in lands he wished to conquer is at the root of all his problems and is the most important factor.

## Examiner commentary

- This offers a very clear judgement and a convincing argument.
- The contextual knowledge is sound and the explanations of the effects of both elements is well made.
- The focus is sustained and there is good analysis.

### Medium level answer

The religious policies are the most important. Aurangzeb destroyed Hindu temples and caused a great deal of unrest by imposing the tax on non Muslims and trying to persuade them to convert to Islam. The Mughal Empire had to deal with many different religions and even divisions between Muslims into Shi'ite and Sunni. Instead of trying to be moderate and tolerant Aurangzeb drove many into opposition. This divided the Empire and cost a lot of money to deal with. It gave him a bad reputation. It also led to problems in dealing with the Marathas in the Deccan.

Aurangzeb wanted to expand his empire and to conquer the Deccan where there were a lot of his religious enemies. He fought a lot of wars there and had to take large forces to defeat the Marathas. Though he was successful in conquering Bijapur and another Muslim state he found it more difficult to conquer the Hindu forces because of the strong forts that they had built, so had to defeat them by sieges which were slow and expensive and weakened his state. He did have some success but he had to be away for a long time fighting and his state depended on him a lot. Aurangzeb also faced other problems especially from rebellions from his brothers and when died in 1707 his empire fell apart.

The war in the Deccan was important, but the religious policy divided his empire. The war was more important because it cost a great deal of money and this weakened the empire.

### Examiner commentary

- This offers a view about the relative importance but it is not developed and seems contradictory.
- There is some explanation of the effects of both elements and some linking of the two, but not very developed.
- There is some knowledge deployed but it is not very developed and the judgement at the end is not strongly supported.
- There is focus for much of the time and an answer is given.

## Y212 American Revolution

Which of the following was of greater importance as a cause of American discontent?

- (i) The 'Intolerable Acts'
- (ii) The First Continental Congress?

Explain your answer with reference to both (i) and (ii).

### High level answer

The Coercive or 'Intolerable' Acts were passed by Parliament in 1774 in response to the Boston tea Party. They were important in causing discontent because whilst the British government aimed to punish Massachusetts, especially Boston, many Americans believed that they were a threat to all the colonies. This therefore helped to turn a local issue into a national one and therefore played a large part in creating the preconditions for American, as opposed to local discontent. Many now felt that if Massachusetts could be treated in this way there was little to prevent the rest of America and therefore no colony was secure. The acts also helped to create unity because it prompted other colonies to come to the aid of Boston and send food and money to the town to aid the poor there. These actions of the British also convinced many Americans that Britain was determined to erode 'English liberties' and convinced many that united action was needed to defend them and ultimately led to an inter-colonial congress to seek redress of American grievances, bringing about united action. The government's decision not to suspend the acts, despite Chatham introducing a bill only added to the tension.

The First Continental Congress played a crucial role as it was a turning point in creating unity between the colonies, with all except Georgia sending at least one delegate, and therefore developing discontent. The congress endorsed the Suffolk Resolves which declared the Intolerable acts null and void, which once more was an example of the united action of the colonies and the growing discontent. It also brought to prominence the very men who would be important in drafting the Declaration of Independence, with men such as John and Sam Adams leading the radical cause. The Congress was important as it helped to bring about united action with a trade embargo and the calling on colonists to form Continental Associations so that non-importation would be a united effort and not merely a local initiative, and was therefore a further sign of widening unrest. Moreover, the attacks on British government officials after the Congress showed how much opposition there was and the committees that were set up suggested that the colonists were becoming more organised in their opposition.

It was the passing of the Intolerable Acts which was the most important in fomenting American discontent. Without their passing the Continental Congress would not have been called. The Intolerable Acts went a long way to help create unity among the colonists, although that was not complete and was still not fully complete after the Congress as not all Americans supported the cause, but it was the Intolerable Acts that had begun to untie America.

### Examiner commentary

- The answer analyses the role of both factors and explains how they helped to rouse the American people.
- It also acknowledges the limitations to both factors and states that even after Congress not all Americans were behind the cause.
- The conclusion reaches a judgement having evaluated both factors and sees how they link together and form part of the process of causing discontent.

### Medium level answer

The Intolerable Acts followed on from the Boston Tea Party. The government in England was determined to take a hard line with colonial defiance. Therefore in early 1774 they passed four coercive acts which have become known as the Intolerable Acts. These acts closed Boston to trade until the destroyed tea had been paid for, the Massachusetts Government Act allowed the royal governor to appoint and remove officials, murder trials would be transferred to Britain and military commanders were given more authority to house their troops. These acts were unpopular in Massachusetts, but also in other parts of the American colonies as they were concerned they could be imposed on them. This led to discontent to spread as other states supported Massachusetts.

The Continental Congress was important in causing discontent. The Congress met in Philadelphia, where all colonies with the exception of Georgia sent a delegate. Many of the men who were sent by the various colonies had already been involved in opposition to Britain, such as Jon Adams, and this gave them the opportunity to come together. They passed the Suffolk Resolves which declared the Intolerable Acts null and void. Other acts were also passed which showed unity among the members. The violence shown toward British officials after the Congress showed that there was a lot of opposition. Some military organization also took place, suggesting the colonies were considering fighting. Therefore the Congress was important as opposition spread and became united.

Both events were important but the Intolerable Acts were more important as it started the united opposition.

## Examiner commentary

- The answer shows considerable knowledge of the Intolerable Acts, but they are largely described and there is only limited analysis of their role in creating opposition.
- The same is true of the Congress, where the detail is limited and the argument is not developed.
- The conclusion is generalized and little more than an assertion.

# Y213 The French Revolution and the rule of Napoleon 1774-1815

(a) Which of the following had the greater impact on the authority of the monarchy in 1789?

- (i) The Storming of the Bastille
- (ii) The October Days

## High level answer

The storming of the Bastille had a big impact on the authority of the monarchy in 1789 because it showed the power of the Paris crowds. The Third Estate had shown its rejection of royal authority by swearing the Oath of the Tennis Court when it had been locked out its meeting room. This oath bound the members not to disperse before France had a new Constitution. Thus the middle classes had already gone much further than the King intended when he summoned the States General. Excited by rumours of a possible coup by the use of military force, the Paris populace with members of the National Guard forcibly entered the Bastille prison, thought to be an arms cache, released the few prisoners and, most significantly of all, murdered the governor M. de Launay. Mob actions were nothing new, but the association of mob violence with political protest was a major turning point. The King had not acted and the growing popular unrest in Paris had been allowed to develop in to an attack on a royal stronghold and the murder of a royal official. It was significant in that other revolutionary days followed in which an alliance of political radicalism and popular violence were to weaken and then finally destroy the monarchy. It was as a courtier said to Louis XVI when he was told it was a revolt – ‘No sire, it is a revolution’.

The October days could be seen merely as an extension of the mob action of the Bastille. Led by discontented women and accompanied by the National Guard, the Paris mob made its way to Versailles and forced the royal family to Paris to dwell in the heart of the city. In addition the assembly went from Versailles to Paris. It was no longer a royally convened assembly but now one that was responsible to the people. The Bastille had not affected the royal family in person – Louis had been out hunting on 14 July and had not even mentioned it in his diary. However being forced from his palace by a violent crowd to the central Tuileries palace was much more significant because it put the royal family much more at the mercy of the crowd. It showed how an alliance of people and political groups could have a big influence and led to considerable changes in the nature of the revolution. In the escalation of revolution, the assembly swept away privileges and the royal family became dominated by mob pressure and the desire of the assembly for a constitutional monarchy. Thus though the October days were a development of the events of 14 July they had much greater impact on the course of the revolution.

## Examiner commentary

- There is analysis of the significance and not just a description of what happened.
- There is a clear answer offered about which is more important in its impact and this is explained.
- There is an understanding of the context with some detailed knowledge.

### Medium level answer

The Storming of the Bastille was more important because it was the real start of the popular revolution and is still celebrated as the key date of the revolution. The Bastille was a big prison in the heart of Paris but it was more a symbol of royal authority, as it did not contain many prisoners. It was attacked by the mob on 14 July 1789 who wanted to take arms, as they feared that there might be an attempt by the king to use force against the rebellious Parisians and the States General. It had a lot of violence as the governor was beheaded by the mob. This was very shocking and its importance is that it showed that the revolution was becoming more violent and out of control.

The October days are not so important because they followed earlier violence. When bread prices rose and the people were discontented they blamed the King and the royal family, so went to their palace and made them come back to Paris after violent actions against the royal guard. This was important as it showed disrespect to the King and Queen who were called rude names when they and the assembly came back to Paris. This showed how the revolution was progressing and also showed the role of women as the procession to the palace was led by some of the working class women of Paris. It was more violent than the storming of the Bastille but it was not so important as the Bastille was at the start of the revolution and the October days was when there had already been lots of revolutionary activity and mobs so was not particularly new.

### Examiner commentary

- There is some attempt to consider significance rather than merely to say what happened.
- There is some knowledge of the context and some knowledge of the key elements.
- The analysis is not well developed and the comparison though answering the question lacks depth and the explanation is not very developed.

## Y214 France 1814-1870

Which of the following had greater consequences for Napoleon III?

- (a) Participation in the Crimean War
- (b) The Austro-Prussian War of 1866

### High level answer

The participation in the Crimean War was the first time since 1815 that France had been involved in a major European War. Napoleon III was determined to protect French prestige and to prevent Russian expansion. French forces fought with Britain and Turkey and a new European alignment was made with France as an ally of Britain. The victory in the war increased French prestige and showed that France was a major force in European diplomacy again. However, the good relations with Britain did not last and the so-called Crimean alliance broke down. The participation of Piedmont in the war led to warmer relations with France, which helped to lead France into another war this time in Italy. The war gained domestic support, particularly among Catholics and boosted the Emperor's domestic position, but also encouraged over-estimation of French military power later on.

Though the Crimean War seemed to put France more in the forefront of European affairs, the Austro-Prussian did the opposite. The future of Germany was settled without French involvement. Bismarck had secured an understanding with France and Napoleon III, expecting a longer war, did not intervene and allowed Prussia in a short campaign to defeat Austria and establish itself as the main power in North Germany. Excluded from influence in an area which he thought was a major concern for France, Napoleon tried to get compensation in Luxemburg only for that to backfire and make it seem that France was expansionist and opportunist. Though war with Prussia was not inevitable it was considerably more likely after the war of 1866 and when it came in 1870, Napoleon III was captured and his regime came to an end. Thus the Austro-Prussian war had considerably greater consequences than the Crimean War. Conflict with a backward military and economic power, Russia, in 1854 led to a victory which enhanced French prestige, but the war of 1866 led to conflict with a much more modern Prussian army, backed by a strong economy which revealed the weaknesses of Napoleon's regime and instead of boosting his image destroyed him.

### Examiner commentary

- Both parts deal with consequences and do not merely offer narratives or explanations of outcome.
- There is a sustained comparison of the consequences of both wars and in the time available, the answer shows an understanding of the impact of both.

### Medium level answer

The Crimean War was fought between France, Britain and Turkey on one hand and Russia on the other. France had become involved because of a dispute over the Holy Places between Catholic and Orthodox monks. Napoleon III was very conscious of catholic opinion and the need for prestige. He welcomed an alliance with Britain and friendship with Austria and the war made France more important internationally and ended in a victory in the Treaty of Paris. It had important consequences in strengthening France and encouraged Napoleon to think in terms of using France's military power.

The Austro Prussian War was brought about by a conflict over Schleswig and Holstein, two areas taken by Austria and Prussia after the war against Denmark. The war was important as it established that Prussia not Austria was the major power in Germany. Germany was an important area for France and France expected to be consulted by any major change. However, Bismarck cleverly kept France out of the war and no foreign power was involved. The war was over very quickly and then Napoleon III felt angry that he had not been involved and tried to get compensation in Luxemburg, but Bismarck did not support this which made Napoleon III angry. Relations between France and Bismarck got worse and Bismarck was able to start a war in 1870 and defeat France, which ended the empire as Napoleon was captured. Thus the Austro Prussian war was more important as it led to greater consequences.

### Examiner commentary

- There is some knowledge here and a comparison is made, but the focus is not wholly on consequences, through some are considered.
- The question is answered, but there is not enough direct comparison and some quite general writing.

## Y215 Italy and Unification 1789-1896

Which caused the greater problems for the new Kingdom of Italy?

- (a) The Brigands' War
- (b) The relations with the church?

### High level answer

The Brigands' War is not an accurate term for the widespread disturbances in the period after 1861 as many parts of the south resisted what they saw as the imposition of rule by Piedmont. Conscription and new taxes on milling grain provoked protests. The new state had to send 100,000 troops to the south and there was a high level of violence. The death toll may have reached 150,000. There were refugees, abandoned lands, unemployment and a great legacy of bitterness. More people were killed in the Brigands War than during the wars of independence. The South saw itself as conquered territory and a legacy of resentment about the reprisals lasted well into the twentieth century. Thus instead of beginning in a mood of idealism, the new Kingdom began with a period of violence and large-scale civil disobedience and armed resistance. Unrest in the South continued as did the problems of secret societies and resistance to state authority.

There is a link between the Brigands' War and the problems caused by the relations with the Church. The rebels did think of themselves as true Catholics avenging the insults to the Pope. The Papal States had been invaded by Garibaldi and then by Piedmontese forces during the Unification. The Pope had opposed the Risorgimento and had had his lands taken, leaving him in Rome defended by French forces. He opposed the ideas of nationalism and so the new Italy, a deeply Catholic country, was at odds with the Pope. This set up problems for devout Catholics who were also patriots. When French forces withdrew in 1870 and Italian troops occupied Rome, the Pope became a virtual prisoner in the Vatican. Thus the new Kingdom had to deal with divided loyalties. But until the 1880s was there an attempt to improve relations and there were clashes over education and matters such as the church's legal rights. Both this and the Brigands' War weakened the new state and made it seem even more as if Piedmont had imposed its authority. However, the tensions between church and state lasted longer and were not resolved until Mussolini's Lateran Treaty. The Brigands' war involved actual physical violence and left lasting resentment but was more confined to regions of the South. The ill will of the church threatened the new state more profoundly.

### Examiner commentary

- This offers direct comparisons and explains the problems of elements rather than simply describing or explaining what happened.
- The answer is analytical throughout and the focus on the question is maintained.

### Medium level answer

The new Kingdom of Italy faced a lot of opposition as Italy was very divided. The South was backward and had a different language so that the regions of Italy could not understand each other. The new kingdom had a Piedmontese monarch and form of government and the people in the south often disliked this and there was a lot of trouble with bandits and people not obeying the laws and running away to avoid joining the army. The so called Brigands' war was very violent and lasted until the mid-1860s. It was important because it weakened the new Italy which had to send police and army to the South to deal with it.

The religious problems were caused by the Pope rejecting the new Kingdom of Italy, because the Pope had not agreed to join it but was forced to. Italy had to accept that the Pope still ruled Rome and it was not until 1870 that Rome could be the new capital. This was a problem for Italy. Also the Pope remained in the Vatican but of not recognize the new state so Catholics were not supposed to have anything to do with Italy and the Pope condemned nationalism. This made it very difficult for the new state as most Italians were Catholics. This was a bigger problem as it affected all Italy and not just the south, but it was not such a big problem as there was not the fighting and killing of an actual war as there was with the Bandits.

### Examiner commentary

- This offers an answer and some explanations, but the knowledge is rather thin and the comparison relatively limited and simplistic.
- The answer maintains a focus and is more than two brief descriptions, but the scale of the Brigands' war is not really appreciated.

## Y216 America in the Nineteenth Century

Which had the greater consequences for Native Americans in the years 1861-1890?

- (i) The 'Indian Wars'
- (ii) The Dawes Act

Explain your answer with reference to both (i) and (ii).

### High level answer

The Indian wars had serious consequences for the Native Americans, particularly in the short term. The wars saw a huge loss of life because the American forces were far better equipped and had better technology. Moreover a number of atrocities were committed against them, such as the Sand Creek Massacre in 1864. The treaties that brought the wars to an end, such as the 1868 Fort Laramie Treaty resulted in the loss of large amounts of land. Although these impacts were dramatic, it should be remembered that the wars did not affect all Native American peoples. However, it did result in the start of the policy of Americanisation and the Reservation Policy which would do a great deal to destroy the Native American's way of life as on the reservations all tribal beliefs and customs were eradicated and American laws replaced tribal laws and communal living ended.

The Dawes Act of 1887 was introduced because the reservation policy had failed. The act divided up the reservation lands and created allotments for Native American families. This added to the destruction of Native American culture that had been started by the Reservation policy as it further destroyed the idea of tribal culture. Moreover, some reservation disappeared and therefore the loss of land for the Native Americans was significant, probably around 50%. Unlike the wars this policy affected all Native Americans and therefore had a larger impact, however, the conditions on the reservations had often been very poor and therefore it is possible to argue that the Allotment policy did bring about some improvements, but it did continue the destruction of their economic and social structures.

The Wars had the larger impact as they started the process of destroying Native American culture and the Dawes act simply continued the policy, but by different means. Both policies were aimed at the Americanisation of the Native Americans and the wars brought about far more destruction in order to bring it about. Although the Native Americans did not want full rights of citizenship or the ownership of land, at least there were some improvements, but the impact of the wars was wholly negative and therefore had a greater impact.

### Examiner commentary

- The significance of both factors are explained and analysed.
- The argument is well supported by accurate and relevant details.
- The judgement is supported and developed.
- The answer considers the significance from a variety of perspectives.

### Medium level answer

The Native Americans lost the wars and therefore the battles for grasslands, water and bison. They were defeated because the American army was bigger and had better technology. The wars meant that the Native Americans were left struggling for food and had to accept American policy. This policy changed their lives completely as they were Americanised. The Native Americans lost lots of people during the wars and then the treaties that they signed to end them, such as Fort Laramie resulted in them losing lots of land. The government then started to put the Native Americans on reservations where their tribal way of life was destroyed and this obviously had a large impact on them.

The Dawes Act was passed in 1887. This act gave land, or an allotment, to each head of the family and eventually they would own the land. The Native Americans who farmed this land were also given full rights of citizenship, but when they tried to claim them they were often discriminated against. This destroyed the reservation system, which had been a very harsh system. The act meant that they lost a lot of land and it also undermined their way of life. This act was important as it affected all Native Americans. Some of the land given to them was not very good and this made it very difficult, whilst others did well, therefore the impact varied.

The Dawes Act had a bigger impact as the wars did not affect everyone, but the Dawes Act did and also it lasted longer, whereas the Wars and the reservation policy that followed were ended by the Dawes Act. The Dawes Act carried on into the next century and therefore lasted longer.

## Examiner commentary

- There is some explanation of the consequences of both factors.
- There is some judgement and attempt to analyse the factors, which could be developed as the ideas are sound but not always well expressed.
- There is some knowledge, although some precise details about the actual Indian Wars would be beneficial.
- There is some limited understanding of the key concepts of Americanised, Reservations and allotments.

## Y217 Japan 1853-1937

Which of the following had the greater impact on Japan's relations with the west 1863-1920?

- (a) The Sino-Japanese War 1894-5
- (b) The Russo-Japanese War 1904-5

### High level answer

The defeats by Japan of China in the Sino-Japanese war showed the superiority of a smaller nation which had modernized and transformed its navy by using British naval expertise and its army by using the German model. It demonstrated to the west the potential strength of Japan and its ability to expand its territory at China's expense. It also led to an assertion of western influence over Japan when Russia, in concert with France and Germany prevented the gains made at the Treaty of Shimonoseki going to Japan, taking away Port Arthur and Dairen as bases. Thus the war set up considerable resentment within Japan at western interference and particularly against Russia whose occupation of Manchuria was seen as a hostile move. The impressive victory however made the western powers aware of the potential of Japan as a great power. The Anglo Japanese alliance of 1902 showed Britain's awareness of Japan's importance as a counter to Russia and the alliance was a major step forward for Japan, its first alliance with a western power on equal terms. The concern that Japan might dominate China after 1895 was a major concern for the USA and began a policy of trying to contain Japan that culminated in the war of 1941. The war for Japan showed the vulnerability of China and encouraged hopes for future expansion, which had a major effect on its relations with the West.

The defeat of Russia by Japan had an even more profound effect on its relations with the West. For the first time an Asian nation had inflicted a major defeat on a Western power which had tried to restrict Japan. The humiliation of 1895 was redeemed by the gaining of Port Arthur. This time Western action was confined to mediation from the USA which led to the peace treaty. Britain renewed its treaty and Japan supported Britain in 1914 by taking German colonies in China and the Pacific. The war had showed that Japan was a serious ally. Given the successes against Russia in 1905 the lack of respect given to Japan at the Treaty of Versailles became even more galling as did the restrictions of the Washington naval treaty. This war was more significant in that it established Japan as a power which could trace on European armies and navies and become victorious. This gave Japan more confidence in dealing with the West and more resentment when its status was not recognized fully. By establishing Japanese power more fully in China it paved the way for further expansion, as did the war of 1894-5, but this time with greater confidence in Japan's ability to defeat the west. For the west, this war was more significant as China was viewed as a weak declining power, but Russia was a great European power and a major ally of France, so Japan became more significant and dangerous as a result of the defeat of Russia in this war.

### Examiner commentary

- This is a well-focused response, which deals squarely with Japan's relations with the west and does cover the period to 1920.
- There is sustained analysis not description and the judgement is clear and supported.

### Medium level answer

The Sino Japanese war was important as it showed how powerful Japan was getting and it had better forced which defeated China and forced the weak Chinese to sign a peace treaty giving Japan gains in territory. This worried Russia and it made Japan give up some key areas including Port Arthur. The Russians also occupied Manchuria. This made Japan angry and this was to lead to a war between Japan and Russia, so the war had important consequences. It made the west think that Japan was powerful and it made Japan realize that western powers could still intervene and treat Japan with contempt.

The Russo Japanese war began in 1904 when Japan attacked Port Harbour without warning. There was heavy fighting and the Russians were defeated at Mukden and also the Russian fleet was sunk at Tsuchima which was a major blow to Russia. The war brought about a revolution in Russia and was a major sign that Japan could have a big influence on Europe. It led to more Japanese expansion and showed that Japan would be a difficult power to defeat because its forces fought so bravely. Therefore the West had to take more notice of Japan. It was more important than the war with China because Japan defeated a European power not an Asian power and so western powers were more worried by this than they were over the previous war and Japan was shown to be a stronger world power than just by defeating China.

### Examiner commentary

- There is some focus on the question, but the answer is rather thin and general on the consequences and does not cover the period well.
- There is some rather descriptive writing but a comparison is attempted and the question is answered even if the depth is limited.

## Y218 – International relations 1890-1941

Which of the following aspects of the Treaty of Versailles caused more problems for international relations in the period from 1919 to 1939?

- (i) Reparations
- (ii) The limitations on German armed forces?

### High level answer

Reparations caused considerable problems until they were ended in the early 1930s. Set at £6.600 million they were justified by blaming Germany for the war. Both these elements were highly unpopular in Germany who was herself suffering from economic problems. They led to support for right-wing nationalist parties, including the Nazis which destabilized the country. In the end the advent of the Nazi regime was a major problem for international relations as Hitler was determined to abolish the restrictions of Versailles. In the 1920s the reparations issue led to the French and Belgian occupation of the Ruhr which was a major international crisis. It led to rapid inflation in Germany which undermined Weimar and was a big factor in giving support to the Nazis as the middle classes lost savings and turned to extremism more. It divided Britain from France as the British disapproved of French action and so made it less likely that the two countries would cooperate later on. Reparations continued and there were international agreements about them in the Dawes Plan and the Young Plan. However, the Young Plan was unpopular and led to more support for Hitler and consequently more problems for international relations in the 1930s.

The restrictions on Germany's armed forces to 100,000 and restrictions on naval, air and heavy weapons and tanks were humiliating for a military nation, but probably less unpopular than reparations which had more direct results and so less important in bringing Hitler to power and the consequent disruption of international relations. However, German conscription and the remilitarization of the Rhineland in March 1936 caused tensions and both of these were in defiance of the limitations imposed at Versailles. Neither however produced more than protests. It was the limited reaction of Britain and France in defending the terms of Versailles that encouraged Hitler to end other restrictions and gave him the means for expansion which did create problems in international affairs and eventually led to war in 1939. Reparations were the most important in that the bulk of the German people were affected; they made it seem as if the Treaty were punishing Germany and it gave support to nationalism within Germany which was to cause very significant problems when it led to expansion into Austria, Czechoslovakia and Poland from 1938-9. This change in the balance of power and signs of danger from German expansion directly followed from Hitler's coming to power.

### Examiner commentary

- This answer keeps a very clear focus on the question and the links with international problems and not just the impact on Germany.
- There is sound explanation and a judgement emerges which is explained.
- The answer is analytical and not descriptive.

### Medium level answer

By imposing reparations and blaming Germany for the war the Treaty of Versailles the allies helped the rise of Hitler. The situation was made worse when France invaded and occupied the Ruhr when reparations were not paid. This caused a major crisis in Germany when the government printed money and the value of the mark fell causing inflation which wiped out the savings of the middle classes. This had a bad effect on Germany and many who voted for Hitler in 1930-33 remembered the inflation and the French actions. This led to the Nazi regime which had a major effect on international relations. It also led to Britain being distrustful of French fears. The French did not act through the League of Nations.

The restrictions on the German army was also very unpopular as many people felt that Germany could not defend itself and that Germany was being treated unfairly as other powers did not disarm so that Germany would not even have been able to defeat Poland. It also led to the rise of Hitler and this had a big impact on international affairs as he remilitarized the Rhineland in 1936 and this could have caused a major international crisis if France had taken action. It also led to Germany signing a naval treaty with Britain in which Britain accepted that Germany would not be as restricted as it had been in 1919. So the restrictions were too harsh and Britain and France were willing to lift them so this encouraged Germany to break more of the Treaty so the clauses had an impact. The restrictions on the army were more important as this led to the Rhineland crisis which was the first step in Hitler taking over more of Europe and the outbreak of War. Reparations were also important but not as important.

### Examiner commentary

- The explanation is less developed here and the focus is more about the general impact of the terms and there is some implicit link with foreign relations but it is too general.
- However there is some judgement made and some explanation and knowledge.

## Y219 – Russia 1894-1941

Which of the following was of greater importance in the Bolshevik victory in the Civil War?

- (i) white weakness
- (ii) foreign intervention

### High level answer

White weakness was a major factor in the Bolshevik victory. Lenin was unpopular because of the Treaty of Brest Litovsk; the left was split; his takeover in October 1917 had not had mass support outside the capital; and other big cities. If the Whites had been strong and united they might well have been victorious. However, they were divided between monarchists, constitutional democrats and a variety of anti-Bolshevik groups. Leaders like Kolchak, Yudenich and Denikin were unable to coordinate their attacks and their armies were geographically divided. Their officers were often corrupt and they could not persuade the peasants that they would not reverse the granting of Land made to them by Lenin in November. Among the whites were different national groups who sought for regional independence, so the Reds could claim to fighting for the unity of the country.

Though foreign intervention was important, it was not as significant as the overall white weakness. Intervention by the US, France and Britain as well as a large scale Japanese invasion of Siberia gave the Bolsheviks support because of the dislike of foreigners and the obvious desire of Japan for territory. The other foreign forces were not strong enough, on the whole, to make a decisive difference, though French leadership did help the Poles defend Warsaw. However it gave the Bolsheviks the reputation of defending the motherland. Execution of red prisoners increased the bitterness of Bolshevik resistance. However had the foreign intervention been to support much more united and effective white armies it might well have been more significant. As it was, the Whites' geographical weaknesses and problem with communication was more important because neither the Whites nor their foreign allies could make headway against a strong red central position with interior lines of defence, good leadership and committed fighters.

### Examiner commentary

- There is sound knowledge of the context, consistent explanation and judgement here.
- The answer avoids narrative and offers reasons for the importance of both elements and for the relative importance.

### Medium level answer

The weaknesses of the Whites were important in the Red victory. The Reds were more united behind Lenin and Trotsky and Trotsky used his armoured train to keep in touch with his forces while the Whites did not have such dynamic leaders and they had poor communications because they were too spread out. The Whites had orgies and corruption and this made them weak and the Reds had the support of the peasants. Some of the White leaders did not organize their forces well and this weakness was important but Trotsky was the main reason for the Red victory. There were different sorts of opponents of the Bolsheviks which made them weak.

The foreign powers were annoyed when Russia made a separate peace and shocked when the Tsar was murdered in 1918. Britain led an expedition to Murmansk and there were US and French forces as well. The foreign intervention however did not last very long as it was too unpopular and costly. The Reds said that they were the true Russians because the Whites had relied on foreigners and so this was an advantage for Lenin. The Whites were weak so the Foreign troops began to leave showing that it was the White weakness that was most important as they were trying to fight all round the outside of the Red area and lacked a real cause, unlike the Reds who fought for communism.

### Examiner commentary

- There is some focus on how each factor led to Red success, though explanation is variable and the contextual knowledge is quite generalized and the answer veers towards the Bolshevik strengths.
- There is some comparison even if it is limited to the final sentence.

## Y220 – Italy 1896-1943

Which of the following was the more serious problem for Italian governments from 1918 to 1922?

- (i) Agrarian unrest
- (ii) The seizure of Fiume by D'Annunzio

### High level answer

Agrarian unrest was strong in Italy in 1919 as peasants returned from the war and expected a reward. There were land seizures and actions against large landowners by discontented peasantry. The high levels of rural violence in the South were accompanied by socialist activity in the North, particularly in the Po Valley and peasant grievances were represented by the Catholic Partito Popolare. This presented serious problems of maintaining law and order. The problem was made worse by the parallel growth of strikes in the industrial areas, by wartime inflation and by disappointment with the Treaty of Versailles. Fearing socialism and some sort of equivalent of the Russian Revolution, landowners often financed fascist squads and the government faced civil disturbances between left and right. The support of the elites from landowners to police and army officers for the Fascist movement as a defence against communism so the threat from the right was added to the threat from the left.

The city of Fiume was not given to Italy but to the new state of Yugoslavia at the Treaty of St Germain in 1919. This provoked fury among nationalists and under the poet and extreme nationalist Gabriele D'Annunzio a force of volunteers seized the city which was ruled as a sort of right wing dictatorship until Italian government forces regained control and gave it back to Yugoslavia. The problems were that the Italian government seemed to lose control to extremists who raised their own armed force. It gave encouragement to right wing opponents like the Fascists. It discredited Italy in international eyes as the city held out for some time. It led to disagreements between the left and the right and gave huge prestige to a dictatorial figure, in the tradition of Garibaldi and paving the way for Mussolini. However, the underlying discontents were more important. Italy was still heavily rural and agrarian discontent on a large-scale destabilised the whole country. D'Annunzio was an extravagant poetic figure rather than a possible national leader and while the Fiume occupation discredited the government it did not pose the physical threat to stability and law order and involve different regions of the country as was the case with agrarian discontent which represented much deeper-rooted grievances than a town desired by Italy but not given to it by the peace treaty.

### Examiner commentary

- The contextual knowledge is effective in that there is some attempt to put the seizures into the more general context of unrest.
- The explanation is quite direct in both cases and there is no a merely narrative approach.
- There is some explained comparison of the relative importance of the factors.

### Medium level answer

The liberal government faced a great deal of social discontent after the war as a result of high prices and resentment about bosses and landowners from the socialists and from the left. The countryside in many areas saw strikes, occupations of large estates and peasant violence. It seemed as if Italy might get out of control and this led to more support for Mussolini and his squads. Mussolini had been a socialist but had changed his mind. He became more right wing after 1919 and was a real threat. The rebellious peasants often fought with the fascists causing violence and disturbance, which was a problem. Mussolini assured Italians that he would bring stability and this is one of the reasons for the march on Rome.

The territory of Fiume was Italian speaking but was given to Yugoslavia in the Treaty of Versailles. This angered many Italians and the liberals were thought to be weak for agreeing to it. So a group of ex-soldiers got together under a poet and occupied Fiume. This was a problem for the government because if they expelled them they would look as if they were going against Italian patriots, but if they did not then they would be going against the terms of the treaty. In the end they did send in forces which made them unpopular and so was one of the problems that led people to support a strong man Mussolini and the Fascists. Fiume was much more important than agricultural unrest because it showed the government was weak and they were uncertain of what to do. Italians wanted a strong government so they accepted Mussolini.

### Examiner commentary

- There is some knowledge if in rather general terms on the first element and some explanation of problems.
- The comparison is quite limited and only appears in a final sentence with limited amplification, but the question is answered.

## Y221 – Democracy and Dictatorships in Germany 1919-63

Which was of greater importance in establishing the Nazi dictatorship?

- (i) The Enabling Act
- (ii) The Night of the Long Knives

Explain your answer with reference to both (i) and (ii).

### High level answer

The Enabling Act, passed in March 1933, was crucial in establishing the Nazi dictatorship as it transferred full legislative powers to the Chancellor, Hitler, and his government for four years, thus establishing a dictatorship. This act therefore meant that parliament and parliamentary legislation became an irrelevance with the Reichstag virtually voting away its own existence. However, in actually voting it away, rather than having it imposed by force, it gave the establishment of a dictatorship the appearance of legality even though members of the Reichstag had been intimidated to ensure its passage. The act also helped to strengthen Hitler's position within the Cabinet as the President's approval was no longer needed for passing legislation, further adding to Hitler's power. It also gave Hitler the power to revise the constitution and removed any doubts that the middle classes had about the legality of the Nazi take-over as everything appeared to have been done legally.

The Night of the Long Knives in 1934 secured Hitler's position within his own party as it removed potential opposition of the SA and its leader Rohm, which wanted the Nazi revolution to become more radical. The destruction of the SA also pleased the army, who had feared the SA, but now supported Hitler with Blomberg's public vote of thanks and it led to the personal oath of loyalty to Hitler that the army took a few months later, thus removing the one group that might oppose him. It also removed many of the traditional such as Schleicher, who might have opposed some of his policies. Most importantly, it secured Hitler's personal supremacy as his decisions were accepted and he had been able to legalise murder, showing clearly that the regime was a personal dictatorship and he could get away with anything.

Although both events were important in establishing the Nazi dictatorship the Enabling Act was more significant as enabled Hitler to embark on a policy of co-ordination, or Gleichschaltung, and create the one-party state by early 1934. This allowed Hitler to remove potential opposition in nearly every walk of life, including Trade Unions and other political parties, thus it was more significant in removing a range of opposition than the Night of the Long Knives. The only exception to this was the army and the Night of the Long Knives was the event that won Hitler their support, but this simply completed the task begun by the Enabling Act. It is also unlikely that Hitler would have been able to undertake the night of the Long Knives without the power and confidence he had gained from the Enabling Act which again suggests that the Enabling act was the most important as it was the basis of the dictatorship and helped take Hitler from the position of Chancellor to Führer.

### Examiner commentary

- Analyses both factors thoroughly.
- The significance of both factors is evaluated.
- The supporting knowledge is detailed and accurate.
- There is a developed judgement.

### Medium level answer

The Enabling Act was passed on 23 March 1933. The act changed the constitution and therefore needed the support of two thirds of the Reichstag, which was only achieved through arrests and intimidation. The act gave Hitler the power to revise the constitution and also meant that he could rule without the Reichstag for four years. The Act meant that Hitler became a virtual dictator as he could pass laws without using the Reichstag.

The Night of the Long Knives in 1934 was when the SS was allowed to attack and kill many of their rivals the Storm Troopers (SA) who they said were plotting against Hitler. This was not true and Hitler wanted to get rid of the SA because they were too violent and the army did not like them. The army did not want any more revolution and if Hitler had not got rid of them then the army could have overthrown Hitler. There were also a lot of people Hitler did not like who were killed and afterwards he became Fuhrer and took full power. He had killed his former friend Rohm and then said he was homosexual and that he was reforming the party. It gave Hitler the support of the army. It showed how Hitler was very violent and would get rid of anyone he thought stood in his way. It was more important than the Enabling Act because that was legal and just gave Hitler more power, but this showed how violent he was as he even killed members of his own party and it got the support of the army, so it went further than just an Act.

## Examiner commentary

- There is explanation of both events.
- There is some analysis of both events, although the analysis of the Enabling Act is less developed.
- There is some evaluation of the Night of the Long knives, but the importance of the Enabling act is largely ignored.
- The judgement is not developed and limited to one sentence.

## Y222 – The Cold War in Asia

Which of the following was the most successful model for the USA 1945-52?

- (i) Japan
- (ii) The Philippines

### High level answer

Japan was a defeated enemy occupied by the US and ruled by MacArthur while the Philippines had suffered badly from Japanese occupation and had been given self-government by the US before the war. It might seem as if the Philippines might be the better model, but it was really Japan. Japan was purged of its militaristic elements and there were punishments for war crimes. This together with land reform and reduction in the power of landlords laid the basis for a more democratic Japan and the old emperor worship was officially ended. To maintain stability Hirohito was allowed to reign as a desanctified constitutional monarch, showing that the US could bring about changes apparently beneficial to the people and that a new Japan could be a model for change and westernization in Asia. Japan was a successful model against communism as the US gave it economic aid, eventually allowed big companies to prosper and Japan was made richer by the Korean War as it became a supply base for the USA. The USA guaranteed it and Japan began a period of rapid economic growth which became a model showing capitalism worked.

This was more successful than the Philippines. Though this was given independence in 1946, whereas Japan was occupied until 1952, old problems were not solved. There was no land reform until 1953 and both Roxas and Quirino were corrupt. Unlike Japan there was a civil war, with the Huk guerillas raising a rebel army of 15,000 and unlike Japan there were religious tensions between Muslims and Catholics which played a big part in destabilizing the country. So while it was a model in terms of the US giving it a constitutional state and aid, it was less of a model than Japan because of the divisions and corruption and its persistent poverty and overcrowding did not show capitalism working so well as did the booming post Korean War economy of Japan.

### Examiner commentary

- This is a well-focused answer which uses knowledge succinctly and offers a clear view.
- The idea of a model is well dealt with in the answer and there is a lot of analysis in a short space.

### Medium level answer

Japan was defeated when the US dropped an atomic bomb on Hiroshima and another on Nagasaki and then the US occupied Japan. Japan became a model because it no longer was allowed to worship the emperor and had a new parliament so it became more democratic and this was different from Communist China. Japan got a lot of money from the US to build up its industries so they became models as they were successful capitalist industries and the US was a capitalist country which opposed communism. Japan was peaceful and it grew so it was a model. Japan had been very military and had the cult of the samurai and had maltreated prisoners as in the Rape of Nanking, but it changed so was a model.

The Philippines was also a model as the US used to have it as a colony but gave it independence so it was a model to show that the US did not want colonies. The US also gave it economic aid and this was a model for other countries to know that if they supported the US they would get aid. However the Philippines had some problems and there were disputes between the different parts of the country and there was a lot of corruption, so it was not necessarily a good model of US influence. It was a more important model because it had been a colony but the US had made it independent and it elected its own president whereas Japan had been an enemy and had been occupied, so that the Philippines was more important because it showed how a former colony could benefit from the US whereas Japan had suffered from the US bombing it and was a less good model.

### Examiner commentary

- Though the argument is variable, there is some comparison attempted and there is some attempt to show in what ways the two countries were models, though the Philippines is dealt with less well and with less knowledge than Japan.
- There is some knowledge and some attempt at judgement.

## Y223 The Cold War in Europe question (a)

Which of the following had the greater impact on the Cold war in Europe?

- (i) The Hungarian Crisis 1956
- (ii) The Czech Crisis 1968

### High level answer

The Hungarian Crisis came as a disappointment to the West and to those who wanted greater change in the East because it seemed that Khrushchev had condemned Stalinism and also The Soviet leader had not let the troubles in Poland get out of hand. Therefore the suppression by force of the Hungarians after the ceasefire and partial withdrawal of Russian forces came as a shock. The heavy casualties and the deployment of tanks and ground forces raised tension between East and West. There were 200,000 Hungarian exiles that fled to the west, bringing with them stories of hardship, so this intensified feeling against the USSR, as did the arrest of Nagy, and disappointed hopes that Khrushchev was bringing about a new era. It worsened relations between East and West, but there was little chance of any real intervention beyond protests, so did not make war likely and neither did it end hopes of détente and Eisenhower still met with Khrushchev.

Between the Hungarian Crisis and the Czech crisis of 1968 there had been the danger of a nuclear war over Cuba and then a series of attempts at détente. The Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, though much less costly in lives than 1956, still showed that the USSR would use the Warsaw Pact to prevent major reform. Again hopes that a regime change with the fall of Khrushchev would bring a more liberal attitude were ended when the Prague Spring reforms of Dubcek merely led to an invasion by the Warsaw pact in August 1968. The invasion led to western criticisms but as in 1956 not to any action. It did however lead to some disunity within the Communist world with China, Yugoslavia and Albania all being critical. However it showed to the west the solidarity of the soviet bloc with East Germany and Poland being in favour. Once again it did not stop détente and the SALT agreements of 1972 showed this. The repression in Czechoslovakia had not resulted in Dubcek's death, merely demotion, nor had the bloodshed been as great as with Hungary, so it probably did not have the effect on hardening the cold war, as had been the case with Hungary. The disappointment was not as great as it had been in 1958, as Brezhnev had not made it clear as Khrushchev that there was to be a new direction after Stalin. The Hungarian revolt was the prelude to some intense hostility between the USSR and the US in the early 1960s, but the Czech crisis came before some of the most important talks of the cold war era over arms limitation.

### Examiner commentary

- The answer tries very hard to contextualise the events and to stay focused on the effects on the Cold War and not merely the effects on the countries involved.
- There is analysis and a direct comparison, which does more than assert.

### Medium level answer

The Czech crisis was not as important as the Hungarian crisis because it did not last so long and fewer people were killed. The Hungarian Crisis in 1956 was brought about because there was a belief that after Stalin's death, Khrushchev (sic) would allow more freedom and the Hungarians had a more liberal leader called Nagy. However, it was too dangerous for the USSR to allow change in the middle of the Cold War so they sent tanks to restore order and there were many people killed. The West did not intervene because of the Suez Crisis but it made relations between the USSR worse because there was sympathy for the Hungarians. It showed that not much had changed because of the death of Stalin and encouraged the West to keep up their defences against the USSR.

The Czech Crisis came under Brezhnev. Though relations had got better since 1962 and there had been arms talks, the Russian reaction to the Prague Spring of 1968 showed that for the USSR keeping their control over Iron Curtain countries was still important and it made tensions between west and the USSR because of the scenes of Russian tanks entering Prague even though fewer people were killed than in Hungary and Dubcek, the liberal Communist leader was not executed. The Hungarian crisis was more important because it was more in the middle of the Cold War than the Czech crisis.

### Examiner commentary

- There is some knowledge of the crises and the context and some comparison here but though the answer does more than tell the story of what happened and offers some comparisons, they are not very effective or sustained.



We'd like to know your view on the resources we produce. By clicking on the 'Like' or 'Dislike' button you can help us to ensure that our resources work for you. When the email template pops up please add additional comments if you wish and then just click 'Send'. Thank you.

If you do not currently offer this OCR qualification but would like to do so, please complete the Expression of Interest Form which can be found here: [www.ocr.org.uk/expression-of-interest](http://www.ocr.org.uk/expression-of-interest)

#### **OCR Resources:** *the small print*

OCR's resources are provided to support the teaching of OCR specifications, but in no way constitute an endorsed teaching method that is required by the Board and the decision to use them lies with the individual teacher. Whilst every effort is made to ensure the accuracy of the content, OCR cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions within these resources. We update our resources on a regular basis, so please check the OCR website to ensure you have the most up to date version.

© OCR 2015 – This resource may be freely copied and distributed, as long as the OCR logo and this message remain intact and OCR is acknowledged as the originator of this work.

OCR acknowledges the use of the following content:  
Square down and Square up: alexwhite/Shutterstock.com

Please get in touch if you want to discuss the accessibility of resources we offer to support delivery of our qualifications:  
[resources.feedback@ocr.org.uk](mailto:resources.feedback@ocr.org.uk)

We will inform centres about any changes to the specification. We will also publish changes on our website. The latest version of our specification will always be the one on our website ([www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)) and this may differ from printed versions.

Copyright © OCR 2015. All rights reserved.

#### **Copyright**

OCR retains the copyright on all its publications, including the specifications. However, registered centres for OCR are permitted to copy material from this specification booklet for their own internal use.

## **ocr.org.uk/alevelreform**

### OCR customer contact centre

#### **General qualifications**

Telephone 01223 553998

Facsimile 01223 552627

Email [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

OCR is part of Cambridge Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge. For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored. © OCR 2015 Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England.

Registered office 1 Hills Road, Cambridge CB1 2EU. Registered company number 3484466. OCR is an exempt charity.

