

History A

Advanced GCE A2 H506

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS H106

Mark Schemes for the Units

January 2009

H106/H506/MS/R/09J

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2009

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE History (H506)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE History (H106)

MARK SCHEMES FOR THE UNITS

Unit/Content	Page
F961-01 - British History Period studies	1
F961-02 - British History Period Studies Option B: Modern 1783-1994	19
F962-01 - European and World History Period Studies	37
F962-02 - European and World History Period Studies Option B: Modern 1795-2003	46
F963-01 - British History Enquiries	60
F963-02 - Option B: British History Enquiries 1815-1945	66
F964-01 - European and World History Enquiries	78
F964-02 - European and World History Period Studies Option B: Modern 1774-1975	83
Grade Thresholds	96

F961-01 - British History Period studies

From Anglo-Saxon England to Norman England 1035-1087

1. How successful was Edward the Confessor as king of England? [50]

Focus: An assessment of the strengths of a king.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Some candidates might argue that Edward had a difficult task; he had spent much time on the continent and lacked the immediate authority to rule England effectively, however he was able to secure himself on the throne. The Earls enjoyed a great deal of power and some might examine the power of the Godwin family to show how far their authority reflected a weakness in Edward. However, this could be balanced against Edward's ability to gain sufficient support to force the Godwin's into temporary exile. It might therefore be concluded that he managed the Earls as well as might be expected. However, Earl Godwin did exert a powerful influence from 1052 after his return from exile and Harold became very influential. There might be some focus on his failure to provide an heir, which plunged the country into the succession crisis, although how far it was his fault might also be considered. Administration continued and taxes were collected as two tests of effective government. His capabilities as a military leader might also be considered as it was an important mark of kingship and was a disadvantage when dealing with troublesome and ambitious earls. Some candidates might mention his piety and artistic interests which were admired, but for their ideals rather than for their practical relevance to kingship. Many may conclude that Edward lacked the strong qualities needed for an effective king as he was often rash and unwise in his judgements. There might also be mention of the problems that followed from his continuing patronage of Normans.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

2. To what extent was William of Normandy's success in 1066 the result of Harold's mistakes? [50]

Focus: An assessment of the reasons for the success of a king.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates can offer contradictory explanations, for example that the major reason was the strength of William's forces or his organisational abilities. However, they must include a sound paragraph on the stated factor if they are to access the highest levels on AO1b. Examiners should also not underestimate the value of answers that are organised chronologically, excellent answers that appreciate the sequence of events and their significance should not be dismissed as low-level narrative. In arguing that it was Harold's mistakes candidates may focus on his actions after Stamford Bridge and before Hastings, although there may be some mention of mistakes made during the battle. Candidates may argue that Harold's mistake in rushing back from Stamford Bridge and facing William without a full force and whilst still tired was a major factor in his defeat. Some may argue that Harold was simply unfortunate in that he faced two invasions in quick succession and that the wind changed direction at the moment he was in the north. They may argue that he had to deal with Harald Hardrada as he was a major threat and needed dealing with quickly and decisively. It is easy, with hindsight, to be persuaded that William would launch the more serious challenge, but Harold had to exert his authority in the north as it was a difficult area to govern. Some candidates may focus on the strengths of William and use the Bayeux Tapestry as evidence of the naval and military preparations that he made. He welded together a diverse group into a formidable fighting force, he was also an excellent commander and some might draw attention to the tactics at Hastings, particularly the feigned retreat.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

3. Assess the reasons why William I was able to defeat opposition to his rule. [50]

Focus: An assessment of the failure of opposition to a king.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The death of Harold at Hastings deprived the Anglo Saxons of their major leader and it frequently meant that opposition was both divided and weak. The defeat at Hastings had also broken the military strength of the Anglo Saxon fyrd and earls. Important Anglo Saxon nobles from Mercia and Northumbria had promised allegiance, which made his task easier. Candidates may consider the policies that William followed such as castle building and how it was used or the 'Harrying of the North', which would have given a clear warning to those who might oppose his rule. Many of the risings were localised, for example Kent, Northumbria, the south west and the Welsh Marches, which made their suppression much easier. Many of the risings also arose from local grievances, rather than dissatisfaction with William's rule. The rebellions often lacked leadership. In dealing with the problem in the north in 1069 with intervention from Scotland and Scandinavia William enjoyed clear military advantage, which made his job easier as his forces were superior to anything the rebels could gather. William was able to move swiftly to put down trouble before it had a chance to develop, he acted decisively and used harsh methods which may have deterred others. The swift manner in which he took England and the armed forces on which he could rely negated the opposition.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Lancastrians, Yorkists and Tudors 1450-1509**4. How successful was Edward IV in dealing with the nobility?****[50]**

Focus: An assessment of a king's ability to deal with the nobility.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Some candidates may argue that Edward was not successful in his dealings with the nobility and did much to create the problems. They may point to his marriage to Elizabeth Woodville, which did much to alienate many nobles as the family was promoted to positions of importance through advantageous marriages. Their promotion was a key factor in the alienation of Warwick and his emergence as the leader of opposition as the marriage prevented a French alliance that he preferred. Some candidates may also point to the fact that the Lancastrian nobility could still mount a challenge and that some hostile nobles were supported by France. The outbreak of Civil War in 1470 may be used by candidates to show that Edward had not been successful in dealing with them. Although Edward appeared more secure in his second reign as he did not face rebellion, he did create 'super nobles' who, it could be argued had too much power and he was only able to control them because of his personality. However, some may argue that he gave too much leeway to potentially troublesome nobles such as Richard. He was able to curb the power of the nobility, but he did not destroy their power. It might be argued that the ability of the king to manage the nobility depended too much on his personality and that this is shown after his death.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

5. Assess the reasons why Richard III's reign was so short.**[50]**

Focus: An assessment of the failings of a particular king.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. It is likely that many answers will focus on Richard's defeat at Bosworth as ultimately that was the reason why he lost the throne. However, without previous events and developments he would not have alienated many who either supported Henry Tudor or waited to see the outcome. The Lancastrians always opposed him and Henry Tudor was the most dangerous challenge. Candidates might go on to consider some of Henry's strengths as they helped to remove Richard; these might include being a clever opponent, avoiding a direct confrontation with Richard until he had a large enough force. Candidates may consider Richard's character arguing that he was untrustworthy, ambitious and even murderous. Many answers are likely to consider the illegality of his seizure of the throne and argue that this was the start of his troubles as it raised doubts about his character and alienated some. It will be relevant to discuss the probable murder of the princes in the Tower, but this must be linked to loss of support. Candidates might consider his relations with the nobility, including the execution of Buckingham. The distrust that surrounded Richard was a key factor in explaining why he was unable to create a wide section of support. His betrayal by Stanley at Bosworth might be interpreted either as justified or as the actions of an unscrupulous noble who wanted to come out on the winning side. Some answers might also argue that Richard's promotion of northern nobles alienated a large number of southern nobles, which would be crucial.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

6. To what extent was Henry VII's foreign policy a success?**[50]**

Focus: An assessment of an important aspect of policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates may set out a list of criteria against which to judge success, considering Henry's aims and how far they were achieved, security, finance and England's position in Europe and the prevention of foreign states from undermining his kingship. Many may argue that Henry was very successful. He was able to gain recognition for the Tudors through a series of marriages to Spain and Scotland; he was able to ensure pretenders to the English throne were not given sanctuary, although this was not achieved immediately and some answers may point to the support given to Simnel and Warbeck by Margaret of Burgundy. As Henry's position was not secure at the start of the period he was keen to avoid expensive wars and this was largely achieved; although he went to war against France over Brittany it was short-lived and Henry actually gained money through the French pension, however he was unable to prevent the French acquisition of Brittany which might be seen as a threat to English security. It might also be argued that Henry's foreign policy was beneficial for trade with the Treaty of Medina del Campo and Magnus Intercursus. Security was improved as England was allied to Spain, the most powerful nation in Europe, and security on the northern border had also been achieved, which also weakened the Auld Alliance.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Henry VIII to Mary I 1509-1558**7. How successful was Henry VIII in achieving his aims as king in the period from 1509 to 1529?**

Focus: An assessment of the success of a king in a given period.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The question focuses on the aims of Henry and better answers will explain his aims and use them as the criteria against which to judge Henry's success. The question allows candidates to consider both domestic and foreign issues, but examiners should not expect a 50:50 balance. However, in order to achieve the top levels candidates should consider both foreign and domestic issues. Some answers will focus on foreign policy as that was Henry's main area of interest. His aim to repeat the glories of Arthur or Henry V were not repeated, but Henry did make his mark on Europe and the defeat of the French at the Battle of the Spurs did give him his glory, although it might be argued that it was exaggerated. However, some may balance this against his failure to get Ferdinand to support him. Some might argue that Henry also achieved his glory through the Peace Conferences that Wolsey organised, although others might suggest that peace was not a preferred policy. Some may also argue that he was much less successful in the 1520s and illustrate this with reference to the failure to raise money, through the Amicable Grant, for an invasion of France. It may also be concluded that he also failed at the end of the period in achieving his divorce, which was particularly crucial. This issue may also be linked to the succession and the need for a male heir; some answers may suggest that in this area he was a failure as his marriage to Catherine had produced only Mary and there was only an illegitimate son. In domestic areas some may suggest that he wanted to show that he was a very different king to his father and that this was achieved through the execution of Empson and Dudley. His desire to be seen as a Renaissance king may also be considered.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

8. Assess the reasons for the fall of Thomas Wolsey in 1529.**[50]**

Focus: An assessment of the reasons for the fall of a key figure.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Many answers will focus on the question of the divorce as this was crucial in the minister's fall. Candidates may explain why the divorce was so important and why Henry would abandon his minister when he failed to deliver, even though the circumstances were against him. As chief minister and with links to the Papacy Wolsey was expected to be able to bring about the divorce. Some answers might show why Wolsey's attempts to solve the problem and satisfy Henry VIII led to his downfall. Some might consider the elements that were exposed by the divorce, such as the Boleyn faction and their ambitions, the growing distrust of Katherine of Aragon and her supporters and others who simply saw the opportunity to bring down an over-mighty minister. They may conclude that by 1529 Henry was surrounded by those who wanted to bring down Wolsey. However, some answers will consider longer term factors that weakened Wolsey's position, making him more vulnerable when he failed to achieve the divorce. They may consider the anti-Wolsey feeling among the nobility, who viewed him as a social upstart and resented his domination over Henry and his attempts, through the Eltham Ordinances, to exclude them. Some candidates will consider the loss of support for Wolsey following the failure of the Amicable Grant.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

9. To what extent was royal authority weak in the period from 1540 to 1547? [50]

Focus: An assessment of the strength of royal authority in a given period.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Although historiography is not an AS requirement some answers may make reference to the debate about Henry's power in the 1540s, but this is not a requirement for any level. With Henry ageing in this period it is possible to argue that it was a period of weak royal authority. However, no minister replacing Cromwell some may balance this against Henry taking control of events. Some answers will consider the factional issues in the period and argue that these show that Henry had lost control, but others will argue that Henry was playing off the various groups and had ultimate control, the examples of his protection of Cranmer and Catherine Parr might be used to support the argument. Some might examine the last year of Henry's reign and argue that the Seymour faction were able to seize control and use their power to manipulate events to their advantage when Henry died, undermining the balanced Regency Council that Henry had envisaged. They may point to the removal of Gardiner over a minor matter to show how Henry had lost control, although some may argue that this was further evidence of a strong king who demanded his will was obeyed. Some may argue that Henry actually enjoyed the sport of court politics and delighted in catching people out in order to show his power. It is therefore possible to conclude that although he may not have had overall control of events, the final decision making was his.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Church and State 1529-1589**10. Assess the reasons for the break with Rome.****[50]**

Focus: An assessment of the reasons for a major historical development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. At the higher levels candidates should evaluate the importance of the factors. Many candidates are likely to focus on Henry's desire for a divorce and the reasons for this. This may include a consideration of issues such as the lack of a male heir and the fact that Catherine was beyond child-bearing age. There may also be consideration of the legality of Henry's marriage to Catherine, which had also been raised by the French during marriage negotiations over a possible marriage of Mary; this may also be linked to the issue of Henry's conscience. However, some may choose to focus on Henry's love for Anne, shown by his letters to her and the length of time he was willing to pursue negotiations. Some candidates might argue that Henry broke from Rome only with reluctance, shown by the attempts at pressure that were put on the papacy. There may be some candidates who argue that anti-clericalism within England and a desire to reform the church was an issue, but this may be dismissed. Ultimately, it was the foreign situation that prevented the Pope granting a divorce and with Anne pregnant resulted in the need to break with Rome. Candidates may therefore give some attention to the foreign situation with the Pope a virtual prisoner of Charles after 1527 and the fact he was Catherine's nephew.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

11. **To what extent were the religious policies of Somerset more successful than those of Northumberland?** [50]

Focus: A comparison of the religious policies of two monarchs.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Although examiners will not expect a 50:50 balance between the two 'protectors' there should be a reasonable balance for the top levels. At the higher levels candidates will need to establish criteria against which to judge the success of their policies. Candidates may examine the success in the short or long term and the different perspectives may lead to different conclusions. In considering Edward's reign candidates may suggest that with England largely catholic in 1547 it was difficult for the nation to be converted by 1553. In support of this argument they may point to the Western Rebellion of 1549 and suggest that Somerset's policies were not a success, but this might be balanced against the ease with which Lady Jane Grey was defeated and Mary restored. However, the issue of the unpopularity of the measures might be balanced by a consideration of the legal and doctrinal position which was fully protestant by 1553 with the Second Prayer Book, although the impact of this might be debated. Some answers might compare the legal position with the situation at the grass roots and use the evidence of wills or the failure to remove images to show the ineffectiveness of the legislation. Some might argue that the ease with which legislation repealing the Edwardian Reformation passed parliament during Mary's reign and the lack of opposition to the burnings suggests that neither was particularly successful. It would also be possible to argue that Somerset faced a more difficult task than Northumberland, Somerset was faced with a nation where Protestantism was very limited, whereas Northumberland was able to build on the achievements of Somerset in establishing Protestantism and that despite this advantage it still took until the last months for a fully protestant church to be established.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**12. To what extent was Puritanism a serious threat to Elizabeth's religious settlement?
[50]**

Focus: An assessment of the problems posed by an important religious group

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Although candidates will need to display an understanding of Puritanism moderate answers might spend too long describing, leaving the seriousness of the challenge to be implied rather than stated and evaluated. The term religious settlement should not be taken to mean simply the events of 1558-9, but can include later developments. Candidates might identify some aspects of the settlement of 1558-9 that puritans wanted to see changed and go on to assess whether their attempts were ever challenging or successful. This may focus on the issue of vestments, where a firm line was taken to resist puritan demands. Some candidates might argue that puritanism was a serious threat due to the numbers in parliament and mention might be made of the 'Puritan Choir', and the way they used parliament. However, Elizabeth was always easily able to defeat them and had considerable support from many members of parliament. The Prayer Book, the 39 Articles and the Advertisements established an Anglican orthodoxy and also resisted puritan demands. There might be some consideration of the organisations that emerged amongst extreme groups and consider links with courtiers such as Leicester. The seriousness of the challenge was assessed differently by various groups and individuals throughout the reign. Orthodox Anglicans saw Puritanism as a danger that needed to be controlled, possibly extirpated. Support among the gentry and in some towns did result in the election of some puritan MPs, who were able to put forward their proposals. Some may argue that the seriousness of the threat varied from group to group within the puritan movement; the moderate puritans were more willing to find a compromise and stay within the established church, whereas the radicals were smaller in number and not a serious threat.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

England under Elizabeth I 1558 -1603

13. 'Cooperation rather than conflict.' Assess this view of Elizabeth I's relationship with her parliaments? [50]

Focus: An assessment of the relationship between the monarch and an instrument of government.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Historiography is not a requirement of AS and references to the views of historians are not necessary for any mark, although credit will be given for relevant references. There are a number of areas that candidates might consider when discussing the view that conflict was more pronounced, these are likely to include the issues of parliamentary privilege, religion, especially the religious settlement and the activities of the Puritans, the problem of Mary Queen of Scots, marriage and succession, foreign policy at certain times and financial aspects, such as monopolies. Parliament was a sounding board and allowed the monarch to discover the views of the political elite and for them to take back the laws that they had to impose. However, this might be balanced by the argument that as MPs became better educated they were increasingly able and willing to challenge the control exercised on parliament through Privy Councillors and the Speaker. This may be supported by the argument that parliament was growing in assertiveness and that were anti-government views in the Commons, particularly from the puritan members. There might be discussion of the so-called Puritan choir and their impact and importance. Some may argue that they did not exist, there was no party and few were puritans pushing their religious views, but others may argue they were an active and well-organised lobby that created problems for Elizabeth. Some answers might consider the role of the House of Lords, which helped the queen in the 1590s over subsidies. The presence of Cecil in the Lords from 1572 may also have helped to ensure that there was co-operation. At the highest levels some answers might show that parliament spent longer discussing local issues and those bills were often assed with few problems. Some answers may place parliament in the wider context of the government of England that it was a only a secondary instrument in the governance of the nation, which could be ignored by the court or council or that it was still an irregular part of government.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

14. Assess the reasons why the issue of the succession caused domestic and foreign problems for Elizabeth I. [50]

Focus: An assessment of a major problem during the reign of a monarch.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. It was expected that Elizabeth would marry on her accession, but the problem was whom to marry? Candidates are likely to be aware of many of the suitors but each of these presented insuperable difficulties of religion, age and even mental stability. Some may argue that proposals from Philip of Spain and Charles IX of France had to be handled very carefully because of the power of their countries and therefore her foreign policy had to be careful, but candidates could balance this against the fact that Elizabeth could play off the two countries against each other, making it less of a problem. The succession was an important issue because of the claim of Mary Queen of Scots as it raised major problems concerning religion and relations with both France and Scotland. Her French links proved a threat, whilst she was also a possible centre of opposition for Catholics both at home and abroad. There was the problem of the suitability of any domestic suitors, particularly following the death in suspicious circumstances of Dudley's wife. If Elizabeth married at home it would raise the issue of faction and the dominance and rewards that would go the family. In the same way there was concern that an overseas marriage would lead to influence and dominance from abroad, memories of Mary's marriage to Philip and the French war still influenced many.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

15. To what extent did the popularity of Elizabeth and her government decline after 1588? [50]

Focus: An assessment of the popularity of a government in a specified period.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. In the last years there was immense strain on the system of government. By the end of her reign Elizabeth was isolated at court and in her government because her associates had either died or retired. There were many who waiting for a new king. The patronage system, in the hands of Robert Cecil, had broken down and this caused resentment. Nevertheless, she maintained a grip on affairs and her weakness and determination should not be underestimated. The last parliament did show a willingness of MPs to criticise her over a policy of monopolies that pointed directly at the crown. On the other hand, some will argue that her Golden Speech demonstrated her continued ability to diffuse opposition. It was really only after the 1601 parliament that she failed physically. The queen herself might have lost some popularity but the prestige of the monarchy was still high. The problems in the last years should be set alongside the achievements; she had brought about comparative religious peace, a stable ministry led by William Cecil and a forced peace on Ireland. Some might argue that the lack of unrest during the period suggests that the popularity of the government had not declined, particularly as the social and economic problems of the 1590s were severe. The lack of support for Essex's Rebellion might also be used to support this view. Elizabeth was also still popular among the populace, although the legend of 'Good Queen Bess' had not appeared in 1603. However, at a local level officials found it increasingly difficult to cope with the financial and administrative demands placed on it and these pressures, in the 1590s coincided with the social strains caused by harvest failures, food shortages and increasing inflation, all of which decreased the popularity of the government. It might be concluded that Elizabeth had reigned too long and the succession of James was widely welcomed.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

The Early Stuarts and the Origins of the Civil War 1603-1642

16. **Assess the reasons why foreign policy caused conflict between James I and his parliaments.** [50]

Focus: Assessment of an important aspect of foreign policy

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Some answers may claim that foreign policy was not a major cause of conflict between James and his parliaments when compared with other issues and this is a valid approach. Candidates might argue that there were two basic reasons for problems over foreign policy although they were linked. James believed that foreign policy was an essential part of the royal prerogative whereas critics resisted the claim, especially parliament as they had to vote the funds to sustain the policy. Secondly, the practicalities of his foreign policy proved unpopular. The pursuit of a peaceful policy appeared to be an appeasement of catholic powers, which was not popular with parliament. James I soon made peace with Spain, Treaty of London in 1604, and this was not popular with some who made money from the war and others who regarded Spain as the arch-enemy. James tried to maintain a balance, for example, marrying his daughter, Elizabeth to Frederick of the Palatinate and making an agreement with the German Protestant Princes. However, for many in parliament his policy did not go far enough and they wanted England to actively intervene in the Thirty Years War. They saw Protestantism as under threat and believed that James should help to defend it. The marriage of Charles became an important diplomatic tool, but it also revealed further conflict. The king's reluctance to offend Spain led to unpopular developments, such as the execution of Raleigh and finally the embarrassment of Charles' failed venture to Spain to agree a marriage. The intervention in the Thirty Years War in 1624 was too late to save James from criticism. He was criticised for following policies which were seen at times to be basically wrong and other times right but ineffective.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

17. How successfully did James I deal with religious problems during his reign?
[50]

Focus: An assessment of an important aspect of policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. It is likely that better answers will identify the religious problems that James faced before assessing how well he dealt with them. There were some religious problems at the start of his reign but they should not be exaggerated. There were hopes of reconciliation at the start of James' reign between orthodox Anglicans, Puritans and Catholics. The Hampton Court Conference was a failure, but its extent might have been exaggerated. The ejection of puritan clergy through Bancroft's Canons appeared to dash the hopes of puritans and created mistrust. He failed to overcome the distrust partially as a result of the advisors he chose, such as Buckingham. The Gunpowder Plot did not help James' preferred policy of tolerance as although it was the work of a small minority it increased antipathy towards Catholics in general and made his policy harder. By appointing Abbot as Archbishop of Canterbury in 1611 James did help to mollify some puritans, but the Book of Sports, 1618 alienated them. Foreign policy and marriage negotiations will also merit mention as that did much to exacerbate the problems. Puritans believed that he did not do enough to support Protestantism in Europe which was under threat, particularly during the Thirty Years War. His policy was seen as too conciliatory towards the Catholic powers. This was exacerbated by Charles' marriage negotiations with Spain as England appeared to be getting closer to Catholicism. When James did finally enter the Thirty Years War it was too late to save him from criticism.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

18. 'Religious divisions were the main reason for the outbreak of civil war in 1642.'
How far do you agree? [50]

Focus: An assessment of the causes of Civil War

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. There are many alternative arguments that candidates might put forward. However, for the higher levels candidates must write at least a good paragraph on the named factor. Other forms of alternative approach will be a focus on 1640-2, from the meeting of the Long Parliament to the outbreak of the civil war, or the longer term approach that shows that factors gradually built up. The problem with the second approach is that candidates might lose focus on the question and simply concentrate on telling the story. Developments before 1640 are relevant, but a civil war could not have been predicted then, nor was it possible. When considering religion, Charles I's Arminianism, encouraged and enforced by Laud, was very different from the religion of many and created problems. There were suspicions that Charles was too tolerant of Catholicism, even that he had sympathies with the religion. Laud was arrested and there were criticisms of the episcopacy. The Court of High Commission was abolished. Reference could be made to events in Ireland, which were strongly linked to religion. There might also be consideration of the Root and Branch Bill. There were also suspicions about the influence of Henrietta Maria. However, candidates should also consider other factors and these might include political divisions, including Charles I tendencies towards absolutism. His prerogative powers also caused disquiet and these were attacked. The arrest and subsequent execution of Strafford was a turning point. Within parliament, the momentum gave impetus to the war party; there were divisions between those who would be reconciled to the king and those who sought to weaken his position further. Control of the army was vitally important, Charles was distrusted personally, a feeling that was confirmed by his attempt to arrest the Five Members.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

F961-02 - British History Period Studies Option B: Modern 1783-1994

From Pitt to Peel 1783-1846

1. How successfully did Pitt the Younger deal with the radical threats in England? [50]

Focus: An assessment of a government's policy towards a problem.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Many answers are likely to argue that Pitt was very successful arguing that the radical movement was weak as it was divided over aims and methods, associated with France and lacked genuine popular support. The repressive legislation in the 1790s was successful and candidates are likely to provide details of the legislation. Some answers might also argue that he was successful because he was able to exploit Whig divisions. The threat might be considered to be serious because the nation was industrialising and urbanising, if this is the line taken candidates may still conclude that Pitt was very successful, England did not face the unrest that France did in the same period. However, although the threat defeated or at least contained there were corresponding societies, combinations, riots and machine smashing. Many are likely to argue that Pitt dealt very successfully with it in the 1790s as Radicals were put on trial in 11793, Habeas Corpus was suspended, creating a new party of Order in 1794 when the Whigs split, The Treasonable Practices Act and the Seditious Meetings Act of 1795 which targeted radical methods, the regulation via taxes of newspapers, which enable freedom to be maintained in theory, and formal bans on radical societies. However, some might argue that these actions drove radical activity underground, but even then it was infiltrated by spies and by financing and fostering loyalist associations. Pitt's success might also be challenged by reference to the danger in 1795 and in the naval mutinies of 1797, together with Foxe's pro-revolutionary stance.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

2. To what extent does the Reform Act of 1832 deserve to be called 'Great'? [50]

Focus: An assessment of a major reform.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Better answers will establish a set of criteria against which to assess whether the Reform Act deserves to be called 'great'. This may involve consideration of the significance of the changes that the Act brought about. A detailed knowledge of the terms of the act will allow judgements to be made about the changes. Candidates might consider the increase in the number of voters, the loss of some of the rotten boroughs and the redistribution of seats to towns and counties. The redistribution of seats went some way to correct the earlier imbalance between county and borough members, the important newer towns received their MPs and many smaller boroughs either lost their MPs or returned one instead of two. It might also be noted that this was the first major change to the franchise and set the scene for future developments. The increase in the franchise encouraged the growth of party organisation as parties needed to ensure registration of the new voters. These considerations might be balanced against the disappointment that followed for many after the act and there might be a link to the growth of other movements, such as Chartism. However, it could be argued that it was great as it prevented revolution and broadened the basis of support for the constitution. On the negative side the act did not remove corruption, although the number of very corrupt constituencies did disappear. More than 50 seats were still under the control of individual patrons. The act did strengthen the existing order, which may have been the aim and the aristocracy retained their dominance, changing little in practice.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

3. To what extent was the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846 the most important reason for the fall of Peel's government? [50]

Focus: An assessment of the reasons for the fall of a government.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Many candidates are likely to agree with the assertion in the question. The policy was divisive and Peel was unable to persuade even his own Cabinet to support repeal, Stanley resigning, nor could he persuade the bulk of his party. However, there were already tensions within the party and there had been divisions over Maynooth and Peel had frequently threatened to resign. Some might therefore argue it was the occasion, rather than the cause of the fall of the government. Some might also note that the government resigned, not over the Corn Laws, but the Coercion Bill for Ireland. Among Tory malcontents there was a long-standing dislike of Peel's dear money and deflationary policies. They already felt he had betrayed them on Catholics and were not willing to see another Tory principle go. The Corn Laws were important to them because they guaranteed high rents and helped to uphold their status and power, which they believed were under threat from the manufacturing interest. Landlords were urged to resist their repeal by the Anti-League. Peel might well have survived had it not been for the venom and persistence of Disraeli and Bentinck. Disraeli had a personal dislike of Peel and felt snubbed by him. Peel openly despised the party that spent 'their days in hunting and shooting and eating and drinking' and never took it into his confidence. Disraeli was a party man, but Peel with his executive mentality starved Disraeli of hope and had to face the consequences.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Liberals and Conservatives 1846-1895**4. Assess the reasons for the emergence of the Liberal party by 1868. [50]**

Focus: An assessment of the reasons for the emergence of a political party.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. There are many reasons that candidates may consider. It is likely that many will point to the support given to the Whigs by radicals such as Cobden and Bright, unity over Italian Unification in 1859, common support for free trade, the success of Gladstone's budgets, the fact that the public trusted the party over finance, a popular foreign policy under Palmerston and the abandonment of the aristocratic Whiggish image associated with Grey and Melbourne in the 1830s. This was important as the party had gained key Peelites, becoming a progressive party with increasingly popular ideas and a willingness to undertake reform. The popularity of its foreign policy might be considered and Palmerston ensured it was well advocated. There might also be mention of the disarray of the Conservative party and the resultant incentive to create a united party. There might be some mention of the role of the new, daily provincial press, which consistently advocated civil and religious liberty and the belief in the idea of progress. This was reflected in increased support in the boroughs. The non-conformists also wanted a party that would adopt their progressive policies in education, politics and religion. From their militant religious outlook came their adoption of 'good causes' that gave the liberals their dynamic quality. The men who noticed the emergence of these groups and the need to bind them to the newly found Liberal party in the Commons were Gladstone and Bright. Gladstone's 1864 speech was important and resulted in him being hailed the 'People's William', although some have seen his role as less important than Palmerston and Russell. The party was seen as the party of business sense, moral integrity and administrative efficiency. However, it is possible that some may argue it was little more than a series of fragile coalitions or ambitious men doing deals to get themselves into power. The party had come together to destroy Derby's administration and wanted to stay in power.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

5. How far do you agree with the view that the foreign and imperial policy of Disraeli's second ministry (1874-1880) was more successful than his domestic policy? [50]

Focus: An assessment of a ministry.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Examiners should not expect a 50:50 balance in the treatment of foreign and imperial policy and domestic, although both aspects do need adequate treatment. In order to assess the success, or otherwise, of foreign and imperial policy candidates may consider the objectives which might include containing Russia, maintaining prestige and the empire and protection of trade. It is likely that foreign policy consideration will be dominated by Disraeli's handling of the Near Eastern Crisis of 1875-8 and his alleged triumph at the Congress of Berlin. In considering imperial policy they might discuss policy in Egypt, South Africa and Afghanistan. The success, or otherwise, of these policies will need to be compared with the impact of the domestic legislation that was passed. It is likely that this will focus on the issue of social reform. The conservative paternalist approach brought practical improvements for the working classes, even for the less respectable and ambitious of them through the Artisans Dwelling Act and the Sale of Food and Drugs Act. Sandon's Education Act was prepared to force parents to send their children to school. The Conservatives were also prepared to allow peaceful picketing and in these last to acts went further than the Liberals. There was also a Public Health Act which consolidated previous statutes and the Employers and Workmen Act. It might be argued that these acts, by being compulsory, did have an impact or it could be argued that they simply tidied up legislation from Gladstone's ministry and were therefore less successful than his foreign and imperial policies.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

6. To what extent were Gladstone's second and third ministries a failure? [50]

Focus: An assessment of governments in a given period.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. There is a tendency to view these ministries as a failure, particularly after the achievements of the first ministry. Answers may focus on the issue of Ireland, particularly the failure to achieve Home Rule and the division within the Liberal party that followed and led eventually to Hartington and other Whigs joining the Conservative party. In considering Ireland, the Second Land Act might be mentioned; this was too late as Parnell was now demanding Home Rule. The party appeared to be following a faddist programme and was losing relevance with many. However, the reforms to the franchise and the electoral system were significant achievements and warrant attention; this includes the Corrupt Practices Act, Parliamentary Reform and the Redistribution of Seats Act. There were also failures in both foreign and imperial policies which will merit attention. The Boers were able to defeat the British at Majuba Hill in 1881 and through the Convention of London, 1884, the Boers gained their independence. Events in the Sudan might also be considered, particularly the death of Gordon as that did a lot to discredit Gladstone with the ordinary man, who blamed him for his death. Consideration of divisions within the party did not help the Liberal cause as early as 1880 with the old-fashioned Whigs and the Radicals, this was to become a more serious issue later and hindered attempts at reform. This might lead to a discussion of Chamberlain and his 'Unofficial Programme' which promised that Liberal government would deal with unemployment, poverty, housing and old age; all issues that Gladstone had avoided.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Foreign and Imperial Policies 1856-1914

7. **To what extent did the principles governing British foreign and imperial policy remain the same throughout the period from 1856 to 1902?** [50]

Focus: An assessment of the factors influencing foreign and imperial policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. This is a wide question that encompasses much, so full or detailed coverage of every aspect is not expected. Candidates should discuss some of the main principles, such as the Balance of Power, the promotion of trade, the preservation of the Empire, concern over Russia and France and a limited preference for constitutional states. The principle of balance of power saw considerable change, this was particularly noticeable over Austria as Britain supported Italian and German nationalism at the expense of Austria. A commitment to the Treaty of Paris had failed by 1870. The balance was now one of 5 or 6 and one could argue that Britain now withdrew into splendid isolation. Challenged by the US and Germany on Trade, Britain remained committed to Free Trade and Sea Power as a means of securing markets. Candidates might argue for a change on Empire, from Free Trade Imperialism to a formal Empire, although some see this as a reluctant change, imposed by others. Russia and France remained constant curbing, Russia in the Crimea and the Balkans and France in Italy, Africa and the Far East. As for supporting constitutional states there was a Gladstonian morality that supported a nation struggling to be free but this depended upon the behaviour of any individual state or its oppressor rather than any consistent preference for constitutionalism per se.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

8. 'The protection of trade routes was the most important reason for British interest in the Eastern question.' How far do you agree with this view? [50]

Focus: An assessment of the relative importance of the issues involved in the Eastern Question.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The Balkans were important in the struggle for supremacy between Russia, Austria and Balkan nationalism; the issues of the Straits, the most pressing in 1854-6 and 1875-8 and Egypt and the Middle East. These issues should give candidates a variety of reasons to consider and make a judgement as to how far the protection of trade was the most important reason for British interest. As this was a vital area for Britain because of the route to India and trade with the east and Mediterranean trade it may be argued that this was Britain's main reason for concern. This was particularly the case when France threatened more control over Egypt via the new Suez Canal. Russia was a threat to the Mediterranean following the invasion of the Danubian provinces and an attack on the Ottomans. Russia also championed the Bulgarian Christians following the massacre in 1875. Their growing power was seen as a menace, not just in Europe but in Asia to the British Empire. Another concern for Britain was how to deal with the declining Ottoman Empire, whether to prop it up, regardless as an economic and strategic investment. This raises the question of the balance of power and candidates might consider this in relation to the decline of Turkey and the rise of Russia. There was fear that a weak Turkey might be unable to prevent a Russian advance towards the Mediterranean and Suez, with implications for trade and security. Interest in the Balkans was also stirred up by Gladstone and his pamphlet attacking the murder of Christian Slavs, although this may have had more to do with election opportunism. The growth of nationalism in the area will also need consideration and how to deal with the decline and ultimate defeat of Turkey in the Balkan Wars.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

9. How popular was the policy of imperialism in England in the period from 1880 to 1902? [50]

Focus: An evaluation of the popularity of imperialism.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The party that dominated politics in this period was the pro-Empire Conservatives. Candidates could support this with reference to the Khaki election of 1900, where their victory, an overall majority of 268 was, in part, the result of patriotic fervour in the earlier part of the Boer War. Even at the end of the war some might argue that imperialism was still popular; British invincibility did remain intact and some may argue that this was reinforced by music hall jingoism and added to the idea that 'the sun never set on the Empire'. Joe Chamberlain had been able to build a new career in the Conservative party on the basis of popular imperialism, as did Curzon. However, this might be balanced by a consideration of the problems that the small force of Boers had created for the might of the British army and the brutal use of concentration camps also damaged prestige. There was questioning of Chamberlain's imperial vision and the social and medical problems of recruitment brought demands for a concentration on domestic issues. After Gladstone, the Liberal leader Lord Rosebery realised the political importance of the Empire. However, candidates could balance this by looking at the 1880 election which Disraeli lost largely due to Gladstone's anti-Imperial campaign. Gladstone in turn was in trouble by 1885 over Egypt and especially for his failure to send sufficient troops to save General Gordon in his attempts to defend Khartoum from the attacks by the Mahdi. After 1900 the Boer War did not aid the Conservatives. Some candidates may argue that the Empire was always politically controversial and divisive. Whether the working class were responsive to imperialism was far from certain, especially as the Empire could be portrayed as wasteful when social reform was a more pressing issue. It could be argued that the popular culture surrounding imperial expansion and policies suggests that it was a popular policy and candidates might point to some of the Music Hall songs, popular literature and also religious concerns, such as some of the late Victorian hymns or missionary activity which had captured the public imagination.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Domestic Issues 1918-1951**10. How far was the government to blame for the General Strike of 1926? [50]**

Focus: An assessment of the causes of the General Strike.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates will need to address the role of the government, even if they conclude that other parties were more to blame. The government were intransigent, combined with an economic policy that was in part mistaken by returning to an overvalued currency backed by gold in 1925 as the main cause. The government was certainly determined to stand by private ownership and lower labour costs. Candidates might also point out that it was the government that precipitated a strike on 3 May by calling off negotiations, not the Unions. Candidates are also likely to consider the role of the Trade Unions, especially the NUM and this might be set alongside the role of the mine owners with their response to adverse terms in world trade which saw British coal as increasingly uncompetitive. The role of the Daily Mail could also be considered as the trigger for the strike. The case for Union unrest as the main cause is the growing power and influence of the Unions up to the First World War and their reaction to changed economic conditions after it. Some candidates might make a distinction between the Miners, led by Smith and Cook, and the leadership of the Union movement in general who were reluctant to act and certainly unprepared to stage a General Strike. The latter were prepared to accept Samuel's recommendation as a basis of settlement. The Miners were less prepared to compromise. Previously they had been the aristocrats of the labour market and long unionised they were especially hard hit by economic contractions, new fuels, poor geological conditions and under investment in mining technology. Employers might also be blamed as they argued that a competitive price could be achieved only at the expense of the miners. It might also be argued that having scored victories with the Sankey Commission and on Red Friday they were keen to make a stand on behalf of other well organised, but struggling industries. It might also be noted that the Unions failed to see Red Friday as simply a government tactic to buy time and stockpile and prepare for a strike.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

11. How successful were the National Governments 1931-9 in dealing with the social and economic problems they faced? [50]

Focus: An assessment of a government in dealing with social and economic problems.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. There were a large number of policies adopted by the National Governments and examiners should not expect all of these to be covered, what is important is the quality of the analysis. In order to assess the success better candidates are likely to identify the problems that the governments faced; this might include the need for a stable currency, tackling unemployment, relieving poverty and tackling the problems of the older, traditional industries. There was success in stabilising the Pound through Snowden's Budget and the end of the Gold Standard, even though the government had been formed to stop it. It boosted exports and reinforced confidence although better candidates might point to external pressure in forcing this. 'Cheap Money' proved very successful in lowering costs, although Britain was lucky that prices dropped far more than wages, enabling those in work to feel better off and sustain the new industries. Protection was more controversial in its impact; it may well have had little impact unless linked to re-organisation, as with steel. The Ottawa conference saw little gain for British industry. As for poverty relief, government continued with the Public Assistance Committees but was determined on cuts to avoid overspend, this resulted in the Means Test, later removed, which was very unpopular. The government preferred to create the conditions to enable private enterprise to prosper, with some success in the Housing Boom in new suburbs. Its one attempt to tackle regional economic problems, the Special Areas Act, was on too small a scale to achieve much. The 1936 Jarrow March was testament to token gestures on relief when faced with the near collapse of a large industry. Welfare payments did continue at a higher level than most countries.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

12. To what extent was Conservative re-organisation the main reason for the defeat of Labour in the 1951 General Election? [50]

Focus: An assessment of the reasons for the defeat of the Labour party at a specific time.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates might point to much recovery and reorganisation of the Conservatives since their damaging 1945 defeat when they had been associated with a failure to deliver on social reform and unimaginative policies, foreign and economic, in the years preceding the war. The scale of their defeat ensured structural reorganisation. This had been run down during the war years. Key constituency staff were put in place; there were membership and money raising initiatives by Lord Woolton which made the Conservative party one of the largest organisations in the UK. Image problems were tackled with a Young Conservative movement reviving grass roots support. The party's structure was democratised following the Maxwell-Fyfe Report in 1949 which allowed a more open selection of candidates. In policy terms the Conservatives accepted the Welfare State consensus established by Labour. An Industrial Charter was produced in 1947 acknowledging co-operation, the role of Trade Unions and a role for the state in maintaining full employment. All this led to a report in 1949 'The Right Road for Britain', which became the party's manifesto. Pledges were also made on housing, a perceived labour failure and a potential vote winner. However, candidates might argue that the main reason was the economy and continued austerity, the state of which was blamed on Labour. Devaluation benefits had yet to work through, restrictions were irritating, rationing was particularly disliked. These provided two key electoral issues in 1951. There was also the Cold War where the Conservatives could play on patriotism and defence again. It is also possible that candidates will argue that Labour lost in 1951 rather than the Conservatives winning it through active policies and reorganisation. Internal labour divisions had worsened between left and right (Bevan v Morrison), brought to a head by Gaitskell's proposals for rearmament to deal with Korea and Britain's Cold War commitments, which meant prescription charges being imposed on Bevan's Health Service, 'free at the point of care'. Bevan, Wilson and Freeman all resigned in April 1951. Nationalisation of iron and Steel in 1951 also proved electorally damaging. The 1951 election was close, Labour registering its highest poll to date with a larger share of the vote. It could simply be a pendular swing with little to do with either Conservative revival or Labour difficulties.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Foreign and Imperial Policies 1945-1990**13. Assess the reasons why Britain joined the EEC in 1973.****[50]**

Focus: An assessment of the reasons for a major development in British foreign policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates may place Britain's decision to join in the context of other failed applications and suggest reasons why it was successful this time and not before. British entry had been vetoed before by De Gaulle and he had resigned as leader of France in 1969 and died in 1970, it was his vision of Europe that had stood in the way of British entry in 1961 and 1967. He wanted France to lead Europe and wanted Europe independent from the US. Britain also had concerns as to whether her membership would be compatible with her commitments to the Commonwealth. Many in the Conservative governments of the 1960s were opposed as was the Labour party. There were economic and political reasons compelling Britain to apply, particularly the strength of sterling. Britain was also prepared to keep her conditions to a minimum, mainly involving CAP and were now willing to accept the Treaty of Rome and the supranational principles behind it. The attempt to join in 1967 was rejected by De Gaulle, but Wilson countered by leaving the application open, ready to be taken up at the earliest opportunity, therefore De Gaulle's resignation was the opportunity. Agricultural concerns were a major issue as Britain would have to pay more into it, and would get less back, than other EEC countries. Heath's election was crucial as he was a pro-European, he played down the special relationship with the US in order to appeal to the EEC. There were problems over the world role of the pound sterling, but Heath's intervention and direct talks with the French President, Pompidou, were crucial as he believed he could trust Heath. The talks between those two were the ultimate reason Britain joined.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

14. How far did public opinion influence Britain's nuclear weapons policy? [50]

Focus: An assessment of factors influencing a key policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should consider a variety of reasons that influenced Britain's nuclear weapons policy before reaching a conclusion as to how important public opinion was in influencing it. They may consider the desire to have an independent nuclear weapons policy to avoid dependence upon the USA following her marginalisation over the Manhattan project. This may be seen as giving Britain a bargaining point with the USA. The development of the Cold War and the fear generated by the fact that Britain was within range of USSR bombers added to the desire to have an independent nuclear weapon. Candidates might also consider the influence of budgets as by 1954-5 the cost of rearmament was approaching the levels at the end of the Second World War, there was also the problem of financing the production of nuclear delivery warhead systems. Cost was a vital factor in British policy, the Blue Streak Missile had to be cancelled, but this was also because there was a realisation that it was to be housed in vulnerable land silos and would not be adequate to improved soviet defence systems. The purchase of Skybolt was also made out of economic necessity as it prolonged the life of the V bombers and could be used with Britain's own nuclear warheads, thus maintaining independence. The development of Polaris may also be considered, even under Labour only one out of the five ordered Polaris was cancelled. One lesson of Suez was the need to retain an independent nuclear deterrent capability as this would allow Britain to influence US defence and foreign policy formulation. However, in the period 1964-79 there was the need to control defence spending. Labour's 1964 campaign had specifically mentioned this, but once in power there was little change. Developments under Thatcher saw a modernisation of weapons. In considering the importance of public opinion candidates might consider the emergence of the Aldermaston Marches and CND, but it is debatable how much influence it had on government policy. However, the new phase of nuclear rearmament under Thatcher did see the recovery of CND, a movement which had been largely dormant since the 1960s, suggesting it had had little impact. Perhaps the best-known incident was the Woman's tent camp at Greenham Common. The Labour party made the nuclear issue central to their campaign in 1983 demanding not only the cancellation of Cruise and Trident but also a completely non-nuclear Britain, but public opinion in Britain was less hostile and Labour did badly in the election.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

15. 'The Falkland's War Thatcher's most successful foreign policy achievement.' How far do you agree with this view? [50]

Focus: An assessment of foreign policy under a British PM.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should write a good paragraph on the named factor before discussing other issues. The Falklands war was certainly a triumph for Thatcher as it not only restored confidence within the nation, but it was a crucial factor in her electoral success in 1983. Although the victory brought little tangible gain, it was seen as a logistical triumph and a reversal of a humiliation when the islands had been seized. This may be balanced against other areas of foreign policy, such as relations with the EU and in particular the budget negotiations and rebate that was achieved. This gain in the short term might be balanced by considering the image it created concerning Britain's future in Europe. The development of the special relationship with the USA, particularly between Thatcher and Reagan may also merit balanced consideration. From early in her premiership she gave full support to Reagan over Afghanistan. There was support for SDI, but only after protests and voicing the concerns of other European powers. Support was given over anti-communist moves in Europe. A working relationship was established with Gorbachev and there was much Soviet-British activity in the diplomatic and economic field culminating in Thatcher's visit to Moscow. It could be argued that Britain was a mediator between US and USSR. Thatcher was unable to halt the momentum of superpower détente. In the collapse of communism all Britain could claim was a moral victory as it had shattered the whole framework of foreign policy. There was concern about the reunification of Germany. There may also be consideration of British support for Kuwait and the subsequent involvement in the Gulf War under Major.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Post War Britain 1951-1994

16. **Assess the reasons why the Conservative party remained in power from 1951 to 1964.** [50]

Focus: An evaluation of the reasons for the dominance of a political party during a specific period.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Many candidates may see national affluence plus Conservative leadership and organisation as being more important than Labour weakness. Labour weakness was certainly important in preserving the Conservatives in power. Candidates might argue that Labour failed to modernise its policies to a more affluent Britain and the party was constantly divided. The parliamentary party was split between the Left and Right, fuelled by Bevan's left-wing hostility to Gaitskell. The former wanted an expansion of the public sector, Gaitskell and Morrison did not. They succeeded to the leadership and agreed on a social democracy rather than a socialist one, attempting to remove Clause IV in 1961, but failing. Only with the gloss provided by science and technology were they able to offer the electorate an alternative in 1964. This enabled the Conservatives to avoid the electoral consequences of their mistakes; particularly Suez 1956 and the resignation of Eden. Their worst moments did not coincide with elections, for example the Profumo Scandal in 1961 and the failure to join the EEC in 1963. Candidates might consider Conservative leadership, which apart from an aged-Churchill, the mistakes by Eden over Suez and Home's unsuitability was proficient with Eden pre-Suez and Macmillan. The role of Macmillan may be considered and candidates might consider his skilful exploitation of television and the media. Macmillan could also be ruthless. The economy is likely to be considered as this was an important factor, there was recovery, the end of austerity and a period of relative affluence, all of which were credited to the Conservatives. Elections were well managed by the Conservatives in 1951, 1955 and 1959. The Cold War also aided the Conservatives. The Conservatives were well organised and this also impacted on more coherent policies with the work of Butler, Maudling, Powell and MacLeod.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**17. How successful were Thatcher's domestic policies in the period from 1979 to 1990?
[50]**

Focus: An assessment of domestic policies under a named PM.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Although a very controversial PM, Thatcher did win three successive elections which might lead many to argue that her policies were successful. However, it was not always domestic policies that brought her success and therefore candidates need to be careful in using criteria against which to assess her ministries. There may be substantial consideration of her economic policies which did see unemployment rise dramatically, although it might be argued that this was essential if the substantial problem of inflation was to be brought under control. It could be argued that her first ministry had few economic achievements. It could be argued that her attack on the power of the Unions was both successful and necessary if modernisation of the economy was to occur, particularly in light of the Winter of Discontent under Callaghan. Some better answers might suggest that she was more successful in taking on the miners than Heath as she prepared for the confrontation. The denationalisation of industries brought many into share-holding, giving them a greater stake in the country, although in the long-term few kept their shares, but it was popular within the country. The availability of buying your own council house might be seen as very successful as it created a new class of property owner who would often support the party. However, in hindsight some have seen the consumerism and 'loads of money' culture that her time in office created as undesirable. For the 'haves' of the mid 1980s it was a period of prosperity as real wages outstripped inflation. It appeared in 1987 as if the government had delivered an economic miracle. However, for those who did not benefit from the economic policies it was a period of increasing social exclusion, this was shown with riots in Brixton and other cities. Unemployment in parts of the inner cities hit levels not seen since the inter-war years as a result of industrial decline. There may be an argument that the government had little regard for civil liberties. The Poll Tax and subsequent riots was not a success. The success depends upon the criteria used to measure success. It had been more difficult to roll back the state, government spending had hardly been reduced, the authority of the government had become increasingly centralised and interventionist. There were controls on local government, education and even privatisation was accompanied by the growth in quangos. This could be balanced against the reduction in Union power, the decline in the loss of the number of working days, the pattern of house ownership was changed and it might be argued that Britain's political culture was changed as socialism as a domestic force was finished off.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

18. How effectively did British governments deal with the problem of Northern Ireland to 1994? [50]

Focus: An assessment of policy in a key area.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The growing unrest and disturbances, at first in Northern Ireland and then on the mainland would suggest that policy towards Ireland was not successful. By 1960 there was resentment against the Northern Ireland government by about 1/3 of the population, by 1968 there was serious rioting and by 1969 rioting by the Nationalists became so serious that RUC was finding it difficult to keep control. Armed Unionist groups were attacking Nationalist areas in Belfast and Derry. This deterioration can be supported by the need to deploy an increasing number of troops on the streets of Northern Ireland, initially to protect Catholics, who then turned on them, highlights the failings and belief among Nationalists that the army were defending Unionists. There may be reference to events such as 'Bloody Sunday' and its consequences, particularly Direct Rule. This can be further developed by reference to the growing support for the various paramilitary organisations and support for Sinn Fein. The use of Internment without trial may be considered as it resulted in the arrest of large numbers and resulted in increased support for the IRA. There may be reference to the attempts at talks with various Nationalist groups, for example Whitelaw in 1972 which was a failure. The Sunningdale Agreement and its failure may also be discussed. The Prevention of Terrorism Act of 1975 may also be considered as may the success of direct rule as it resulted in the reorganisation of IRA into cells, which the British army could not break. Thatcher governments faced the problem of hunger strikers, which also led to an increase in support for Sinn Fein. There were attempts at 'rolling devolution', but more successful were the increased links between London and Dublin and this culminated in the Hillsborough Agreement, which did have long term consequences. The increased amount of terrorist activity on the mainland during the 1980s also suggests that government policy did not work and there may be reference to events such as the murder of Airey Neave, the murder of Mountbatten, the Hyde Park bombs or the bombing of the Grand Hotel in Brighton, which came close to wiping out the Conservative leadership. There may also be reference to the murder of various ministers as evidence that the democratic process was not working. At the end of the period there was a continuation of political violence, continued political success for Sinn Fein, the existence of paramilitary groups on both sides and limited support for a lasting peace involving both sides of the community; it was only with the 1993 Downing Street Declaration that success appeared possible and this can be seen with the IRA and Loyalist declarations of ceasefire in 1994. Therefore it might be concluded that the more successful policies were towards the end of the period.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

F962-01 - European and World History Period Studies

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
1	<p>The Crusades and Crusader states 1095-1192</p> <p>To what extent do the weaknesses of its enemies explain the success of the First Crusade (1096-99)?</p> <p>No specific answer is being looked for. However, candidates should deal with the issue of weaknesses of its enemies even if they wish to argue other factors were more important in explaining the success of the First Crusade. In relation to weaknesses candidates may discuss: the divided nature of Islam both at the general level (Seljuk/Fatimid, Sunni, Shi-ite) and more locally (rivalries between Kilij Arslan and the Danishmends, Aleppo and Damascus etc.); underestimation of the threat posed by the Crusade (e.g. Arslan away fighting the Danishmends); weaknesses compared to the Crusaders in some aspects of the military, and so on. Such discussion needs to be balanced and linked to other factors such as the relative unity and strengths of the Crusaders, their religious motivation and determination, the aid given by Alexius Comnenus, military leadership shown by Crusade leaders such as Bohemond, the fear the Crusade forces inspired after Antioch and so forth.</p>	[50]
2	<p>Assess the view that the ability of its rulers was the <u>main</u> reason the Kingdom of Jerusalem was able to survive during the twelfth century.</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for, but candidates do need to ensure that they deal with the given factor adequately even if they wish to argue that other factors were more important. In relation to the ability of its rulers, candidates may point to the abilities of both Baldwin I and Baldwin II who did much to first establish the Kingdom of Jerusalem and then to hold onto it in the first thirty years of its existence, pointing both to their qualities of military leadership in the battles against the Fatimids and the Seljuks, the ways in which they ran the state, and conducted relations with barons and other princes of the Crusader states. Indeed candidates may point to the ability of all rulers up to and including Baldwin IV. Such discussion needs to be balanced against other factors. These include the relative disunity of their real and potential enemies, the occasional/limited/sporadic support from the West, the increasingly important role of the military orders, the development of defensive fortifications, good fortune and so on.</p>	[50]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
3	<p>Assess the reasons for Saladin's success against the Crusader states in the 1180s.</p> <p>No specific answer is being looked for. Candidates need to identify, explain and assess a range of reasons. They may discuss some of the following: how Saladin operated from a strong power base and his consolidation of power in Egypt and Syria in the 1170s and early 1180s; the use of the concept of jihad to unite Muslims in an attack on the Crusader States; the size of the forces Saladin was able to gather to attack the Crusader States in the mid 1180s (and in 1187 in particular); the succession crisis and the factional in-fighting that beleaguered the Kingdom of Jerusalem as Baldwin IV's leprosy progressed to his death; the actions of Reynald of Chatillon in provoking Saladin; the errors made by the crusader army in 1187 when Saladin besieged Tiberias; the disaster at Hattin which left the kingdom defenceless; Saladin's reduction of crusader castles and taking of ports and strongholds; the taking of Jerusalem. Candidates may well argue that it was a combination of Saladin's strength and Crusader weakness that accounts for his successes.</p>	[50]
4	<p>The Renaissance from c.1400-c.1550</p> <p>Assess the reasons why the Renaissance began in fifteenth-century Italy.</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for, but candidates do need to assess a range of reasons typically by evaluating relative importance and/or by analyzing linkages between different reasons. Candidates may discuss a range of reasons including: the political situation of Italy c.1400 (many city states, rivalries etc.), the nature of individual states with their city/urban base and controlling families, guilds etc, relative wealth, the existence of classical remains, the contacts with Constantinople and the Levant (and the exodus of Greek scholars as the Ottomans advanced), the development of humanism and the revival of classical learning. For example, candidates may argue that the relative independence and wealth of city states engendered a rivalry that found expression in art and architecture, that the presence of classical remains provided stimulus for artistic development, and that the interest in learning and classical literature enabled scholars and artists to draw on classical ideas.</p>	[50]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
5	<p>To what extent did the patronage of princes and nobles influence Renaissance art and architecture?</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for, but candidates do need to deal fully with the role of the patronage of princes and nobles even if they wish to argue other factors were more important. In relation to the patronage of nobles and princes we may get discussion of their influence on subject matter and themes, the sponsorship of art and architecture, the employment of particular artists and so on. There may be discussion of the role played by individual nobles/princes such as (Florence) Palla and Filippo Strozzi, Cosimo and Lorenzo di Medici, Francesco Sassetti, (Mantua) Ludovico and Francesco Gonzaga, Isabella d'Este and (Urbino) Federigo da Montefeltro. In relation to such figures there may discussion of the particular developments/influences they, through the artists they patronized, are associated with. Such discussion may be balanced against the role of guilds (e.g. in Florence), the civic authorities (e.g. in Florence after Savonarola's fall), the Papacy (although individual popes may be treated as 'princes') and the Church, the Council of Ten in Venice. Other factors may also be brought into play, such as the influence of classical examples, the individual genius of particular artists, new techniques and so forth.</p>	[50]
6	<p>Assess the influence of classical literature on the ideas of Italian writers such as Ficino, Mirandola and Machiavelli. (You may refer to other Italian writers of this period as further examples.)</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for, but candidates do need to deal fully with the role of classical literature even if they wish to argue that its influence has been overstated. Candidates may or may not refer to the writers included in the question. Candidates may argue that one of the key foundations of the Renaissance was the renewed and widened study of Latin and Greek texts. The study of Latin texts especially had also been a feature of Medieval scholarship and some candidates may argue for the degree of continuity here. However, the influx of Greek scholars and texts (especially after the fall of Constantinople) clearly had great influence on both what was studied, how it was studied and the results of study. In discussion of Ficino candidates may refer to the central importance of Plato and the development of Neo-Platonism and the idea of Platonic love. In relation to Mirandola, candidates may refer to his 'Oration on the Dignity of Man' and its focus on the centrality of human capacity and perspective and point to the influence of Aristotle and Plato. In relation to Machiavelli we may have discussion of the influence of Aristotle and, especially, Livy. Candidates may argue that whilst the study of classical literature was important, there was no lock, stock and barrel importation of classical ideas. Writers and scholars were concerned to reconcile 'philosophy' to Christianity and the reality of the early modern world. The 'rediscovery' of classical literature provided them with a perspective.</p>	[50]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
7	<p>Exploration and Discovery c.1445-c. 1545</p> <p>How important were Spanish monarchs to the success of Spanish overseas exploration during this period?</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for. Candidates must deal with the given factor even if they wish to argue that other factors were as or more important. Candidates should recognize that the focus is on overseas exploration rather than empire-building, although there is some overlap. Candidates are likely to focus on the roles of Ferdinand and Isabella, and Charles I. They may well suggest that royal patronage was vital to the success of Spanish overseas exploration and discuss the voyages of Columbus especially in relation to this. They may also discuss the acquisition of the Canaries by treaty with Portugal in 1479 (an important staging post for voyages across the Atlantic). However, candidates may balance this by noting Isabella's rejection of Columbus' request for support in 1486. They should also balance any discussion of royal patronage against other factors such as technological developments (caravel, ability to calculate latitude), geographic position, strong economic motivations, the role of individuals (Columbus, Balboa, Vespucci, Magellan etc.), the nature of Spanish nobility (aggressive bravery and adventurism borne of the Reconquista).</p>	[50]
8	<p>How important were individuals such as da Gama and Cabral in the development of the Portuguese Empire?</p> <p>No specific answer is being looked for. Candidates may assess the importance of the role of individuals in relation to the role of other factors. They need to come to a reasoned judgement about 'How important?' in order to score well. Candidates are likely to consider both Cabral and da Gama, but may well also consider leaders of other expeditions (Diaz, Covilha etc.). In relation to Cabral, candidates are likely to consider the acquisition of Brazil (1500), whilst in relation to da Gama (voyages of 1498, 1502 and 1524) they are likely to discuss the establishment of interests along the coast of Africa and India. Such discussions are likely to be set in the context of other factors, not least royal patronage and the desire of kings like John II and Manuel to set up trading posts and capture the spice trade (there may be reference to sea battles (e.g. Diu in 1509) and seizing of various staging posts (e.g. Ormuz in 1515) . There may also be some discussion of the earlier establishment of control in the Azores, Cape Verde Islands and Madeira. Candidates may well argue that individuals like da Gama were the trailblazers that began the process of empire-building, rather than the empire-builders themselves.</p>	[50]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
9	<p>To what extent was the quest for gold and silver the <u>main</u> reason for the development of the Spanish Empire in America?</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for. Candidates must deal with the given factor even if they wish to argue that other factors were as or more important. In relation to the given factor, candidates may discuss the significance of Columbus returning from his first expedition with gold along with the Carib natives. Cortes was motivated at least in part by the rumours of a vast wealthy empire in the heart of Mexico, and Pizarro plundered the Incan empire of Peru. The hope of (easy) riches was clearly a strong motivator for those who forged the Spanish Empire in the Americas. The discovery of silver and the need to secure it was also a prime reason for the development of empire in Peru. However, such considerations need to be balanced against others such as land for colonization (from the start settlers set out from Spain and the granting/seizing of large <i>encomiendas</i> encouraged such settlement. There was the wealth to be made from cochineal, sugar, cocoa, cotton as well as food staples. Another reason can be found in religion. Isabella was keen that natives were converted from the start and received papal encouragement in 1493 – by 1536 there were over 5 million converts in New Spain (Mexico). Nevertheless candidates may well argue that the pursuit of gold and silver was the driving force behind the development of a Spanish Empire.</p>	[50]
10	<p>Spain 1469 – 1556</p> <p>To what extent was Isabella’s marriage to Ferdinand of Aragon the <u>main</u> reason for the consolidation of her rule in Castile to 1479?</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for. Candidates must deal with the given factor even if they wish to argue that other factors were as or more important. Candidates may tackle this question by setting out the problems facing Isabella at the start of her reign, such as the rival claims of Joanna supported by Alfonso of Portugal, the problems posed by aristocratic factions and the cities, the parlous state of royal finances and so forth. In relation to the marriage they may discuss the significance of the terms of the marriage contract (Ferdinand had to live in Castile, acknowledge Isabella as the dominant partner, supply her with 100,000 florins and 4000 troops). The significance of Ferdinand’s contribution may be discussed in particular in relation to the defeat of Alfonso at the battle of Toro 1476. The significance of the marriage should be set in the context of other factors such as Isabella’s personal strengths and talents, relations with the nobles and cities, the use of corregidores (begun in Henry IV’s reign, the institution of the Santa Hermandad in 1476, the grant of 162 million maravedis by the Cortes in 1476 and so forth.</p>	[50]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
11	<p>How successful were Ferdinand and Isabella in dealing with the problems posed by the nobles during their reigns?</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for. Candidates may seek to test the degree of success, for instance, against aims, outcomes and the seriousness/nature of the problem. Candidates may discuss the power of the aristocracy and the influence of powerful families like the Mendozas before Ferdinand and Isabella came to power. They may also point to the deals done with and promises made to grandees to win their support during the war of succession. They may point to the increasing influence of letrados (lawyers) in royal councils (and lessening influence of nobles), but recognize the role of the aristocracy in provincial government (as governors and viceroys). They may also point to Isabella's limited success in dealing with the land question, discussing, for example, the decision of the 1480 Toledo Cortes agreeing to the recovering of lands lost since 1474 (whilst accepting those lost before that date). There may also be discussion of the War v. Granada in this context (nobles could be rewarded with lands from conquered territory. There may also be discussion of royal attempts to gain control of military orders and the noble unrest accompanying the succession crisis following the death of Isabella. Candidates may well argue that the price of royal control at the centre was acceptance of aristocratic control and influence at a provincial level and that in most areas success was at best mixed.</p>	[50]
12	<p>To what extent were the problems Charles I faced during his reign as King of Spain of his own making?</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for. Candidates who have not read the question carefully may be tempted to deal only with the early years of the reign. However, to score highly candidates must give reasonable coverage to the whole reign. Candidates will need to identify a number of problems that Charles faced (such as finances, nobility, towns, rebellion, unrest and revolt, dealing with the Americas). Candidates may well argue that at least in the early part of his reign many of the problems Charles I faced were to a significant degree of his own making – the use of foreign advisers, his foreign status, his absenteeism,, his use of Spanish taxes in support of his wider ambitions (to become Holy Roman Emperor, in his wars). However, others may argue that many of the problems he faced were of a longer term or intractable nature – problems of finance, control of nobility and towns and so on.</p>	[50]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
13	<p>Charles V: International Relations and the Holy Roman Empire 1519-1559</p> <p>How successful was Charles V in dealing with the princes in the Holy Roman Empire?</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for. Candidates may discuss a range of issues and developments. They may discuss the circumstances of his election as Holy Roman Emperor and the nature of the Empire and his authority within it, the role of Diets, the limitations placed on him by virtue of his other responsibilities (e.g. as King of Spain), and the impact of the Reformation. Candidates will also need to focus on the relationship and dealings with the princes and Electors to assess his success. They may discuss the Diet of Augsburg and Charles' alienation of the protestant princes, the significance of the Schmalkaldic League and events like the Battle of Mühlberg and Charles' failure at the Diet of Augsburg, his alienation of the Electors over the succession (Augsburg agreement) and the revolt of the princes and the Diet of Augsburg (1555).</p>	[50]
14	<p>Assess the reasons for the spread of Lutheranism in the Holy Roman Empire.</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for, but candidates do need to assess a range of reasons typically by evaluating relative importance and/or by analyzing linkages between different reasons. Candidates may discuss some of the following: the role of Martin Luther and his pamphlets, the power of the ideas associated with Lutheranism (<i>sola scriptura</i>, <i>sola fide</i>, priesthood of all believers, etc.), the Indulgences Controversy and the reputation of the Catholic Church and Papacy in Germany, the background of humanism, the role of the printing presses, the role of princely protectors, like Frederick of Saxony, the significance of the Diet of Worms, the role of popular support in towns and cities, links with peasant unrest, lack of decisive action by Charles V in 1520s, the Schmalkaldic League. Candidates may argue that there was a combination of circumstances (Papal exactions, princely concern for their privileges, weaknesses of Charles V's actions in Germany -distractions elsewhere, lack of power-, the printing press) in the Holy Roman Empire that allowed the ideas of Luther, powerful as they were, to gain public currency and many may stress the crucial roles played by lack of effective action against Luther by Charles V combined with the protection of Frederick of Saxony.</p>	[50]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
15	<p>To what extent was Charles V's policy towards France a failure?</p> <p>No specific answer is called for. The assessment of 'failure' may take into account aims, outcomes and context, for example. Candidates may discuss the strategic and political situation in 1519 and Charles' aims, referring to the extent of Charles' territories, the strategic importance of Italy to the physical linkage of these territories, the history of warfare and rivalry with France, Charles' desire to recover Burgundy and so forth. Candidates may discuss developments over time to explain relative success and failure, pointing to the ups and downs of the Habsburg-Valois rivalry in the 1520s (Pavia, Madrid, Cognac, sack of Rome, Landriano and Cambrai) and Charles strong position at the end of the decade, the events of the 1530s and 40s to Charles' triumph' in the Peace of Crèpy (1544) and the renewal of war with Henry II and the failure of the siege of Metz. Candidates may legitimately refer to the Peace of Câteau-Cambrèsis (1559) as a way of discussing overall success or failure.</p>	[50]
16	<p>Philip II, Spain and the Netherlands, 1556-1609</p> <p>Assess the strengths and weaknesses of Spain at the time of Philip II's accession.</p> <p>No specific answer is called for. Strengths and weaknesses will need to be identified, explained and assessed to score highly. Assessment may take the form of analysis of relative strengths and weaknesses and/or how strengths/weaknesses combine or link together, and/or an overall judgement of strength/weakness. Candidates may discuss the relative strength/weakness of some of the following: the extent and diversity of the monarchy; finances; economy; government and administration; religion; the Americas; position of the nobility; the Cortes; communications. Candidates may point to finances and the power of the nobility as areas of relative weakness and Castile and religion as areas of relative strength, for example – but in each case the key will be the assessment of relative strength of weakness.</p>	[50]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
17	<p>How successful was Philip II in his policies towards France and England?</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for. Success may be assessed in terms of aims, outcomes and context; there is no need for balance of treatment between France and England, though candidates may well discuss the linkages between policies towards both. There has been dispute over Philip's 'aims' although there appears to be some consensus that overall Philip's aims were largely defensive (to hold on to what he had) and candidates may assess the success of his policies toward France and England largely in these terms. They may also assess success in the context of the security of Philip's possessions in the Netherlands and/or in terms of religion. Candidates may discuss some of the following: war with France and the Treaty of Câteau-Cambresis, marriage to Mary of England and pursuit of 'friendly' relations with Elizabeth in the 1560s, the issues arising from the Revolt of the Netherlands and tensions over the Americas, Philip's involvement in France via the Catholic League in the 1580s, English intervention in the Dutch Revolt and the outbreak of war with England (the Armadas), intervention in France in 1590 and 1592 and war in 1595.</p>	[50]
18	<p>How important was foreign support to the success of the Dutch revolt?</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for. Candidates must deal with the given factor even if they wish to argue that other factors were as or more important. Candidates may argue that, whilst significant and an important contributory factor in the success of the revolt in the 1580s and 90s, foreign intervention (principally by England, but also by France) was not decisive. In relation to France (Duke of Anjou) they may argue that it was of little significance, but that despite the limitations of Leicester's actions in the 1580s, the presence of 7500 troops and annual subsidies did much to sustain the Dutch rebels in the 1590s. They may argue that other factors were more important, pointing to the leadership of William of Orange and Maurice of Nassau, the development of an effective fighting force and tactics, the diversion of Spain's forces/priorities at crucial times (such as the Armada, 1588 and intervention in France), and Spanish financial problems.</p>	[50]

Paper Total [100]

F962-02 - European and World History Period Studies Option B: Modern 1795-2003

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
1	<p>Napoleon, France and Europe 1795-1815</p> <p>Assess the reasons for Napoleon’s rise to power in France to 1799.</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for. Candidates will need to identify, explain and assess a range of reasons. Candidates may argue that much of the explanation lies in the talents and opportunism of Napoleon himself, pointing to his rise as an officer and general during the 1790s, from the siege of Toulon in 1793, through his Italian campaigns in 1796-7 and his efforts in Egypt in 1798. They may also point to his taking advantage of opportunities as they arose, including his relationship with Barras and marriage to Josephine de Beauharnais. Many will seek to place such factors in the context of the developments of the revolutionary years, particularly the increasing importance of military victory to the stability of the revolution, the significance of Napoleon’s victory and peacemaking in Italy, and the weaknesses and increasing reliance on the army of the Directory. There may be some concentration on the developments of 1799 and the actions of individuals like Sieyes and Lucien Bonaparte before and during the coup of Brumaire.</p>	[50]
2	<p>To what extent were Napoleon’s domestic reforms during the Consulate (1799-1804) shaped by Revolutionary principles?</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for. Candidates may test the reforms of the Consulate against the revolutionary principles of ‘liberty’ and ‘equality’ but may also refer to ‘property’ and ‘popular sovereignty’. Candidates may use these ideas to assess the reforms of the Consulate – the Constitutions, religious changes, legal reforms, education reforms, and so on. In relation to ‘liberty’ candidates may discuss freedom of religion/religious toleration, but also controls over the press/freedom of expression and limitations on freedom of movement (such as the <i>livret</i>). In relation to ‘equality’ candidates may discuss legal equality and in relation to ‘property’ consider the protection afforded to those who had purchased Church and émigré lands during the 1790s. In relation popular sovereignty there may be discussion of the real degree of this in the constitutions. Candidates may well argue that Napoleon followed the principles either insofar as they contributed to winning support or insofar as they were consistent with his hold on power.</p>	[50]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
3	<p>To what extent did Napoleon’s treatment of conquered territory and satellite states bring benefits to them?</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for. This question is about the impact of Napoleon on Europe outside France that France directly or indirectly controlled. Candidates may draw distinctions between different areas and periods of influence to highlight different impacts. For example, they may point to the benefits of the changes brought about in the former Holy Roman Empire/Low Countries/Italian peninsula – the extent to which the ‘benefits’ of the French Revolution were exported to these areas (encompassed, for example, in the Code Napoleon and the reorganisation of states and government). Such benefits may be contrasted with the costs (and candidates may well argue that they outweigh them)– the subordination of these areas to the needs of France and Napoleon, taxation, conscription, the antipathy of those who lost out from government/administrative changes, the impact of the Continental blockade and system (such as the damage to the Italian silk industry to protect that of France), the use of the Empire and satellites states as a ‘spoils’ system to reward Napoleon’s marshals (as in the Grand Duchy of Warsaw).</p>	[50]
4	<p>Monarchy, Republic and Empire: France 1814-1870</p> <p>How far did Louis XVIII’s policies change during his reign?</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for. Candidates may well argue that the murder of the Duc de Berry in 1820 marks a watershed in the policies of Louis XVIII, contrasting the relatively ‘liberal’ policies of the period prior to 1820 under de Richelieu and to an extent Decazes with the more reactionary policies under Villèle. In relation to the question there may be discussion of the nature of The Charter, the impact of the Hundred Days, the ‘White Terror’ and Chambre Introuvable, legislation in relation to rights to vote, army reform and press freedom, the payment of the indemnity and the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle (1818), Ultras, restoration of Ferdinand VII in Spain (1823) and so on. There may also be discussion of Louis XVIII’s personality and beliefs and their impact on policy and some may argue that despite the apparent success of the Ultras after 1820, Louis XVIII, however reluctant a ‘constitutional’ monarch kept the ultras at arms’ length.</p>	[50]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
5	<p>Assess the reasons why Charles X was overthrown in 1830.</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for. Candidates will need to identify and explain a number of reasons and evaluate their relative importance and/or links to access the higher bands. Candidates may identify and explain reasons in a number of ways. For example, some may distinguish between long term (such as the revolutionary heritage), short term (such as Charles X's policies towards religion) and immediate causes (such as the Ordinances of St Cloud). Candidates may also discuss reasons such as the legacy of the revolutionary and Napoleonic era, the Charter and the attitudes of Charles X and liberals towards it, the range and nature of Charles X's political and religious policies, the impact of economic problems, the extent and nature of opposition, the circumstances of 1830, and so on. Candidates may argue that Charles X largely brought his downfall upon himself or they may stress the difficulties of his position or that the longer term influences of the revolutionary years made further revolution/political upheaval more likely. Many may well argue that it was a combination of factors that brought about the events of 1830 – to be successful such an argument needs to be underpinned by effective analysis that may, for example, distinguish between direct and indirect causes, or contributory and necessary reasons.</p>	[50]
6	<p>How far did Napoleon III achieve his aims in foreign policy?</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for. Candidates will need to identify Napoleon's aims in order to discuss his achievements. In relation to aims, candidates may well refer to Napoleon III's claim 'the Empire means Peace', the desire to overturn the Vienna Settlement, the desire to reclaim France's 'natural frontiers' along the Alps and the Rhine, sympathy for the causes of 'Poland' and 'Italy', the more general desire to achieve 'gloire' and national greatness. More specifically, some may suggest that Napoleon's policy to some degree was based on a desire to break up the Holy Alliance and maintain good relations with Britain. Whatever aims are identified they need to be assessed in relation to some or all of the following: the Crimean War and its aftermath, Plombières and the Italian war of 1859 and its aftermath, the Mexican adventure, involvement in Austro-Prussian relations and the war of 1866, the attempt to secure 'compensation', the Franco-Prussian War. A line of argument may well be that after some initial successes (Crimea and arguably the achievement of Nice and Savoy) the general pattern was one of humiliation and failure resulting ultimately in the end of the Empire.</p>	[50]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
7	<p>The USA in the 19th Century: Westward Expansion and Civil War 1803-c.1890</p> <p>To what extent was cattle-farming the <u>most</u> important factor in opening up the West?</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for. Candidates need to address the given factor adequately even if they wish to argue that other factors were more important. In relation to cattle, candidates may discuss the significance of the cattle drives from the south (Texas) to railheads such as Abilene, Dodge City and Miles City to enable cattle to be transported on to the populous north east in the 1860s. They may also discuss the development of cattle ranching from the 1870s enabled, at least in part, by the invention of barbed wire. Such discussion needs to be balanced against discussion of other factors in opening up the West, such as the role of fur-trappers and pioneers (such as those that followed the 'Oregon Trail', the stimulus given by Federal-sponsored explorers such as Lewis and Clark, by expeditionary forces such as Fremont's, the discovery of gold and silver that led to various rushes, the development of railways, deals with and destruction of Native Americans, Federal encouragement such as the Homestead Act, the desire for religious freedom (the Mormons of Utah) and so on.</p>	[50]
8	<p>Assess the reasons why it proved impossible to secure peaceful relations between White and Native Americans for most of this period.</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for. Candidates will need to identify and explain a number of reasons and evaluate their relative importance and/or links to access the higher bands. Candidates may discuss reasons such as: the mutual misunderstanding arising from different cultures, the incompatibility of nomad and settler cultures, the power of interest groups in Washington in undermining agreements and the distance/poor communication/lack of knowledge between policy-makers in Washington and the situation in the West, corruption of government Indian Agencies, the constant westward pressure by a growing white population, the impact of minerals finds and the subsequent 'rushes', the destruction of the buffalo on the Plains as they were settled and railways pushed through, the actions of individual commanders in the field, the desperation of the Native Americans as their way of life disappeared and so forth. In discussing some of the above candidates may refer to some of the following developments: the impact of the Louisiana Purchase and the Tecumseh Confederacy, the First Seminole War, Andrew Jackson and the Indian Removal Act of 1830, the Black Hawk War, Second Seminole War, Reservations and the 'trail of tears', the Laramie Treaty, Sand Creek massacre, the Fetterman massacre, the Red River War, Little Big Horn, Americanisation and so on.</p>	[50]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
9	<p>Compare Lincoln and Davis as war leaders.</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for. Candidates, however, do need to compare the two leaders in order to score well. Candidates may argue that overall Lincoln was a better war leader than Davis and compare their qualities in various aspects of leadership, such as: appointment of ministers and management of government, appointment of and relationship with commanders, ability to inspire the people and read their mood, political judgement, the use of executive powers to pursue the war effort effectively, decision-making. For example, candidates may praise Davis' choice of Lee and trust of him and criticize Lincoln's early appointments such as McClellan. On the other hand, Lincoln did not interfere closely in military affairs, whilst Davis, as a military man, sometimes did. Lincoln's oratory and judgement of the public mood may be compared favourably with Davis' as may his relations with and appointment of ministers. Such comparisons may be set in the context that each leader found himself in. Lincoln inherited and established government and administration, whilst Davis and the Confederacy had to create one. Davis was hampered by the powers of the states (after all 'States' rights' was a key reason for war).</p>	[50]
10	<p>Peace and War: International Relations c. 1890-1941</p> <p>Assess the reasons why the stalemate on the Western Front was finally broken in 1918.</p> <p>No specific answer is required. Candidates should discuss a number of reasons and assess their relative significance and/or the linkages between them. Candidates should be aware of both the German Spring Offensive as well as the Entente advance after August 1918. They may discuss some of the following factors: the development of new weapons and technology, such as the tank and calibrated artillery; the development of new tactics such as whirlwind artillery bombardments and new approaches to infantry advances; the collapse of the Eastern Front with the withdrawal of Russia which enabled the Germans to concentrate on the Western Front and launch an offensive; the entry of America into the war on the Entente side; the long term effects of the war of attrition on the Western Front and the honing of the British army into the most effective armed force on the western front. For each factor discussed candidates may discuss its strengths and limitations as an explanatory factor and its links with other factors.</p>	[50]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
11	<p>To what extent was the Paris peace settlement shaped by the principle of self-determination?</p> <p>No specific answer is being looked for. Candidates should be aware that the Paris Peace Settlement refers to all the peace treaties concluded at the end of the First World War and not just the Treaty of Versailles. Better candidates, therefore, will seek to assess how far and in what ways the principle was applied in each of the treaties with the defeated powers and come to an overall judgement in relation to the peace settlement as a whole. They may argue that in relation to the Treaty of Versailles the principle was largely put to one side; they may argue that the forbidding of Anschluss was a specific denial of the principle as was the seizure of West Prussia for Poland and that the plebiscites held in Schleswig and Silesia were only allowed because these areas were not deemed crucial to other issues. In relation to the treaties with Austria and Hungary they may argue that more attention was paid to the principle, although the qualification may be that in reality the peacemakers were trying to rationalize a <i>fait accompli</i>. In relation to Turkey candidates may argue that little more than lip-service was paid to the principle as the Ottoman Empire was broken up into mandates controlled by Britain and France.</p>	[50]
12	<p>Assess the reasons for the outbreak of war in Asia and the Pacific to 1941.</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for. Candidates should discuss a number of reasons and assess their relative significance and/or the linkages between them. The focus of this question is the outbreak of war in Asia and the Pacific; events and developments in Europe are only relevant insofar as they have a bearing on the outbreak of war in Asia. Candidates may well focus on the ambitions of Japan in China and South East Asia more generally. They may point to the aggressive foreign policy pursued partly as a consequence of the Depression and the growth of nationalism. There may be discussion of Manchuria, the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese war, alliance with Germany and Italy, the Co-Prosperity sphere and the decision to attack Pearl Harbour. Such discussion needs to be balanced against other factors such as the attitudes of the USA, Britain and France, the weakness and failure of the League of Nations, the distractions of events in Europe, and the relative weakness of and internal divisions in China. Candidates must 'assess' the different reasons identified and come to argued judgments on relative importance and or linkages to score highly.</p>	[50]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
13	<p>From Autocracy to Communism: Russia 1894-1941</p> <p>Assess the reasons for the 1905 revolution in Russia.</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for. Candidates should discuss a number of reasons and assess their relative significance and/or the linkages between them. Candidates may use their knowledge/understanding of the nature of the 'revolution' to show how the reasons identified link to the revolutionary events. They may discuss some of the following areas of reasoning: long term developments in the countryside and reasons for growing unrest to 1905; developments in industry and the problems in towns/factories etc (context of economic depression since c. 1900); Nicholas II, the nature of Tsarism, repression and the growth of opposition/political parties; the impact of the Russo-Japanese War; and the role and impact of 'Bloody Sunday'. Candidates may relate longer term stresses and strains to the shorter term factors and the 'immediate' cause ('Bloody Sunday').</p>	[50]
14	<p>'The Bolsheviks won the Civil War <u>mainly</u> because of the weaknesses of the Whites.' How far do you agree with this view?</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for. Candidates must deal with the given factor even if they wish to argue that other factors were as or more important. In relation to the given factor, candidates may discuss the patchwork of opposition to the Bolsheviks, the lack of coordination of efforts, the lack of clear or agreed aims, the resistance of the peasants (and Green forces), the strategic difficulties, the quality of leadership and size of armies, and the ambivalent attitude of the Entente powers despite their presence and supply of arms. Such discussion needs to be balanced against other factors which may well focus on the relative advantages and strengths of the Bolshevik forces: the central strategic position and control of key transport links and industries, undivided leadership and aims, the relative preference of the peasantry for the 'Reds' over the 'Whites', the organization and leadership of Trotsky, the quality of generalship relative to the Whites, the size of the Red Army and so on.</p>	[50]
15	<p>Assess the reasons why Stalin was able to rise to power in Russia after the death of Lenin.</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for. Candidates should discuss a number of reasons and assess their relative significance and/or the linkages between them. Candidates may discuss the factors specifically associated with Stalin: his position in the Communist Party and the use he made of his influence and power there, his opportunism in exploiting the chances afforded by Lenin's funeral, his exploitation of the personal and ideological differences amongst rival candidates for power, his willingness to shift position to gain advantage and so forth. Candidates may also discuss the lack of a clear line of succession on Lenin's death and the suppression of his last testament, the strengths and weaknesses of Trotsky and other possible rivals such as Kamenev, Zinoviev and Bukharin, the divisive debates within the party over policy ('socialism in one country').</p>	[50]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
16	<p>Democracy and Dictatorship: Italy 1896-1943</p> <p>Assess the impact of the First World War on Italy from 1915 to 1920.</p> <p>No specific answer is called for. Impact can be discussed in a variety of ways: candidates may choose, for instance, to examine impact in terms of casualties, morale, territorial gains (or absence of them), economic and social problems, rise of extremism, impact on liberal politics and so forth. Candidates may refer to some of the following: the progress of the war (especially the reverses in 1917, Caporetto) and the 680000 dead; problems of mobilization (over 5 million) and demobilization, morale, socialist ‘pacifism’; economic dislocation, inflation (250% 1914-18), lack of raw materials, budget deficits (expenditure three times income); the ‘mutilated victory’; D’Annunzio, extreme nationalism and Fiume; total economic breakdown, strikes and violence, growth of the ‘red menace’; weak liberal government; 1919 general election and significance.</p>	[50]
17	<p>Assess the reasons why Mussolini consolidated his power in the 1920s after he became Prime Minister</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for. Candidates should discuss a number of reasons and assess their relative significance and/or the linkages between them. Candidates may discuss reasons to do with Mussolini himself: his abilities as a propagandist and orator; his leadership of/position in the Fascist Party; his political abilities. Such discussion may be related to other reasons: the circumstances of his appointment as Prime Minister; the Acerbo Law; Matteoti murder; Aventine Secession; the outlawing of other political parties; the attitude of the King; the weaknesses of potential opposition; the attitude of the Church; press censorship; OVRA; popularity and early successes.</p>	[50]
18	<p>How successful were Mussolini’s economic policies from 1922 to 1940?</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for. Candidates may establish criteria by which ‘success’ can be judged: in relation to aims, outcomes and context, for example. Candidates may assess the success of individual policies and/or analyse success over time but they should come to a reasoned overall judgement to score highly. Candidates may evaluate success of some of the following policies: the emphasis on self-sufficiency (including the raising of import tariffs to protect domestic industry, the ‘battle for grain’, the ‘battle for the lira’ etc.); improvements in the transport system (roads and railways); state subsidies to industries like steel, the ‘battle for births’ (in relation to its economic impact); the impact of the corporative system. Candidates may well point to some (superficial?) success (draining of the Pontine Marshes, trains running on time, increase in wheat production, increase in electricity supply), etc. Such ‘successes’ may be set in the context of economic recovery that had begun before Mussolini came to power, the (early) onset of the slump, the adverse impact of the inflated value of the lira on exports and tourism, the inefficiencies encouraged by protectionism and state subsidies, the distortion of the economy by emphasis on certain products (e.g. wheat).</p>	[50]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
19	<p>The Rise of China 1911-1990</p> <p>To what extent was Jiang Jieshi (Chiang Kai Shek) a successful leader of China from 1928 to 1949?</p> <p>No specific answer is called for. Success as a leader may be assessed in terms, for example, of aims, outcomes and the historical context. Candidates may discuss some of the following aspects: the establishment of a Nationalist state symbolised by capital at Nanking (but varied extent of authority of Nationalists in areas away from key centres); his relations with Soviet Union and Japan, later reliance on USA; his failure to deal with communists and forced mutual action against Japan after 1937; comparison with warlord years; lack of democracy and corruption, lack of support; the degree of economic progress (industry, transport) and limited social reform (education, New Life Movement, women); the failure to help peasants; his eventual defeat.</p>	[50]
20	<p>Assess the view that popular support was the <u>main</u> reason for the success of the Communists in gaining power in 1949.</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for. Candidates must deal with the given factor even if they wish to argue that other factors were as or more important. In relation to the given factor, candidates may discuss some of the following: Mao's and communism's appeal to peasantry, the promise of land reform and the role of Communists in defeat of Japan. They may also balance discussion of the extent and significance of popular support against factors such as the weaknesses and unpopularity of Nationalists, the leadership and ideas of Mao, the organization and approach of Red Army and the weaknesses and mistakes of Guomindang.</p>	[50]
21	<p>To what extent did political and economic policy change after the death of Chairman Mao (1976) to c.1990?</p> <p>No specific answer is called for. In seeking to assess the extent of change, candidates may discuss some of the following: the significance of Deng Xiaoping and the trial of the Gang of Four; the 'four cardinal principles'; the 'four modernisations' and limited liberalization; the four 'Special Economic Zones' and growth of foreign trade; developments in social policy – one-child family; the limited political reforms; the significance of the 'democracy wall' and the 'fifth modernisation'; Tiananmen Square. Candidates may argue that whilst there has been significant development in the economic sphere, moves towards political liberalization have been limited and that the essential political domination and control of the communist state has remained.</p>	[50]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
22	<p>Democracy and Dictatorship in Germany 1919-1963</p> <p>Assess the reasons for the survival of the Weimar Republic in the 1920s.</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for. Candidates will need to explain a number of reasons and assess their relative significance and linkages to score well. Candidates may discuss some of the following: the early deal with the army (Groener), how the Weimar governments managed to deal with the threats to their existence from both the extreme left and the extreme right, how the government was able to survive the crisis of 1923 (invasion of the Ruhr and hyperinflation, the significance of statesmen like Ebert and (especially) Stresemann, the importance of the Dawes Plan, American and other foreign investment, the Locarno Treaties and membership of the League of Nations, the existing support for democracy (or at least rejection of extreme solutions), and so forth. Candidates may argue that early survival depended as much on the extreme left and extreme right cancelling each other out than any positive government action (pointing to the use of Freikorps to defeat the left and workers' strikes to defeat the right), and may go on to argue for the crucial importance of Stresemann's statesmanship, the Dawes Plan and subsequent economic recovery.</p>	[50]
23	<p>How successful were the Nazis in their policy of <i>Gleichschaltung</i> (coordination) after 1933?</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for. Success may be assessed in terms of aims, outcomes and context. Candidates may interpret the term <i>Gleichschaltung</i> as referring to the ways in which the Nazis sought to ensure control of the state by the (forcible) 'coordination' of all aspects of political and social life and discuss mainly the measures and methods adopted in the early years of Nazi Rule focusing on 1933-34 in the main. They may discuss: take over of the states, laws such as those for the restoration of a professional civil service and the law against the formation of new political parties and the law for the reconstruction of the state; the concordat with the Catholic Church; the German Labour Front; the Army Oath; the use of force and arrest of political opponents; the Hitler Youth; organisations such as the German Lawyers' Front and so on. Candidates may argue for the success of the policy, but there should be some balance recognizing, for instance, the limitations of control/influence over the Church and even the army (until 1938).</p>	[50]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
24	<p>Assess the reasons why two German states emerged from 1945 to 1949.</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for. Candidates will need to explain a number of reasons and assess their relative significance and linkages to score well. Candidates may discuss some of the following issues: the Yalta Conference (Germany to be divided into zones of occupation), the Potsdam Conference (reparations issues), perceptions of Britain, USA, France and the Soviet Union on the future of Germany, wider context of Cold War developments (including Soviet consolidation in Eastern Europe, Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan, Cominform and Comecon, communist coup in Czechoslovakia), the creation of a Soviet friendly 'Socialist Unity Party' (SED), creation of Bizonia, Trizonia, the Moscow Conference of Foreign Ministers (1947), the London Conference, new currency, the Berlin Blockade, NATO, creation of FRG and GDR. Candidates may argue that because of Cold War tensions the creation of a divided Germany was almost inevitable.</p>	[50]
25	<p>The Cold War in Europe from 1945 to the 1990s</p> <p>Assess the reasons why relations between wartime allies broke down in 1945.</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for. Candidates will need to explain a number of reasons and assess their relative significance and linkages to score well. Candidates may evaluate reasons through discussion of some of the following: the position in 1945 (Yalta, Potsdam and end of war, position of Allied forces), ideological differences as context, divisions over Poland, Germany etc., Soviet actions in Eastern Europe, Churchill's 'Iron Curtain' speech, Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan, Cominform, Czechoslovakia and developments in Germany. Candidates may argue that whilst conflicting political ideologies were central, this was compounded by strategic and economic concerns and mutual suspicions and fears.</p>	[50]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
26	<p>How similar were the causes and consequences of the Hungarian uprising of 1956 and the Prague Spring of 1968?</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for. To score well candidates should actively compare causes and consequences, seeking to assess similarities and differences; there does not need to be balance between the treatment of causes and consequences (causes may well dominate). In relation to causes of the Hungarian uprising candidates may refer to the context of destalinisation and raised expectations following the fall of Beria and release of Gomulka and Kadar compounded by Khrushchev's recognition of the right of satellite states to find their 'national ways to socialism' and improved relations with Yugoslavia, protest in Poland, Tito's encouragement, Nagy. Reference to these may be used in comparison with some of the following relative to the Prague Spring: context of retreat from Cuba, détente and Sino-Soviet split, Slovak discontent, pressure for economic links with West (also Romania), fall of Novotny, Dubček's reforms, support of Tito. Similarly in relation to consequences candidates may discuss: (Hungary) the context of Western diversion (Suez in 1956), the decision to use force by Khrushchev in 1956 and Brezhnev in 1968, repression and the Moscow conference (1957), alienation of Tito, strengthening of Khrushchev's position; (Czechoslovakia) context of Western diversion (and Vietnam and cracks in the NATO alliance), use of force, repression, Brezhnev Doctrine, return to Stalinist-style economic policies, slowing of détente.</p>	[50]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
27	<p>‘Economic and political chaos in Russia and Eastern Europe was the <u>main</u> consequence of the collapse of the Soviet Union.’ How far do you agree with this view?</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for. Candidates must deal with the given factor even if they wish to argue that other factors were as or more important. Candidates may take the phrase ‘collapse of the Soviet Union’ to refer generally to the years leading to the creation of the CIS, or specifically to the end of the Soviet Union in 1991. Candidates may argue that economic and political chaos was certainly the most important immediate and short-term consequence of the Soviet Union’s collapse, pointing to the problems for the new 15 states of the CIS in creating political structures and dealing with the collapse of the Soviet economic system. Similarly in Eastern Europe new democratic structures had to be created and societies needed to adjust to multi-party democratic systems whilst coping with the economic problems of adjustment to capitalism. Some may argue that these economic problems pre-dated Soviet collapse, but certainly unemployment and dislocated trade were a feature in many states. Candidates may argue that in the longer term there were other consequences as Soviet control was released associated with nationalism (in the break up of Czechoslovakia, for example,) or in the CIS the consequences of which are still present as ethnic nationalism threatens political stability in a number of states, such as Georgia and even the Russian Federation itself (Chechnya). Candidates may also argue that many states, including Russia as well as states such as the Czech Republic, have adjusted economically relatively rapidly and living standards are rising. They may also point to the resilience and reinvention the communist parties in the new states and the trend to authoritarian and nationalist regimes. Elsewhere they may point to the closer links and economic and political cooperation with the West (request to join NATO and the EU).</p>	[50]
28	<p>Crisis in the Middle East 1948-2003</p> <p>Assess the reasons for the creation of the state of Israel in 1948.</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for. Candidates will need to explain a number of reasons and assess their relative significance and linkages to score well. Candidates in assessing reasons may discuss some of the following: Zionism and Theodore Herzl; Balfour Declaration 1917; the British mandate in Palestine, British policy and post WW1 immigration; Peel Commission Report 1937; WW2 and impact of Holocaust; US and UN involvement (UNSCOP) and partition; the role of Ben Gurion, Haganah, Irgun and Stern Gang; role of Huseini, the Arab Liberation Army, the Muslim brotherhood, and the Arab League; the declaration of Israeli independence 1948. Candidates may discuss the difficulties facing Britain in the post-war years, the King David Hotel and Exodus incidents, the development of the partition proposals in the UN and the responses of the Jews and Arabs, the development of conflict within Palestine and the final withdrawal of the British and the proclamation of the state of Israel. Such short term issues should be set against the longer term context.</p>	[50]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
29	<p>To what extent was Israel responsible for the failure to resolve the Palestinian question after the Yom Kippur War (1973)?</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for. Candidates will need to discuss the degree of Israeli responsibility and balance this against other factors to score well. In coming to a judgement candidates may discuss some of the following: the impact of the 1967 and 1973 wars; the role the PLO and Arafat; the policies of Begin after 1977 and growth of Israeli settlement of West Bank and Gaza; the post-1985 'Iron Fist' policy; the roles of Islamic Jihad, Hamas and other radical Palestinian groups; the Intifada post-1987; PLO acceptance of UN resolution 242 and renunciation of terrorism; US involvement and refusal of Israel to negotiate; post-1991 US-Soviet brokered talks in Madrid/Washington; the Oslo Accords, Oslo 2 and Arafat's return to Gaza; the Wye River talks linking Israeli withdrawal to action against Hamas and Islamic Jihad; Camp David and renewed violence, the second Intifada; Bush and the 'Road Map'.</p>	[50]
30	<p>Assess the consequences of the Iran-Iraq War (1980-88)</p> <p>No specific answer is looked for. Candidates will need to explain a number of consequences and assess their relative significance and linkages to score well. Candidates may distinguish between short and long term consequences, direct and indirect consequences. They may discuss some of the following: the short term costs of war – 500000 killed, \$800 billion, little change (final settlement in 1990 virtually a repeat of 1975 Algiers agreement); the legacy of debt – Iraq (and Iran) bankrupt; the results for Hussein - able to tighten grip on Iraq (especially over Kurds and Shia) – and Iraq - now perhaps most powerful state in Gulf (55 divisions and 4000 tanks) – left neighbours anxious, including Israel; in longer term - crippling debt and unwillingness of Arab states to write them off despite Hussein's 'defence of Arabs' would lead Saddam to look to wrest money from Kuwait and eventually invasion in 1991 and thence the first Gulf War; legacy of fear and unrest in Iraq (assassination attempts); Iraq's isolation and seeking of friends – e.g. Arab Cooperation Council and non-aggression pacts.</p>	[50]

Paper Total [100]

F963-01 - British History Enquiries

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
1(a)	<p>The Normans in England 1066-1100</p> <p>Study Sources A and B Compare these Sources as evidence for the ways in which the Norman conquerors treated the native English.</p> <p>Focus: comparison of two Sources</p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source ‘as evidence for ...’. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p> <p>Both Sources focus upon the fate of the native English hierarchy. Source A, written soon after the Conquest, sees the English as treated well; no matter Norman-French gains, the native English are not treated unjustly, indeed the emphasis is upon even-handedness and justice, but Source B takes a different line. Written some time after the Conquest, it emphasises the grants made to Norman-French lords; the tone is one where ‘foreigners grew wealthy’ from ‘the spoils of England’; Englishmen have been killed or driven into exile. In A there seems to be an attempt to retain something of an English presence higher up the social scale but in B the reverse is true, with foreign influence and presence paramount. The tone of the comments in A is reasonably ameliorative, that of B harsher and tougher. The language used in both can be assessed for content and message.</p> <p>Comment on the provenances might refer to the different origins of the authors as well as the dates. A comes from a Frenchman closely involved in the Conquest and known to be sympathetic to William I while B comes from an Englishman, raised and educated in Normandy, but who retained some residual sympathy for his native land and its treatment. Yet both present slightly unexpected views, above all A. The context of the events described might be remembered. B might be seen as typical of opinion over time. The provenances can be engaged to help explain and evaluate the differences. So, too, the dates are important: A precedes the major tenurial-territorial changes of c.1070-2, B presents the aftermath.</p>	[30]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
1(b)	<p>Study <u>all</u> the Sources</p> <p>Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that the changes in land holding after 1066 were the result of military needs.</p> <p>Focus: Judgement in context based on the set the Sources and own knowledge.</p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, including any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set answer is expected.</p> <p>The question focuses on the reasons for changes in land holding patterns and context. The Sources offer a variety of points. All the Sources emphasise or suggest issues of security, control, defence, military needs with Sources C, D and parts of the other Sources supporting the view of the predominance of military needs and military thinking. Sources A, B and E in places offering different perspectives. The Conquest was undertaken to gain the throne but the invaders needed reward; colonisation and settlement followed; lands were used for patronage and as reward. There is much debate about William I's intentions, given that, initially, there was no wholesale redistribution of lands, save for those lost by Anglo-Saxon landholders killed at Hastings. Land grants were rewards, forms of patronage, a means to secure control and hold on to acquired lands; they were a part of the Norman-French process of takeover, along with the use of the Church, monasteries, control of towns and castles (as in Sources A and D). The Sources, especially B and E, suggest the scales of change and upheaval. Source E does summarise some of the features of the takeover process and its stages; Sources C and D are good examples of the methods as well as military needs involved. Parts of Sources A, B and E point to the need to reward participants in the Conquest and subsequent settlement process; reference is made to the spoils of victory. A mentions grants of lands and castles, rewards for hardships and danger while B specifies some of those rewarded by the King's patronage; E offers an idea of the scale of patronage in terms of how much was held by the new political élite. Control, settlement, rewards were all linked, above all in the period from 1066 to the mid-1070s. Topic knowledge can be used to support analysis: William I's hold and methods of control, the issues involved in Normanisation (Sources A and B could be contrasted there), the place of Domesday Book as a source of evidence for the extent and success of changes. The better answers will see links of military and political needs and strategies and relate to the context of takeover, colonisation and control.</p>	[70]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
2(a)	<p>Mid-Tudor Crises 1536-1569</p> <p>Study Sources D and E Compare these Sources as evidence for ways in which the gentry and nobility tried to win support for the rebellion.</p> <p>Focus: Comparison of two Sources.</p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources ‘as evidence for ...’. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p> <p>The Sources agree that rebel leaders of the nobility and gentry classes used xenophobia, status and appeals to religious belief to rally support from their fellow landowners. The Sources show some similarities in the approaches they adopt. Both claim to be loyal to the Queen, though Source D is less positive, specifying ‘no harm’, whereas Source E asserts their ‘true and lawful’ nature. Both Sources appeal to xenophobic feelings, Source D raising the spectre of ‘a hundred armed Spaniards’ marching on London, and Source E suggesting imminent invasion. Both refer to freedom: Source E to the ‘enslavement’ of the English people, and Source D to the ‘liberty and the commonwealth’ of England which are at stake. Source D raises the fear of loss of property – ‘our health and wealth depend on it’, and Source E talks of the ‘displacement of the ancient nobility from the Queen’s side’ with its economic repercussions. This shows the main audience of the appeal to be the landed classes themselves who are then expected to rally popular support among their tenants. Both ask for supporters to assemble, but Source D emphasises the amount of support while Source E focuses on the speed with which the rebels need to act.</p> <p>On the other hand, there are differences. Catholicism is an important means of rallying support in Source E, whereas religion is not mentioned in Source D, even though one of Mary’s motives in the Spanish marriage is to strengthen Catholicism in England and produce a Catholic heir. Wyatt focuses solely on xenophobic, defensive and economic persuasions. A focus on Protestantism might have lost Wyatt support, as Catholicism remained strong in some parts of Kent. In Source D Wyatt’s appeal is broadly to the men of Kent, many of whom are Protestants, after the collapse of the other planned prongs of the rising, revealed to the government by Edward Courtenay. In Source E Northumberland and Westmorland, in contrast, are Catholics appealing to their Catholic tenants and allies in the north of England, an area of with a majority of ‘church papists’. They are reacting almost spontaneously to Norfolk’s revelation of the plot, to marry him to Mary Queen of Scots, to Elizabeth’s government, and are bringing forward their plans to rise. There is no mention of Mary Queen of Scots, who had arrived in England the previous year, perhaps because of anti-Scottish sentiment in the north of England. Thus both Sources conceal some of their intentions in their rallying of support.</p>	[30]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
2(b)	<p>Study <u>all</u> the Sources. Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that the <u>main</u> aim of rebellions between 1536 and 1569 was the restoration of the Catholic faith.</p> <p>Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.</p> <p>The Sources contain references to religious, economic, political, social and regional aims. Religion is central to Sources A, B and E, whereas the references to religion in Source C are less prominent and Source D implies a religious aim. Sources A, B and E aim for a restoration of Catholicism. Both Source A, the Pilgrimage of Grace, and Source B, the Western Rebellion, have traditionally been seen as having primarily religious aims, but they reveal a web of intentions. They are both supported by conservative Catholics in opposition to religious changes. Both wish to see the abbeys restored, but Source A is trying to halt the process as it is taking place, whereas Source B occurs when monastic land had long ago passed into lay hands, so the aim is less realistic. Source B is a response to the First Book of Common Prayer 1549, when Protestant doctrine and banning of Catholic practices emerged as grievances. Restoration of Catholic doctrine is also shown in Source E, and the rebels later celebrate Mass in Durham Cathedral. Sources A and B aim to punish heretics, and Source E to remove heretical councillors from influence over Elizabeth. In contrast Source C, Kett's Rebellion accepts change and has Protestant aims: an elected, resident and well-educated ministry. Source D omits to mention the implicit religious aim of the rebels, in attempting to marry the Protestant Elizabeth to Edward Courtenay and replace the Catholic Mary. Similarly, Source E omits its other aim, to marry Mary Queen of Scots to the Duke of Norfolk and replace Elizabeth. Both of these hidden aims might be supplied from own knowledge.</p> <p>Political aims feature in Sources A, D and E. Source A aims to restore Mary to the succession, in contrast to the aim in Source D, to prevent Mary and Philip from establishing a Catholic succession. Factionalism is revealed in Source A, with the aim to remove Cromwell and Rich, and Source E, to remove Protestant councillors. A broader view might be taken, that the aims pursued by noble rebels differed from those of popular rebels. Thus the Pilgrimage of Grace might be seen as a hybrid rebellion with Darcy and Hussey having similar political and social aims to Northumberland and Westmorland, whereas the popular elements were merely trying to attract attention to their grievances, as their only means of making their voices heard.</p> <p>Economic aims feature in Source C, such as an end to enclosures</p>	

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
	<p>and rack renting. Financial aims might be inferred in Sources D, 'health and wealth' and E, 'displaced the ancient nobility'. This links also to class and social aims, present in Source B, limiting the number of gentry servants, and in Source C's attempts to free bond men and reduce the power of capitalist landlords. Regional aims feature also in Sources A and B, which aim to reduce the control of central government. The aim to defend national interests is in Sources D and E. The style of the rebels' presentation of their aims suggests that lower class rebels might present their aims humbly, as in Source C, or stridently, as in Source B, reflecting longer standing regional grievances.</p> <p>Candidates are likely to consider a range of aims taken from the wide range possible: religious, economic, social, political or regional. They are likely to see an interaction between religious aims and others. It is up to candidates to assess and decide upon relative importance here, there being no set conclusion.</p>	[70]
3(a)	<p>The English Civil War and Interregnum 1637-60</p> <p>Study Sources A and D</p> <p>Compare these Sources as evidence for opposition to the First Civil War.</p> <p><u>Focus: comparison of two sources</u></p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the sources 'as evidence for...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p> <p>Both sources are contemporary accounts, although they come from different ends of the First Civil War, which affects their content. Source A is a public declaration, while source D is a letter of a local parliamentarian who offers both the facts and a judgement upon them, but his loyalties do not compromise the source's veracity. Both sources report opposition to the war, D from the civilian population, and A from the more propertied and prominent gentry. Both refer to 'the miseries' (source A) or 'misery' (source D) of War, such as capture of prisoners (source A) and seizure of possessions and plundering (sources A and D). Here, however, the sources differ: the Cheshire gentry want to achieve peace, and to avoid taking sides, so they propose a petition to both King and Parliament urging this; source D, in contrast, sees neutralism as a reaction to military plundering and, were this redressed, then most neutralists could be converted into parliamentarians. Cheshire wishes for arms to be laid down; the west country neutralists are taking up arms to protect their property. These different concerns should be linked to the date of the two documents: in December 1642 the First Civil War was only gradually spreading across the country, with many communities not yet adjusted to war; by 1645, as source D indicates, frustration at plundering and the inability or unwillingness of parliament's military</p>	[30]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
	commanders to do anything about it, led to militancy. Areas of similarity and difference thus should be identified and analysed.	
3(b)	<p>Study all the Sources.</p> <p>Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that Parliament’s ineffective military leadership was the main reason Parliament took so long to win the First Civil War.</p> <p><u>Focus: Judgment in context, based on the set of sources and own knowledge</u></p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, and any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focussing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.</p> <p>Sources B and C support the proposition: that Manchester and Essex were not committed to all-out victory, squandered opportunities such as Newbury (source B), and, as candidates may add from their own knowledge, failed to build on the successes such as Fairfax and Cromwell at Marston Moor in 1644. The resolution of the tension between the ‘peace party’ and hawks such as Cromwell in the winter of 1644-45 was the Self-Denying Ordinance and the creation of the New Model Army, which quickly won the Civil War in 1645-46. But other sources point in other directions: sources A and E indicate opposition to the war, either by proposing peace (source A) or by taking up arms in protection against the parliamentary forces (source E); however, the latter suggests that were Parliament to suppress plundering, then it could recruit supporters from these militant neutralists. The wider point that these two sources raise is the extent to which opposition to war delayed Parliament’s eventual victory. Source E opens up another flank: the advantages which the royalists possessed, which Parliament had to overcome in order to achieve victory, as well as their weaknesses, which Parliament could exploit. So there are three alternative explanations here which need sorting and testing against the question.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Total for paper:</p>	<p>[70] [100]</p>

F963-02 - Option B: British History Enquiries 1815-1945

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
1(a)	<p>The Condition of England 1815-53</p> <p>Study Sources A and B Compare these two Sources as evidence for the arguments about state elementary education in the early 1830s.</p> <p>Focus: Comparison of two Sources</p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source ‘as evidence for...’. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p> <p>Both Roebuck and the Edinburgh Review in A and B agree that the main argument in favour of education was that it was seen as the key to ensuring law and order at a time of considerable discontent. The Review stresses education’s role in promoting religion and morality whilst Roebuck differs, stressing that an understanding of problems will diffuse discontent. Peel in B takes the opposite view, that there is no problem that greater State education could solve and that the existing voluntary and private system is sufficient. It is under the control of charitable gentlemen, where it belongs. Roebuck in B and the Review in A also differ on the extent to which discontent will be diffused. ‘B’ is very optimistic, seeing education as a panacea, allowing all to put their ignorance into perspective, from the peasantry to sturdy paupers intent on demanding their doles from hard pressed parishes. Roebuck even extends this argument to future landlords and manufacturers who will see the evil of their respective monopolies. ‘A’ merely argues a view that education will serve traditional control, via religion and morality.</p> <p>Comment on provenance might stress that a Whig journal would be expected to support more education, especially given the context of disturbed times (the Swing Riots and the Reform Act Crisis), hence its traditional stress on religion and morality. As an upper-class ‘establishment’ journal it is concerned to spread proper social values in its arguments. In contrast Roebuck’s speech is just after the Reform Act and designed to persuade MPs that education is a liberating force, a view countered by a Conservative like Peel. Peel and the Edinburgh Review may be far more typical of the arguments that swayed MPs, with few subscribing to Roebuck’s rather ambitious claims.</p>	[30]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
1(b)	<p>Study <u>all</u> the Sources</p> <p>Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that the <u>main</u> obstacle to educational development in the period from 1830 to 1853 was financial.</p> <p>Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, including any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set answer is expected.</p> <p>The question focuses on the obstacles to educational development in the period. The Sources contain a variety of useful points, either implicitly or explicitly. The sources may be grouped into C and E both of which refer to financial issues. A different set obstacles are raised in A, B and D with C and E adding to these. The view that money was an obstacle is mentioned by both C and E, although only C implies that it was the main reason. Both sources come from key moments in the educational debate, 'C' from the fears generated by the proposal for the first State Grant to assist elementary education, D in the wake of Graham's attempt to use the Factory Acts to extend provision. Candidates could also stress that Roebuck's scheme for universal state education would, inevitably, incur huge cost. Cobbett in C is a surprising source. One might expect a radical of his experience to favour educational development and ally with Roebuck, but he does not. He provides reliable evidence of the rural conservatism of some Radicals. As an enemy of 'old corruption' he regards taxes for education as just another excuse for a rotten state to bank- roll new jobs and placemen. Perhaps aware of the extent of the private provision for working class children, free of Church and State patronage, he opposes taxing them a second time to provide for a state education that would seek to control, although it is difficult to see how 'the people' will bear the brunt of taxation, unless indirectly. From a very different radical angle Engels in E is scornful of a government that will not spend more than £40,000 pa. from a total Budget of £55 million. He implies that money is there but the will is lacking. Engels is a shrewd commentator, who is likely to see cost as important to a capitalist class, yet he gives more weight to religious rivalry both as stimulus and obstacle. Own knowledge could comment on the small size of the initial grant and to concern that finance should be voluntary, not a state affair. The Monitorial system reflected the concern to keep education cheap.</p>	[70]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
	<p>All the Sources mention other obstacles. One is the debate over what education was for. The stress on the benefits of education in A imply that many in the establishment feared that education might have the opposite effect, hence its stress on religion and morality. In a different context Cobbett in C, like Peel in B, stresses that there is no need for education. Cobbett's definition of education is what most suits a man to his situation. Most working men had no need. Like Baines in D, Cobbett fears state control. He refers to teachers as a 'new race of idlers', useless and wasteful state servants. Baines approaches this from a powerful Nonconformist standpoint. One might expect him to champion education but his liberal Laisser-Faire outlook makes him fear education under state control. He uses the examples of military and oriental despotism (Prussia and China), both well known for their state schemes of education and thus lack of freedom. One of Baines's motives would, undoubtedly, be his fear of the Anglican State, a point developed by Engels in E who refers to the religious obstacles to education. Using own knowledge candidates could expand upon this, as Engels sees religion as both a stimulus but also hindrance to a rational curriculum developing. His is a balanced set of points with the advantage of an outsider's view, in every sense. Own knowledge of the religious rivalries and especially the controversy over Graham's Bill in 1843 could develop the religious point for those seeking to argue that disagreements over who controlled education were the major obstacle. Such knowledge could also point to a lack of trained teachers, disagreement over the curriculum and to working class anti- state views as other obstacles. The better candidates will compare the obstacles to assess which was the main limitation.</p>	

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
2(a)	<p>The Age of Gladstone and Disraeli 1865-86</p> <p>Study Sources A and D</p> <p>Compare these two Sources as evidence for Liberal views of the Irish and their problems in the period from 1885 to 1886.</p> <p>Focus: Comparison of two Sources</p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source ‘as evidence for...’ The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p> <p>Both sources are reporting on Gladstone’s views and both point to a consistency on his part in acknowledging the Irish as settling for nothing less than their own parliament as the solution to their problems. Both, historically, were sympathetic to the Irish, especially on grounds of religious and land discrimination. However, both Gladstone and Bright regard the current Irish nationalist MPs and their tactics at Westminster as an increasing nuisance. Something needs to be done to tackle their obstructionism and improving organisation. They differ in that A just reports Gladstone’s views, hardly a typical liberal when it came to Irish affairs, whilst D also includes Bright’s older liberal views on Gladstone and the Irish. In A Gladstone continues to be sympathetic and thinks the Irish will be content with their own parliament. He continues to do so in D but Bright, also in D, does not believe the Irish, on past record, to be faithful. He considers them a ‘rebellious’ party intent on gaining whatever they can, up to and including independence, and the imposition of duties on British goods as a solution to their poverty. Comments on the provenance of the Sources might stress that both are private conversations, where Gladstone is sounding out colleagues on Irish issues, although Derby in A is keen to share Gladstone’s views with Granville and the context of A is significant - Derby is worried about the direction of Gladstone’s thoughts on the Union. At a later date, when Gladstone had returned to power for a third government, Bright shares these Whig fears. Although reported by Derby, Gladstone’s views are reliably conveyed. Nonetheless to a Whig leader Gladstone may have over-stressed Irish obstructionism at Westminster. Bright may be the better evidence as it goes against the grain for a former ‘friend’ of Ireland to oppose Gladstone and Home Rule. It also gives both sides, an Irish analysis but one which remains very sceptical about Irish motives and trustworthiness, both in its content and tone. Better candidates might comment on the closeness of Gladstone and Bright.</p>	[30]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
2(b)	<p>Study <u>all</u> the Sources.</p> <p>Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that the First Home Rule Bill failed because of Gladstone’s mishandling of the issue.</p> <p><u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</u></p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, including any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set answer is expected.</p> <p>The sources can be interpreted in more than one way. All five could be used to either agree or disagree with the proposition. On balance Sources C, D and E could be said to support the view that Gladstone’s failure was because of his own mishandling of the issues. Two of these are contemporary critics of Home Rule commenting on it after its public announcement; the third is a modern historian critically assessing matters at a considerable distance. In contrast Sources A and B, before Gladstone’s conversion to Home Rule was public knowledge, suggest a much more careful and astute handling of it, although both are Gladstone’s own views and this will condition what he has to say. The historian in E could be considered to belong to either view.</p> <p>From hindsight Gladstone failed and disastrously split the Liberal Party, but at the time of the sources (1885-6) Home Rule could have been secured. The Sources focuses on Gladstone’s views and manoeuvrings, those of the potentially hostile Whigs whose support he was trying to secure and of his mentor and the standard bearer of older middle class Liberalism, John Bright. The evidence that Gladstone mishandled Home Rule depends on how far candidates think that his positive assessment of settling Ireland in A is correct. Clearly Bright in D thinks it mistaken and candidates might refer to Parnell’s famous hints in 1885 that independence was the real goal to suggest delusion on Gladstone’s part. In B Gladstone could be accused of converting to Home Rule simply to regain power once the November election had given Parnell the opportunity to return a Liberal government to power. Candidates could usefully deploy their knowledge on the Hawarden Kite. The Source suggests that Gladstone wished to avoid ‘bids’ for nationalist votes but clearly Home Rule would, in effect, do this. Was he unlucky that his son went public during delicate negotiations with the Whigs, or was it intended? In C, soon after the Hawarden Kite, the Whig leader Hartington clearly feels that Gladstone has kept everyone in the dark and is not to be trusted. Linking to the point in E made by Partridge about the difficulties Gladstone faced in his own party, this is reliable evidence that Gladstone had failed to keep the important Whig leadership onside. Bright in D could be said to voice wider concerns about Gladstone conceding too much to the ‘rebel’ Irish, a point not lost on English voters. Many considered Gladstone too trusting and</p>	

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
	<p>naïve, Bright citing a very vague reply from Gladstone to his point on import duties. Partridge in E judges Gladstone to have been too reliant on oratory, too convinced of the morality of his case ('God'). Own knowledge could add substance to E's points about Ulster and to Gladstone's political motives which outraged Chamberlain whose plans for local devolution were derailed. Own knowledge could then stress that Gladstone's controversial conversion and his possible motives for it, would lead to Commons failure (where there is no evidence that he prepared Liberal MPs for it), let alone its fate in the House of Lords</p> <p>However a case could be made that Gladstone did the best he could and failure was not down to personal mishandling. The sources present evidence that he tried to handle the issue with some skill. He might have survived a few resignations from the likes of Chamberlain, but not the Whigs, hence his appropriate concentration on them in sources A, B and C. To Derby in A he stresses the need to overcome increasingly organised Irish obstruction. He is clearly concerned to keep the Whigs informed, possibly, as Hartington in C saw it, of gaining a 'drift' into acceptance of Home Rule. C thinks Gladstone stood a good chance of bouncing the Whigs into it. He reassures Hartington in B that a Dublin Parliament would only consider Irish affairs, whilst to both Bright in D and the Whigs, he is keen to stress the 'removal' of the Irish from Westminster. Own knowledge might point out that, in discussion with Parnell, other angles were stressed. Such detailed contacts with the Whigs in A and B would give the lie to Hartington's accusation in C that he didn't know what Gladstone was doing. Partridge in E also refers to the difficulties Gladstone faced from both Commons and Lords. Yet B provides evidence that Gladstone is trying to get Lord Salisbury's conservative minority government to undertake it, thereby preventing Liberal splits and getting it through the Lords. Was this a pretty forlorn hope? Gladstone is also aware of the need to prevent a bidding war between Tory and Liberal over the Irish vote, although the Hawarden Kite destroyed this. Thus he thought the right moment had come and the Irish wanted Home Rule. The Sources do not pursue in detail the other problems that led to failure – Chamberlain, Ulster and an uncooperative Conservative party (both Salisbury and Lord Randolph Churchill).</p>	[70]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
3(a)	<p>England and a New Century 1900-24</p> <p>Study Sources B and D Compare these two Sources as evidence for opinions on the role of the House of Lords.</p> <p>Focus: Comparison of two Sources.</p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources ‘as evidence for...’. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation, and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p> <p>Content: Source B presents a negative view of the House of Lords. Campbell-Bannerman accuses the Lords of damaging democracy by obstructing the legislation (an education bill) of a Government recently elected by the people with the largest majority in history. He promises that a solution will be found to this challenge facing the Constitution. Source D, on the other hand, presents a positive view of the Lords as protecting the people against a tyrannical government. According to Balfour, the second chamber exists to guard against hasty legislation.</p> <p>Provenance: There are clear differences of provenance. Source B. 1906. A recently-elected, radical Liberal PM, with a clear mandate for reform. But frustrated by a Conservative-dominated House of Lords. The language used supports this. Source D. 1909. Balfour is still frustrating the Liberal Government. But now, three years later, the conflict is much more serious, and the Conservatives are on the defensive. The context is now Lloyd George’s People’s Budget. Balfour (with his allies in the Lords) sees this as ‘vindictive’ legislation. The Conservatives suspect that there are wider political motives behind the bill.</p>	[30]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
3(b)	<p>Study all the Sources.</p> <p>Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that it was the Conservatives who were <u>mainly</u> responsible for clashes between the Commons and the Lords in the period from 1906 to 1911.</p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge, and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses and any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question, but no set conclusion is expected.</p> <p>Most of the constitutional problems stemmed from the Liberal's landslide victory in the 1906 Election, and the Conservative reaction to this predicament. The sources cover the period 1906-1909. But answers will be strengthened by a knowledge of political events between 1906 and 1911, especially Lloyd George's People's Budget, the two General Elections of 1910, and the Parliament Act of 1911. The "Conservatives" of 3 (b) might be restricted to the opposition party led by Balfour, and its representative M.P's in the Commons. But candidates will have more scope if they include the Conservative majority in the Lords led by Lansdowne.</p> <p>Sensible source grouping would put Sources B and C on the Liberal Government's side of the argument. Thus, the House of Lords is often seen as 'Mr Balfour's poodle'. Sources A, D and E represent a Conservative view of the constitutional debate (the Lords as the 'watchdog' of the Constitution), and blame the Liberal Government for the crisis. As there is clear polarity between the two groups of Sources, one would hope that candidates in their evaluation of the Sources would spot that the authors are often extremely partisan.</p> <p>In Source B, Campbell-Bannerman, a reforming Prime Minister enjoying a huge majority, is frustrated by the recent destruction of the Government's education bill in the House of Lords. He clearly blames Balfour's Conservatives. The battle lines are being drawn. Of course, it is a matter of opinion whether Balfour and Lansdowne are acting unconstitutionally, although, it is on record that Liberals like Asquith, Lloyd George and Churchill believed the Lords were being partisan. Candidates might argue that most aristocrats would oppose new liberalism anyway, without any prompting from the Conservative Party. By 1909, Lloyd George is in no doubt (Source C) that the Lords are acting unfairly, particularly in their reaction to his budget. Candidates might wish to discuss if this budget was a deliberate trap laid by the Liberals, or rather a necessary move to raise taxes for social reforms and for the navy. Either view could be argued from own knowledge, although it is clear from the source that Lloyd George has come to regard the aristocracy as the enemy of the people.</p> <p>In Source A, Balfour agrees with Lansdowne the policy of conservative co-operation which was to infuriate the Liberal leadership.</p>	

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
	<p>In Source D, the actions of the House of Lords in opposing the People's Budget are defended by Balfour on the grounds of protecting the people against the actions of a tyrannical government. This is a different version of democracy to that presented (for example) by Campbell-Bannerman in Source B. Again, in Source E, Lansdowne defends the Lords opposition to the Budget on the grounds that this budget is more than a 'finance bill'. Therefore, according to the Conservatives, the Lords are not acting unconstitutionally.</p> <p>The Conservative majority in the Lords did reject several Liberal bills between 1906 and 1909. In November 1909, they rejected the Budget. After the first Election of January 1910, they were forced to accept the Budget. Then, until August 1911 (through the accession of George the Fifth, the Liberal threat to create 500 Liberal peers, and the second Election of December 1910) they resisted the Parliament Bill, which reduced the powers of the Lords. The two elections were inconclusive. All of the major parties were weakened by them in some respect. The Liberal Government, now dependent on Irish support, found it easier to get legislation through the Lords (eg. 1911 National Insurance Act), although the Irish Home Rule Bill (1912) was lost through delay.</p>	<p>[70]</p>

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
4(a)	<p>Churchill 1920-45</p> <p>Study Sources B and C.</p> <p>Compare these two Sources as evidence for opinions among Conservatives about Chamberlain’s handling of the Munich Settlement.</p> <p><u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources</u></p> <p>No set answer is expected but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source ‘as evidence for...’ The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p> <p>Content B is clearly condemnatory – an unmitigated defeat; C on the other hand thinks that the government’s case is excellent. There is no hint of ‘a disaster of the first magnitude’ with the House of Commons giving full support. C says that Churchill’s contribution lacked any substance and merely ‘enlivened the house’ casting doubt on the depth of his criticism. There is no real refutation of the points made by Churchill in B about the fate of Czechoslovakia or further German expansion eastwards. C is more concerned with the political support for Munich. In that sense Churchill may be right in saying that ‘everyone would like to forget or ignore’ the defeat. C refers to Chamberlain beaming with pleasure, whereas the tone of Churchill’s speech shows a sombre mood.</p> <p>Provenance: the nature of the sources is very different. Though on the same day, Churchill’s is a public speech intended to influence not only parliamentary but public opinion, so is a strong rhetorical statement. Chips’ diary is very much for his personal use and expresses feelings about Churchill which he would not say in public. It also reveals a superficial approach and a ‘toadying’ approach to the Prime Minister far removed from Churchill’s thundering. Churchill seems to be speaking in terms of high seriousness, yet this is seen as merely ‘antics’ by Channon. In a sense, Channon’s is a more typical view, as many MPs in the party were relieved that peace had been preserved and many at the top of the party felt that Britain was not ready for war. However, Churchill’s views were held by others in the party even if few ministers actually resigned and were more typical of attitudes when the euphoria of Munich died down and MPs reflected. The superficial popularity recorded by Channon came to seem hollow, while Churchill’s view came to be more accepted. In terms of usefulness, Channon’s source may help to understand Chamberlain’s policy, Churchill’s view may be less useful as evidence for Conservative views, as he was seen as an eccentric and the arguments presented are perhaps not very strong. However he and not Channon foresaw the fate of Czechoslovakia.</p>	

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
4(b)	<p>Study all the Sources.</p> <p>Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that Churchill’s criticisms of Munich were unjustified.</p> <p><u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge</u></p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, including any limitations as evidence. A range of issues will be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set answer is expected.</p> <p>The debate is whether the state of the armed forces, Britain’s lack of allies, the uncertainty about Imperial support and public opinion meant that Chamberlain had little choice in 1938 except to play for time or whether Churchill’s view that Munich merely brought about dishonour, ended British credibility, led to Germany gaining strength and encouraged her ambitions in eastern Europe is more justifiable. Grouping: by and large A, C, and E are critical of Churchill, while D offers a more balanced view. B obviously attempts to justify Churchill’s view.</p> <p>The Churchill case is that the French alliance system in Eastern Europe was swept away, weakening a possible defence against Hitler. Czechoslovakia was likely to be engulfed and more resources would then be available if Hitler continued eastwards expansion. His final point in B is the subordination of Britain to Hitler Evaluation. At this point Churchill did not have wide support and was desperate to put over his points; he was not in the government and did not know Britain’s weaknesses first hand. He was speaking in the House of Commons and expressing a public view. His view is supported to an extent by Ismay in D who argues that German military preparations were not so strong in 1938 that Britain could not have resisted and also that by sacrificing Czechoslovakia Hitler gained the Skoda arms factory. However Ismay who was in a position to know does not back up Churchill’s view in the main.</p> <p>Own Knowledge. To support Churchill’s case, candidates could be aware that German arms manufacture outpaced that of Britain 1938-39.; that Germany gained Russia as an ally thanks to the gap between Munich and war in 1939; that the Czech army of 35 divisions was lost to any anti-Hitler coalition; that public opinion was not as anti-war as Chamberlain made it out to be. France did lose credibility in her alliances with Poland and the Little Entente. The alternative view is well expressed in D – the nation was more unified in 1939 than in 1938 and as we did depend on the empire, it was important that the dominions gave support which was not likely in 1938.</p> <p>Evaluation : It should be noted that Ismay is writing in hindsight, but at the time he was in a position to know about the state of Britain’s armed forces – which Churchill was not. The point about public opinion is well brought out by A which shows the royal family’s keen support for Munich and C which shows conservative support in parliament and the view that Churchill’s criticisms were merely antics.</p>	[30]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
	<p>Evaluation Both these Sources are from the time of the crisis itself and both from within an establishment that feared the effects of another war on British society. Channon is writing a personal diary and there is no need for him to exaggerate a genuine affection for Chamberlain which was typical of many in the Conservative party. However a less personally involved Source, E, supports the view. This interpretation accuses Churchill of hypocrisy and opportunism and failing to understand the pressures of the government having to watch out for Germany, Italy and Japan. Evaluation This is in many ways fair – candidates could point out the Italian-German Axis and the problems caused by Japan’s renewed attacks in China. Churchill did reduce arms spending under the 10 year Rule and so was partly responsible for the situation in 1938. Own knowledge could include public revulsion against the losses of world War I (a war that Churchill had enjoyed!) and the expressions of pacifism in the Peace Ballot of 1935 (which Churchill despised).</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Total for paper:</p>	

F964-01 - European and World History Enquiries

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
1(a)	<p>The First Crusade and the Crusader States 1073-1130</p> <p>Study Sources A and C Compare these Sources as evidence for the problems faced by the new Crusader States.</p> <p><u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources.</u></p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source ‘as evidence for ...’. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p> <p>Both Sources set out a range of problems but they differ as to the nature of those problems. Both point to issues surrounding location and the presence of hostile neighbours. Differences can be set out thus. In A the small numbers of crusaders, the dependence on good leadership, the needs of manpower and horses are discussed while in C the focus is upon the enmity of the Emperor of Byzantium; evidently he felt threatened and wanted to reassert control over lands he saw as his own preserve. The tone of C is significant: it records the Emperor’s machinations and his attempts to goad Muslim rulers into removing the crusader presence. The tone of A is, ultimately, more hopeful, placing much stress on the qualities of King Baldwin I and implying that problems could be overcome, not least through the fear engendered in the crusaders’ opponents. Both Sources convey, then, a range of problems, both internal and external.</p> <p>Comments on the provenances may well engage the authorship and dates of each as well as their typicality. A may be viewed as typical of a reliable contemporary chronicler, recording key features and problems at the inception of the new States; specifically the Kingdom of Jerusalem. C has obvious interest and importance, though composed later; its typicality lies in the reflection of a major, on-going problem faced by the States, namely the hostility and machinations of the Emperor of Byzantium.</p>	[30]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
1(b)	<p>Study all the Sources.</p> <p>Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that the survival of the Crusader States in the period from 1100 to 1130 depended on the disunity of their Muslim enemies.</p> <p><u>Focus: Judgement in context based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</u></p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, including any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set answer is expected.</p> <p>The question focuses on a key reason for the survival of the four Crusader States in the face of much adversity. The Sources contain a range of points, explicit and implicit. Source E highlights some development of the Crusaders' position. Divisions and disunity are mentioned in Source E and some of B and implied in parts of A (fear of crusader power is implied) and D. Other factors are set out in Sources A, C and D, plus parts of B. Source E shows the precarious nature of the crusaders' position and its dependence upon the divided Moslem rulers but also Crusader strengths; Source B shows how the crusaders were able to use Muslim quiescence, overcome problems (there is some link with A on this point) and so expand their influence. Source A stresses crusader leadership and its qualities as well as luck and these features can be supported from own knowledge. A suggests initial crusader successes. Source C raises the problems posed by the Byzantine Emperor; again, own knowledge can support this by reference to the Emperor's diplomacy and general unease over the presence of crusaders adjacent to his lands. There are links between Sources A, B and D: military action, good leadership and general strategic issues are raised. Again, own knowledge can supply support: examples of leaders; battles; Moslem successes and failures; incipient Muslim divisions and enmities between leaders. Source B can also be linked to examples of regional agreements made between crusader leaders and Moslem leaders (e.g. in 1109). Further factors could include the periodic arrival of new settlers (E); the value of sea power provided by, for example, the Genoese; the arrival of the Knights Templar in 1118 (E), a formidable if small elite fighting unit; the mixture of setbacks and successes (e.g. 1119 Blood Field and Tell Danith); the development of castles and a feudal system (E); strategic and tactical awareness, including the better use of forces and responding to opponents' tactics; leadership (the early leaders were all capable men). Better answers will see links and be aware of counter-argument to the interpretation, allowing for the view that, ultimately, no matter incipient strengths, so much turned on the unity or disunity of the crusaders' enemies.</p>	[70]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
2(a)	<p>The German Reformation 1517-1555 Study Sources B and D. Compare these Sources as evidence for the attitudes of Charles V and his brother Ferdinand towards the German princes.</p> <p><u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources.</u></p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources ‘as evidence for ...’. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p> <p>The Sources show some continuity in the attitudes of Charles V and Ferdinand. In both Sources they claim that their chief aim is a peaceful relationship. In both, they wish to avoid the princes gaining a one-sided settlement and imposing Lutheranism on Germany. But their attitudes have changed considerably by 1555. In Source B, the Emperor is expressing his personal views in a private letter to his half-sister. At this stage he seems in control and has consulted his brother, who, as King of the Romans, will succeed him as Emperor. He is exasperated after failing to reconcile the Protestants and Catholics at the Second Colloquy of Regensburg 1546, and is trying to divide and outmanoeuvre his princely enemies. However, Source D is an official document which gives less insight into their views. It is a two-sided settlement recognising toleration for both Lutheran and Catholic states, after the failure of Charles’s attempt to re-impose Catholicism in Germany. In Source B Charles is embarking on a war after failing to persuade the princes to join an imperial league which they feared would rob them of their power. However, in Source D Charles has lost the Schmalkaldic War and been forced into a peace, accepting princely power to impose Lutheranism, which he had resisted earlier. Source B shows his mistrust of the princes, after spies have reported their plotting. He wishes to crush princely attempts to undermine his plans to extend his and Ferdinand’s authority and restore Catholicism. Charles deliberately tries to ‘divide and rule’ the princes in Source B, using the pretext that some have taken lands from others and disturbed the public peace, whereas in Source D he is exhausted and Ferdinand takes the lead in backing down. Mistrust of individual Lutheran princes and a position of perceived imperial strength, in Source B, has given way to humiliation and defeat by the combined Catholic and Lutheran princes in the Schmalkaldic War. Thus, in Source D, the official line taken by Ferdinand lacks the imperious tone of Charles’s private views in Source B. Source D is signed by his brother Ferdinand on his behalf, as the Emperor refuses to personally acknowledge his defeat, is now a broken man and is in the process of abdicating his lands. This makes Source D much less useful as evidence for their views.</p>	[30]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
2(b)	<p>Study all the Sources Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that the actions of the princes were the <u>main</u> reason for the survival of Lutheranism in Germany between 1545 and 1555.</p> <p><u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</u></p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.</p> <p>Sources A, B, D and E suggest that princely action was an important reason for the survival of Lutheranism. The actions of the princes are referred to in Sources B and E, are implied in A and may be explained using own knowledge. Electors within the Schmalkaldic League threatened imperial power, as future imperial elections might return a Protestant Emperor. Source B suggests they were intriguing to disrupt the Diet after withdrawing from the talks which sought religious compromise. Own knowledge might supply the evidence that Charles hoped to take advantage of papal promises of support and a temporary peace with the Turks, France and Denmark to outmanoeuvre his Lutheran enemies and restore Catholicism in the Empire. It might also be added that, in the ensuing war, summarised in Source E, Maurice of Saxony was rewarded for supporting the imperial side with the lands and electoral title of John Frederick of Saxony for aiding the victory at Mühlberg. Maurice's change of sides and his part in the Emperor's defeat might be used to evaluate Sources D and E on the victory of the combined forces of the Catholic and Protestant princes. Source D shows the result of this victory: the official recognition of Lutheranism and its survival in the Empire.</p> <p>Sources B, C and D suggest the Emperor's actions, or inaction, were crucial. The emperor's delays and failures in reconciling with Lutheranism are suggested in Source B. There may be own knowledge of his political weakness within the empire and his other distractions linked to his vast inheritance. Mühlberg and the Emperor's consequent over-confidence might be linked to Source C. The unpopularity of Charles's policy in imposing the Interim was temporary in areas of the Empire under his military control and only strengthened Lutheran opposition. It also provoked all princes to fear a loss of political power within their states, leading Catholic and Protestant princes to combine forces.</p>	

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
	<p>Sources A and C suggest more personal reasons for the survival of Lutheranism. These include: papal inaction and delay in calling a General Council, also suggested in Source E, due to the fear of the conciliar movement, and genuine religious enthusiasm which stiffened opposition, disregarded by Charles, but apparent in Sources A and C. Own knowledge might be used to develop these ideas: for example, married clergy in Source C might be seen as soft-living persons in Source A. Luther himself also played a very important part in the foundations of survival, but during this period the movement passed into the hands of his successors, including Melanchthon, the author of Source A.</p> <p>Candidates are likely to consider a range of reasons taken from the wide range possible: princely actions, Charles's mistakes, the strength of personal motives - including genuine religious enthusiasm - and papal inaction. They are likely to see an interaction between princely actions and Charles V's mistakes. It is up to candidates to assess and decide upon relative importance here, there being no set conclusion.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Paper Total:</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[70] [100]</p>

F964-02 - European and World History Period Studies Option B: Modern 1774-1975

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
1(a)	<p>The Origins and the Course of the French Revolution 1774-1795.</p> <p>Study Sources B and C Compare these Sources as evidence for the unrest in the French provinces in the summer of 1789.</p> <p><u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources</u></p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability; so using the Source ‘as evidence for...’. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p> <p>In terms of content, both B and C offer evidence of unrest; C refers to the destruction of chateaux and B confirms this, naming places attacked. C refers to the seizure of records of dues, which B does not – theft and banditry are the complaints here, whereas C does not refer to this – it is destruction, but as protest not for gain. There is no reference to punitive actions in C. Instead the actions are justified by the humiliations suffered by the people – barbarous remains of feudal laws. In B there is no justification but condemnation of illegal and violent acts justly punished by shooting and subsequent executions. Justice here is enforcing order; Justice in C is the ending of inhumane laws.</p> <p>In terms of provenance, though referring to similar events at the same period – that of the Grand’Peur of summer 1789, the two sources have different origins and purpose. Both are trying to persuade, but have different aims. C wants to use the peasant violence to persuade the assembly to end feudal obligations. Though a provincial noble like those writing in B he has a different agenda – reform. The authors of B do not call for reform but effective police support against bandits – not revolutionary peasants. Their aim is to shock the Assembly into action – but action of a different sort. The letter is from people actually in the countryside feeling the effects of disorder; C is a motion from a liberal noble in the capital, swept away by the revolutionary events in 1789 and seeking to establish a more equal society. In a sense both are typical – since the joining of many liberal nobles and clergy were seized by a vision of change; but the fears of B were typical of many who subsequently fled abroad to avoid the revolution or supported provincial counter-revolution.</p>	[30]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
1(b)	<p>Study all the Sources.</p> <p>Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that the <u>main</u> motive for revolutionary activity in 1789 was economic.</p> <p><u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</u></p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, including any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set answer is expected.</p> <p>The debate here is between explanations which focus on the economic discontents 1787-9, the rising prices, the unemployment in the swollen city of Paris; the falling income from taxes which made the crown's financial position harder; the poor harvests and land hunger in the countryside – and explanations which see 1789 much more in political terms. These arguments focus on the political crisis arising from the deficit and the calling of the Estates general; the political failures of the Crown to manage the new assembly; the politicization of France by the discussion of cahiers and the elections of 1789; the desire for a constitution and enlightenment influences for more freedom, toleration and more efficient government.</p> <p>Grouping the Sources The Sources which stress economic discontents are C and E. Economic factors may lie behind the violence as seen by B. A is much more political as is D which represents the political influence of the Enlightenment.</p> <p>Economic C sees economic oppression as the farmers 'groan' under dues and suffer a heavy burden' the countryside is seen as desolated. However this Source has a distinct intention of modernizing and liberalizing and is justifying rural unrest. This could be assessed with knowledge of the immediate problems 1787-9 and from knowledge of taxes and dues affecting the peasants. This could also be linked to B, though the authors of the Source do not make the connection. This Source sees mere vandalism and banditry rather than an expression of economic hardship, but it is written by a member of the propertied classes directly affected by the violence who would not necessarily be analyzing the economic causes. E links political weakness of the crown in being forced back to Paris with the economic problems of the capital. This could be supported from own knowledge of discontents or might be challenged by knowledge of the growing political awareness of the Paris populace given the large number of revolutionary tracts and the influence of mob orators.</p>	

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
	<p>Non-Economic For A the issue is of the duty of the representatives to give France a constitution, a long term political aim not motivated by economic problems. Politics is at the heart of A and the background could be explained. Some may know of Sieyès' famous pamphlet – What is the Third Estate? And the political demands of the Third Estate in 1789 in the face of their treatment by the King in May 1789. However the author is an educated middle class intellectual not likely to have been directly affected by the economic downturns of 1787-9 eager to push a political agenda. The representative to the Estate General did not include those who suffered most from economic hardship and were more concerned with legalistic/constitutional issues. D shows that there were wider political demands based on ideas of tolerance and enlightenment not necessarily linked directly to economic discontent. Reflects the interests of an enlightened member of the elite in toleration rather than economic problems and is written at a period when the Assembly was intoxicated by its desire for all sorts of reforms. By this time the Paris crowds and the peasantry had issues which went beyond this enlightenment liberalism and were more concerned with economic discontents.</p> <p>Judgements Some may argue that the bad harvests and urban discontents together with the longer term economic factors such as the wealth of the bourgeoisie not being reflected in any political power or the resentment at taxation and feudal dues were more important motives purely political considerations encouraged by the enlightenment, the increasing political awareness and the rise in number of books, pamphlets and political debate. At key points popular discontent pushed along the revolution, for example 14 July, the summer violence in the countryside or the October disturbances described in D. Others may take the view that there was an interaction between political and economic motives – that awareness of economic inequalities such as shown in C leads to demands for political change. Others may argue that despite the pressure of economic events the essential motives for the key players were political change or a more enlightened society.</p>	[70]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
2(a)	<p>The Unification of Italy 1815-70</p> <p>Study Sources A and B. Compare these Sources as evidence for the failure of the revolt in Piedmont in 1821.</p> <p><u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources.</u></p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources ‘as evidence for ...’. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p> <p>Both accounts refer to the betrayal of the revolution which, in Source A, is attributed specifically to Charles Albert and implicitly in Source B: Mazzini highlights the conservatism of the monarchy in broader terms by emphasising the role of Charles Felix too. The intervention of the Austrians is highlighted as a key factor in Source A and Source B pinpointing the battle of Novara as the only major engagement. The more discerning may comment on the indeterminate degree of popular support. In Source A ‘popular affection’ in support of reform is mentioned with no real assessment of popular commitment and in Source B the implication of the reference to ‘local people’ is that support for the rebels may have been retrospective and limited to a few. The key difference between the sources concerns the rebels themselves. In Source A they are described as having ‘fought bravely’ but in Source B it is claimed they ‘did not resist’ and the rebel leaders refused to rise to the challenge of local people to resist in Genoa.</p> <p>The convergence of the accounts is explained by the historical reality of events. Charles Albert was not prepared to go as far as the rebels hoped and finally went into exile. It is also incontestable that Austrian intervention was decisive. The divergence between the sources can be explained, in part, by their authorship. In Source A Santarosa, as leader of the revolt, was anxious to deflect criticism from himself so it served his purpose to stress the weakness of Charles Albert more than is the case in Source B and for the same reason it was in his interest to claim the rebels fought bravely. Mazzini’s criticism of the rebel leadership might be questioned. He was only a teenager in 1821 (born 1805) so his understanding of the events may have been limited, (even influenced by his mother). Further, his account is written many years after the event providing him with the opportunity to write a history in line with his own political views and reputation at the time of writing. Here, candidates might stress Mazzini’s preference for a populist movement (Young Italy) to not only reform states like Piedmont (the limited ambition of Santarosa) but unite Italy.</p>	[30]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
2(b)	<p>Study all the Sources.</p> <p>Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that the revolutions in Italy in 1820-21 and 1831 left the nationalist cause without hope.</p> <p><u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</u></p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.</p> <p>Sources C and E are more likely to be seen as supportive of the interpretation whereas Sources A and B are likely to be considered as evidence against the interpretation. Source D might be used either way. In fact, there is room for argument on several of the sources. Source C might be interpreted as clear confirmation that the nationalist cause was left without hope. Describing revolution as ‘fantasy’ it claims that important sections of society were opposed to change preferring to sustain their links with Austria. The last sentence states clearly that the experience of recent disturbances caused ‘widespread disillusionment’. The prosperity of Lombardy, referred to in the source, helped generate benign attitudes to Austria and the disturbances in neighbouring Modena and the Papal States in 1831, which challenged Austrian power, were regarded with suspicion. It was only in 1848 when the economic fortunes of the area deteriorated that hostility to Austria emerged on any scale. At least a ‘few fools’ were not discouraged and the author’s claim that the higher classes backed Austria allows the possibility that the lower orders felt differently. The reliability of this account might be questioned as it was written by someone in the service of the Austrians. The author’s judgement is questionable it was the middle classes, regarded by the author as supportive of Austria, who were at the forefront of the revolution in 1848. However, the loyalty of the nobility and the clergy, stressed in the source, remained steadfast.</p> <p>Source E reinforces Source C. The implication is that the activities of secret societies in the early part of the century undermined the hopes of those who wanted change by creating fear and delayed independence. D’Azeglio argues that the young men of Milan were disinterested in revolutionary activity. The war of 1859 and subsequent political developments in 1860 which achieved the independence he refers to explains why ‘men are only just beginning to be less frightened of liberty’. The political views ascribed to the author in the introduction may be developed by reference to him as prime minister of Piedmont, 1849-52, when he strove to modernise the state by consensus and reform. Such an assessment of his political views could be deployed to explain his hostility to the events of the 1820s and 1830s.</p>	

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
	<p>Source D supports the view that the nationalist cause was without hope as the masses were 'without faith in the future'. Reference to the various revolutions in the years 1820-21 and 1831 in Naples, Piedmont and the Papal States could be made to explain how early hopes faded, as stated in the source. The identification of poor leadership as the factor to explain failure might be developed by commenting on the Carbonari and other groups. However, whilst at face value Mazzini's comments suggest an absence of hope, in fact, they disguise a real optimism. It is clear that Mazzini was hopeful that millions could be roused 'to the defence of the cause' with the right leadership. Candidates might comment on Mazzini's confidence in his own ideas and his ability to lead the nationalist cause with particular reference to Young Italy which he launched in the year in which these remarks were published.</p> <p>Mazzini appears to be more positive about hopes for the future in Source B. Indeed, some candidates may prefer to pair Source B with Source A which might also be regarded as revealing optimistic attitudes. Both acknowledge the reality of defeat in Piedmont in 1821 and the clear disappointment of both leaders and their supporters. The sense of betrayal is evident in both and in Source B the revolutionaries are described as 'distressed'. Yet, the last lines of Source A present a belief in final victory even if they were the plaintive words of a leader trying to put a brave face on things. The grandiose language of his appeal and the unconvincing assessment made about Austrian power are worth analysis. Similarly, in Source B the courage of the Genoese is stressed and suggests that despite defeat in Turin hope remained. The author admits that the events he witnessed revealed to him the desire and duty of Italians to continue the struggle. Given the date of publication of Source B it is possible to argue that it was easy for Mazzini to claim hope was strong in 1821 writing at a point in history when unification had been achieved. In evaluating both Source A and Source B refer to events in Piedmont only and are confined to the year 1821 and, as such, they do not provide sufficient evidence to comment on the revolutions of 1820-21 and 1831 in their entirety. Indeed, it is possible that some candidates will place emphasis on the negative aspects of the content of these two sources and the less than reliable features of their provenance.</p>	[70]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
3(a)	<p>The Origins of the American Civil War 1820-61</p> <p>Study Sources A and E. Compare these Sources as evidence for opinions on the abolition of slavery. <u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources.</u> No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources ‘as evidence for ...’. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p> <p>The sources agree that the institution of slavery is unacceptable although Source A is more strident in its denunciation of it categorically stating it ‘should no longer be tolerated’ whereas Source E merely suggests a ‘cure’ which implies that the practice of slavery needed to be addressed but with less urgency. They differ on the best way to tackle the problem and their attitude to slaves. The author of Source A implies that slaves should be freed immediately in the comments he makes about the hypothetical reversal of the situation if whites were enslaved. In stark contrast the editorial in Source E dismisses outright abolition as ‘twaddle’ expressing a preference for ‘colonization’. Source A asserts the equality of slaves with other American citizens because the majority were born in America. However, Source E indicates that slaves do not deserve equal rights by suggesting they are intellectually inferior and that they will only be free if they return to ‘the land of their forefathers’.</p> <p>There was common ground between the Colonization Society and other abolitionists. The fact that Garrison was invited to speak to the former indicates a friendly relationship between the two at that time. Quakers and other Christian foundations supported both movements. However, the Colonization Society had southern slave owners from the upper slave states like Kentucky and Virginia as members. Supporters of immediate abolition were almost all Northerners. This helps to explain the clear difference between the sources. Those who favoured colonization as in Source E did so because it allowed for the gradual demise of slavery. In Source A Garrison, and the Anti-Slavery Society he started three years later was impatient for change as they had less to lose. The slow progress of colonization might explain Garrison’s preference for abolition: by 1830 more slaves were born in a week in the USA than were sent to Liberia in a year. His emphasis on equality of privileges might be explained by the date within the year on which the speech was delivered. The caution of the editorial reflects the less dogmatic and practical approach of those who were aware of the racial problems that immediate abolition might create.</p>	<p>[30]</p> <p>[30]</p>

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
3(b)	<p>Study all the Sources.</p> <p>Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that the campaign for the abolition of slavery failed to win popular support in America before 1850.</p> <p><u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</u></p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.</p> <p>According to Calhoun in Source C both races will benefit ‘if not disturbed by the fierce spirit of abolition’, consistent with the ‘good’ relations that existed. He warns that emancipation would lead to ‘social and political equality’ and ultimately the subservience of whites to Negroes. He claims to represent the views of those in his constituency so it could be argued that abolition clearly did not have the support of his constituents at least even if his mandate was limited to white voters only. However, candidates may also acknowledge that Calhoun was successful in his proposal which was only possible with the support of Senators from other states, including many from the North. South Carolina, which he represented, was strongly resistant to change as shown in subsequent events, notably the secession of the state in 1860. In addition, the memory of slave rebellion was acute in South Carolina after the uprising in Charleston in 1822 and the Nat Turner Rebellion in neighbouring Virginia in 1831 which were blamed by Southerners on abolitionist agitators.</p> <p>Sources D and E confirms that racism was a reason for opposition to abolition. Source E concedes that attitudes in both North and South were entrenched that the Negro would always be regarded as a slave and inferior to whites. Despite its sympathy for change it dismisses abolition as ‘twaddle’. Candidates should be able to comment on how typical this view was of opinion in the North. Cross reference to Source A and the mention of The Liberator would be one way of illustrating the existence of papers with a contrary viewpoint. Source D explicitly recognises racism in the opening sentence and whilst the author concedes that racial division was less in 1843 than ten years previously the fact that he says only ‘we begin to feel that we are on the same footing’ implies that there was a long way to go. The insecurity of fugitive slaves in the North and the ways in which Negroes were treated differently in the North might be mentioned. Garrison in Source A anticipates a struggle and even implies a clash with opponents. His methods were controversial and arguably counterproductive. In 1840 he formed the Liberal Party to fight the presidential election and help explain the split in the Anti-Slavery Society that year. Source B also indicates that there was considerable hostility to abolition in the town of Hartford at least. The numbers of agitators against abolition might be interpreted as reflective of substantial or limited opposition depending on the views of the candidate but the determination and strength of feeling of the opponents is not in doubt.</p>	

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
4(a)	<p>Yet, abolition did have considerable support. Source E advocates freedom for the slave by colonization though by the date of publication it was a largely discredited notion (only 10,000 slaves had been returned to Liberia by 1860). It is clear from Sources B and D that there was interest in abolition. Both authors refer to abolitionists who were not only active but also brave ('decent intelligent people' and 'a noble band of fearless women', according to Source B, and Quakers are singled out in Source D as well as 'a host of American friends'). Indeed, by 1838 the Anti-Slavery Society had 38,000 members most of them drawn from the educated, wealthy and religious with women prominent. This is indicated in Sources B and D explicitly and by implication given the contrasting reference to opponents as 'savages' and a 'mob'. The evidence is fairly reliable as in writing to his wife the author of Source B might have understated the danger he faced in order to allay her fears and if so it might underestimate the strength of opposition. Source D is even-handed in its assessment of opponents and supporters of abolition. Reference might be made to the experiences of other escaped slaves such as Frederick Douglass, to corroborate the evidence of Source D, who campaigned tirelessly for abolition in much the way that the author of Source B described. Even Source C provides evidence of support for abolition. Calhoun's appeal for a 'gag' on petitions to Congress was a reaction to the deluge of petitions asking Congress to abolish slavery similar to the huge quantities of abolition literature being mailed to southern residents. Even the impact of the rhetoric of Source A might be assessed on the audience both immediate and afar. There is scope to expand on the role of The Liberator again and the formation of the Anti-Slavery Society in 1833.</p> <p>Dictatorship and Democracy in Germany 1933-63.</p> <p>Study Sources A and B. Compare these Sources as evidence for the effectiveness of opposition to the Third Reich.</p> <p>CONTENT Both sources agree that opposition was not especially effective. However whilst A is very pessimistic on the ability of the SPD to oppose, citing their illegality, the denial of plans to associate and the prevalence of spies, the Gestapo in B does acknowledge some limited opposition success in the workplace and in workers' organisations in getting their message across. For example, the mumbling of a response to a Hitler salute. It also comments on SPD training, experience and cohesion. Nevertheless, neither make any reference to more serious opposition (strikes, risings, mass disturbance etc). Interestingly, the SOPADE report in A doesn't mention the KPD whereas the gestapo in B refers to both SPD and KPD commenting that the KPD were more effective in the factory itself than the SPD with a different tradition in both factory and workers' leisure organisations.</p>	[70]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
	<p>PROVENANCE</p> <p>Given their corroboration, both are valid pieces of evidence, coming as they do from two of the organisations pitted against each other, the Gestapo and an SPD agent. Perhaps inevitably the SPD agent on a personal level feels the inhibition of the block warden while the Gestapo, whose job it was to create a new totalitarian control and Volksgemeinschaft vision, feels the frustration of a 'word of mouth opposition'. Given this mutual frustration, both in practice concur. However, they are talking of different areas - the domestic sphere of the home in A, the factory (Dusseldorf) in B. Both are private reports, reflecting genuinely held opinion, with no motive to distort other than to give vent to a certain frustration of the effectiveness of each other's tactics.</p> <p>JUDGMENT</p> <p>Candidates might conclude that the evidence in B is better given its recognition of low level activity and its wider frame of reference, but it is possible to make a case for A on the grounds of the wider Nazi aim of indoctrination of the masses.</p>	

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
4(b)	<p>Study all the Sources.</p> <p>Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that the Gestapo and the other security services were able to control the German population <u>mainly</u> because they were ‘all seeing and all knowing’.</p> <p>Grouping: A, C and D seem to support the assertion. The impression given in both sources is that, directly or indirectly, the Gestapo were ‘everywhere’. However, whether D belongs in this group is more questionable Maria Kraus is a private citizen, not employed by the Gestapo It is quite likely that she bears a long standing personal grudge against Ilse Totzke and sees her denunciation as an opportunity to settle old scores. She might well have been acting on the Gestapo’s exhortation to denounce ‘undesirables, but this does not necessarily mean that the Gestapo themselves were ‘all seeing’ and ‘all knowing.’ The fact that this is wartime could well have a bearing since, naturally, ‘aliens’ were suspected far more.</p> <p>C also is from wartime. At face value it does look as if the Gestapo were omnipresent. However, the tone and content of the source might suggest that there was not enough Gestapo presence. The SD report is asking officials to be more vigilant, expanding their watchful presence into new areas. The last sentence is relevant here.</p> <p>E clearly suggests that there was very little physical Gestapo presence as shown by the figures given for Essen. It points out the heavy reliance on denunciations [for whatever reason] shown in D. The author gives other reasons for the feeling of being ‘watched over’. However it refers to a large army of “spies and informers”.</p> <p>Own knowledge: This is a central and mainstream aspect of Nazi Germany so candidates should have no problem in drawing on examples to support their evaluation. There is the contrast between the image and the reality. Candidates can offer judgements on how successful or unsuccessful the Gestapo was the implications of rule by fear and terror in a state with totalitarian aspirations. Did the feeling that they were constantly being spied upon cause them to ‘retreat into the private sphere’? Candidates might refer to the effectiveness or otherwise of the Gestapo and other security services. One can expect other means of controlling the population to be offered: eg, propaganda and indoctrination, control of the media, elements of consent etc..</p> <p>Evaluation: Relevant comments can be expected about the provenance of sources A-D. Good use of contextual knowledge can be used here, as can good cross referencing, for example D and E., B and C etc.</p> <p>There is no set conclusion, candidates can either agree with the assertion. Indeed, For example, sources C and D can be interpreted either way.</p>	[70]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
<p>5(a)</p>	<p>The USA and the Cold War in Asia 1945-75</p> <p>Study Sources C and D. Compare these Sources as evidence for the attitudes of the USA and the USSR towards intervention in Korea.</p> <p><u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources</u></p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source ‘as evidence for...’. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p> <p>The provenances and tones of the two Sources can be examined and contrasted. Both suggest the importance of the intervention of both Superpowers but there are significant differences. In C the approach is cautious but Stalin is prepared to help; there is a sense of being persuaded to that position, where he is ‘ready to help’. In D the author is clear that the USSR was indeed behind the invasion of the South and he argues that the USA has to act, citing several reasons, including the defence of Japan and the need to stop South Korea becoming a ‘Soviet puppet’. Both set out intervention as a decision area and see South Korea as an important regional issue.</p> <p>Comment on the provenances may include the nature of the authorship and the dates, with D being a reflection on events and decisions at the time. C is very much contemporaneous and reflects a decision at the very top, with D reflecting the response. Both can be seen as typical of attitudes and stances at that period of the Cold War.</p> <p>Study all the Sources.</p> <p>Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that the Korean War was made possible <u>only</u> because of the Cold War rivalry between the USA and the USSR.</p> <p><u>Focus: Judgement in context based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</u></p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, including any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set answer is expected.</p>	<p>[30]</p>
<p>5(b)</p>		

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
	<p>The focus of the question is the argument and counter-argument around the key causes of the Korean War. The Sources offer a variety of useful points, explicitly or implicitly. They can be grouped accordingly. Source E provides an effective overview, raising several possible or likely causes, and Sources A on North Korean help, B on their appeal for Soviet help, and C on the firming-up of that support, all are valuable in answering the question. Source D focuses on the US defence of South Korea once attacked, while Source E does mention the ambitions of Kim Il Sung in the North and Syngman Rhee in the South. Their rivalries are a key focus. But some argue that the support of the USSR and China was a decisive factor. Sources C and D are central to the view that USSR support was crucial. Source A makes no mention of the USSR while Source B is altogether very cautious about support for North Korea and Source E provides several other factors and views, effectively summarising the different opinions about the origins of the Korean War. Own knowledge can supply support here: the roles of China and the USSR and the view that Stalin acted once he thought Mao had backed North Korean action; also, the view that the South Korean governments had provoked Northern aggression, quite possibly to fit its own agenda (the 'rollback' thinking). The personal roles and even agendas of the Presidents of the North and South might be examined. Stalin's attitude was indeed one of caution, even reservation (as in B), but altered within a year (as in C). The caution expressed by the North Korean regime – no action without Soviet backing – might be assessed. Source D expresses the American view of the origins of the War: North Korean aggression based on Soviet support; it puts the War into a wider context with the reference to the need to defend Japan. C and D can be linked and assessed for viewpoints. Source A can be used with own knowledge for the view that the North Koreans believed they were pursuing a true civil war and would be supported by extensive networks in the South (in fact, such had been crushed by late 1949). Candidates could cite the US arguments advanced in 1950, not least in the forum of the UN, about Soviet-backed aggression against the South, while also citing the counter-views put forward at the time by North Korea, the USSR and China, seeing the South Korean regime at fault and viewing the War as a liberation struggle. Again, Source E usefully surveys several causes without prioritising such. Better answers will see links but also argue and counter-argue from the grouped Sources and consider any factors omitted or mentioned briefly.</p>	[70]

Grade Thresholds

Advanced GCE History H106 H506
January 2009 Examination Series

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
F961	Raw	100	75	65	55	46	37	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
F962	Raw	100	75	65	55	46	37	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
F963	Raw	100	74	65	56	47	39	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
F964	Raw	100	74	65	56	47	39	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see:
http://www.ocr.org.uk/learners/ums_results.html

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

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

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2009

