

**ADVANCED GCE****HISTORY B**

Historical Controversies – British History

**F985**

Candidates answer on the Answer Booklet

**OCR Supplied Materials:**

- 16 page Answer Booklet

**Other Materials Required:**

None

**30 November 2009 – 11 December 2009****Duration: 3 hours****INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES**

- Write your name clearly in capital letters, your Centre Number and Candidate Number in the spaces provided on the Answer Booklet.
- Use black ink.
- Read each question carefully and make sure that you know what you have to do before starting your answer.
- Answer **both sub-questions** from **one** Study Topic.
- Do **not** write in the bar codes.

**INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES**

- The number of marks is given in brackets [ ] at the end of each question or part question.
- The total number of marks for this paper is **60**.
- This paper contains questions on the following 4 Study Topics:
  - The debate over the impact of the Norman Conquest, 1066–1216
  - The debate over Britain's 17th-century crises, 1629–89
  - Different interpretations of British imperialism c.1850–c.1950
  - The debate over British Appeasement in the 1930s
- You should write in continuous prose and are reminded of the need for clear and accurate writing, including structure and argument, grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- The time permitted allows for reading the Extract in the one Option you have studied.
- In answering these questions, you are expected to use your knowledge of the topic to help you understand and interpret the Extract as well as to inform your answers.
- **You may refer to your class notes and textbooks during the examination.**
- This document consists of **8** pages. Any blank pages are indicated.

## 1 The debate over the Impact of the Norman Conquest, 1066–1216

*Read the following extract about the impact of the Norman Conquest and then answer the questions that follow.*

By 1086 the Anglo-Saxon aristocracy was no more and its place had been taken by a new Norman elite. Naturally this new elite retained its old lands on the Continent; the result was that England and Normandy now became a single cross-Channel political community sharing not only a ruling dynasty but also a single Anglo-Norman aristocracy. From now on until 1204, the histories of England and Normandy were inextricably interwoven.

Since Normandy was a principality ruled by a duke who owed homage to the king of France this also meant that from now on 'English' politics became part of French politics. But the French connection went deeper still. The Normans brought with them the French language and French culture. The Norman Conquest of 1066 was followed by an Angevin conquest of 1153–4; although this did not involve the settlement of a Loire valley aristocracy in England, the effect of the arrival of the court of Henry II and Eleanor of Aquitaine was to reinforce the dominance of French culture. Whereas in 1066 less than 30 per cent of Winchester property owners had non-English names, by 1207 the proportion had risen to over 80 per cent, mostly French names like William, Robert and Richard. Indeed so great was the pre-eminence of France in the fields of music, literature and architecture that French became a truly international language, spoken and written by anyone who wanted to consider himself civilized. The Norman Conquest ushered in a period during which England, like the kingdom of Jerusalem, can fairly be described as a part of France overseas, Outremer; in political terms it was a French colony.

It is hardly surprising, then, that generations of patriotic Englishmen should have looked upon the battle of Hastings as a national catastrophe. Yet even if we do not, as the Victorian historian E A Freeman did, describe Paris as 'beastly', it can still be argued that the Norman Conquest was the greatest disaster in English history. This is because of the problem of '1066 and All That'. With 1066 as the most famous date in English history it is devastatingly easy to see the Norman Conquest as a 'new beginning' or a 'significant turning-point'. Almost everything that happened in late eleventh-century England has been discussed in terms of the impact of the Norman Conquest. But this was a period of rapid development throughout Europe. Countries which suffered no Norman Conquest were none the less transformed. So there is the problem. In some respects 1066 wrought great changes; in other respects great changes occurred but can hardly be ascribed to the Conquest; in yet others, the most striking feature is not change at all, but continuity.

- (a) What can you learn from this extract about the interpretations, approaches and methods of this historian? Refer to the extract and your own knowledge to support your answer. [30]
- (b) When studying the Norman Conquest, some historians have focussed on the impact of the conquest from below. Explain how this has contributed to our understanding of the impact of the Norman Conquest. What are the shortcomings and disadvantages of such an approach? [30]

## 2 The debate over Britain's 17th-century crises, 1629–89

Read the following extract about Britain's 17th-century crises and then answer the questions that follow.

England has contributed many things, good and bad, to the history of the world. But of all her achievements there is one that has had the greatest effect. The transference of sovereignty from Crown to Parliament was achieved despite developments in continental Europe at the time. During the seventeenth century a type of despotic society and government was so firmly established in Europe, that but for the course of events in England, it would have been the only successor of the medieval system. But at this moment the English developed a system of government which differed as completely from the new continental model as it did from the anarchy of the Middle Ages. This system combined freedom with efficiency, and local rights with national union. It showed the world, by the example of a great nation that was fast becoming a great Empire, how liberty could mean strength not weakness.

Revolution may succeed or fail; but it will reveal the worth or vileness of the country in which it happens. A revolution with high ideals can take place only in a country where wealth is well distributed, classes are fairly balanced and the moral standard high. It is rare that the politics of so fortunate an era demand a revolution. Yet for this once in history all causes for the unique event were found together. When Charles and Laud began to play the tyrant in England, it was a country of excellence: the character of the various classes, gentlemen and yeoman, merchant and apprentice; the sports, traditions and customs of every shire and village, which gave even the poor a part and a joy in life; the conditions of labour and leisure in country and town; the Protestant religion; all these things together, when warmed by revolution, gave us our Cavaliers and Roundheads. With very few exceptions, history records no revolution so noble as this. In England the revolutionary passions were stirred by no class in its own interest. The men involved were prosperous men acting for liberty and religion and not for class greed. This was the secret of the moral splendour of our Great Rebellion and Civil War.

In the first few weeks of the Long Parliament, the policy of those who fought the battle of Protestant supremacy and political freedom underwent a change. Former Parliaments had spoken for the people, but had never called upon the people to protect them. Parliament called in clubs, broadswords and other weapons to protect it from the fate to which all its predecessors had submitted. The force of the mob came to guard religion and liberty. The gain from this was great because English liberty came to include more than the narrow legalism of the Parliament men. For the people of street, and farm, and village, called in the hour of need to act in partnership with the Puritans of the manor house, added not only to the fighting power, but to the spiritual and intellectual content of the cause. Behind the mobs who hooted the King's captains and knocked down papists at the street corners, moved the humble men who were to inspire democracy with its hopes and ideals.

- (a) What can you learn from this extract about the interpretation, approaches and methods of the historian? Refer to the extract and your own knowledge to explain your answer. [30]
- (b) Some historians have focused on class struggle in their study of the seventeenth-century crises. Explain how this has contributed to our understanding of the seventeenth-century crises. Has this approach any disadvantages or shortcomings? [30]

### 3 Different interpretations of British Imperialism c.1850–c.1950

*Read the following extract about British imperialism and then answer the questions that follow.*

Our own argument will be that the central weakness in existing accounts of imperialism is that they underplay the relationship between the British economy and Britain's presence abroad. Putting the metropolitan economy at the centre of the analysis makes it possible to establish a new framework.

The imperial mission was the export version of the gentlemanly order. The empire was a superb arena for gentlemanly endeavour, the ultimate testing ground for the idea of responsible progress, for the battle against evil, for the performance of duty, and for the achievement of honour. We have constructed a central proposition, based on gentlemanly capitalism, and tested it against various case studies.

The character and purpose of Britain's presence on the moving frontiers of empire can be fully understood only by linking events in diverse parts of the world to causes that can be traced back to the metropole itself. Our own interpretation attempts to connect metropole and periphery by linking innovations in the finance and service sector to the priorities that shaped both national and Britain's unofficial presence abroad. One of these innovations was the rise of gentlemanly activities centred on London. City finance performed a vital function of integrating countries that lacked adequate capital markets of their own. By funding export development overseas, the City enabled newly incorporated regions to raise an increasing volume of foreign loans. The City acquired a world role, and London became the centre of a system of global payments.

The impulses drawing Britain overseas merged economic considerations with a wider programme of development that aimed at raising the standard of civilisation as well as the standard of living.

The colonies of white settlement fell more firmly under British influence during the second half of the nineteenth century. As they increased their formal political independence, so they became reliant on flows of British capital to an extent that limited their freedom of action. A very similar pattern can be discerned in the case of the South American republics, where British finance was heavily involved in funding the apparatus of government as well as the growth of exports, thereby helping them both to build new nation states and to subordinate them to external control. As Disraeli observed, 'Colonies do not cease to be colonies because they are independent.'

We have questioned the widespread and long-standing assumption linking the 'triumph of industry' to imperialist expansion, and have emphasised instead the role of finance. Shifting the basis of causation has also required us to reconsider some of the standard divisions of imperial history. Linking imperialism to the process of industrialisation has produced a number of well-known landmarks: an informal empire in the mid-Victorian era followed by the defensive imperialism of a declining power. In fact, Britain's informal influence was growing at precisely the time when it is thought to have been in decline. Britain's strategy still lay in the hands of officers and gentlemen whose vision of a world order managed from London remained undimmed.

- (a) What can you learn from this extract about the interpretation, approaches and methods of the historian? Refer to the extract and your own knowledge to explain your answer. [30]
- (b) Some historians have focused on the importance of events and people on the periphery in their work on British Imperialism. Explain how this has contributed to our understanding of British Imperialism. Has this approach any disadvantages or shortcomings? [30]

#### 4 The debate over British Appeasement in the 1930s

*Read the following extract about appeasement and then answer the questions that follow.*

Historians often dislike what happened or wish that it had happened differently. There is nothing they can do about it. They have to state the truth as they see it without worrying whether this shocks or confirms existing prejudices. I do not come to history as a judge. As a historian I recognise that Powers will be Powers. My book has little to do with Hitler. The vital question, it seems to me, concerns Great Britain and France. They were victors of the First World War. They had the decision in their hands. It was perfectly obvious that Germany would seek to become a Great Power again; obvious after 1933 that her domination would be of a peculiarly barbaric sort. Why did the victors not resist her?

I want to understand the ‘appeasers’, not to vindicate them or to condemn them. Historians do a bad day’s work when they write the appeasers off as stupid or as cowards. They were men confronted with real problems, doing their best in the circumstances of their time. They recognised that an independent and powerful Germany had somehow to be fitted into Europe. Later experience suggests they were right. The ‘appeasers’ feared that the defeat of Germany would be followed by a Russian domination over much of Europe. Later experience suggests that they were right here also. Nor is it true that the ‘appeasers’ were a narrow circle, widely opposed at the time. On the contrary, few causes have been more popular. Every newspaper in the country applauded the Munich settlement.

It is no part of a historian’s duty to say what ought to have been done. His sole duty is to find out what was done and why. Little can be discovered so long as we go on attributing everything that happened to Hitler. He did not make plans – for world conquest or for anything else. He assumed that others would provide opportunities, and that he would seize them. Neville Chamberlain provided an opportunity which Hitler could take and who thus gave the first push to war. From the moment that he became prime minister in May 1937, he was determined to start something. Of course he resolved on action in order to prevent war, not to bring it on; but he did not believe that war could be prevented by doing nothing. He believed that the dissatisfied powers – and Germany in particular – had legitimate grievances and that these grievances should be met. He accepted that Germans were the victims of national injustice; and he had no difficulty in recognising where this injustice lay. There were six million Germans in Austria, to whom national reunification was still forbidden by the peace treaties of 1919; three million Germans in Czechoslovakia, whose wishes had never been consulted. It was the universal experience of recent times that national discontent could not be challenged or silenced – Chamberlain himself had had to acknowledge this unwillingly in regard to Ireland and India. It was the general belief that nations became contented and peaceful once their claims were met.

Here was a programme for the pacification of Europe. It was devised by Chamberlain, not thrust upon him by Hitler. These were ideas in the air, shared by almost every Englishman who thought about international affairs. Few dissented. One very small group rejected the validity of national claims. They held that policy should be determined by questions of Power, not of morality; and that nationalism should be subordinated to security. It was a view which shocked most Englishmen. Power, it was argued, had been tried during the First World War and afterwards. It had failed; morality should take its place.

- (a) What can you learn from this extract about the interpretation, approaches and methods of the historian? Refer to the extract and your own knowledge to explain your answer. **[30]**
- (b) In their work on British appeasement some historians have focused on the lack of freedom of action of the British government. Explain how this has contributed to our understanding of appeasement. Has this approach any disadvantages or shortcomings? **[30]**





**Copyright Information**

OCR is committed to seeking permission to reproduce all third-party content that it uses in its assessment materials. OCR has attempted to identify and contact all copyright holders whose work is used in this paper. To avoid the issue of disclosure of answer-related information to candidates, all copyright acknowledgements are reproduced in the OCR Copyright Acknowledgements Booklet. This is produced for each series of examinations, is given to all schools that receive assessment material and is freely available to download from our public website ([www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)) after the live examination series.

If OCR has unwittingly failed to correctly acknowledge or clear any third-party content in this assessment material, OCR will be happy to correct its mistake at the earliest possible opportunity.

For queries or further information please contact the Copyright Team, First Floor, 9 Hills Road, Cambridge CB2 1GE.

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