

**Advanced GCE**  
**GCE HISTORY B**  
Unit F985 *Historical Controversies - British History*

## F985 QP

**Specimen Paper**

Morning/Afternoon

Time: 3 hours

Additional Materials: Answer Booklet



### INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

Write your name, Centre number and candidate number in the spaces provided on the answer book. Write your answers on the separate answer book provided.

This paper contains questions on the following 4 Study Topics:

- The debate over the Impact of the Norman Conquest 1066-1216
- The debate over Britain's mid-17th Century Crises 1629-89
- Different interpretations of British Imperialism 1850–c.1950
- The debate over British appeasement in the 1930s

Answer **both sub-questions** from **one** option.

### INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES

- Each question is marked out of **30**.
- The number of marks is given in brackets [ ] at the end of each question or sub-question.
- You should write in continuous prose and are reminded of the need for clear and accurate writing, including structure and argument, grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- The time permitted allows for reading the Extracts in the one Option you have studied.
- In answering these questions, you are expected to use your knowledge of the topic to help you understand and interpret the Extracts as well as to inform your answers.
- **You may refer to your class notes and textbooks during the examination.**

### ADVICE TO CANDIDATES

- Read each question carefully and make sure you know what you have to do before starting your answer.

This document consists of **9** printed pages and **3** blank pages.

1 The debate over the impact of the Norman Conquest 1066-1216

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

The Victorian historians could not escape the bias of their times, when British supremacy in the world was attributed to the workings of nationalism and democracy. Therefore, fully accepting the current perverse historical doctrine that the past could only be understood in the light of the present, they became preoccupied with tracing modern principles backwards. As a result they were led to praise the Anglo-Saxon age, in which they detected the seeds of all later freedom, and contended that the incursions of the Normans did no more than put fresh life into the old institutions and intrude a foreign element which was absorbed and assimilated.

The new interpretation of the Norman Conquest placed a great emphasis upon the influence of continental innovations. This new approach most regrettably, in order to counterbalance the previous excessive praise for what had been accomplished before 1066 and in order to magnify the part played by the Normans in the making of the English nation, dwelt at length upon the shortcomings and faults of the Old English state. Just as elaborate theories of the institutional weakness of the Old English monarchy were constructed from no better evidence than the character of the Confessor. The evolutionist conception was thus displaced by that of cataclysmic change, and the Conquest came to be openly regarded as a revolution which signalled the real starting-point in the unbroken development of England. Extreme opinions are superficial opinions and, plausible as this explanation of events may appear to be, it dissolves completely when removed from the realm of theory and submitted to the acid test of fact; it has, indeed, less of the essential truth in it than the account of the Victorian historians.

The work of the Norman conquerors of England can nearly all be traced to the operation of two factors, Norman monarchy and Norman feudalism. After 1066 the crucial point in development is the monarchy from which the institutions of the past were to continue to derive their origin. The change made in 1066 was severely practical; it placed a stronger emphasis upon the part that kingship should play in the routine of government.

So in conclusion it must be stressed that the coming of the Normans was not 'the beginning of English history'. The essential truth is contained in the words of Freeman: 'William conquered neither to destroy nor to found but to continue.' To appreciate the full importance of what happened next we must look before as well as after 'the thin red line of the Conquest'. Only through a true interpretation of both the Anglo-Saxon and the Anglo-Norman ages can the influence of the Normans be faithfully traced. The interaction and complex blending of two different systems of government, two different structures of society, had remodelled them all and produced a distinctive version.

- (a) What can you learn from these extracts about the interpretation, approaches and methods of the historian. Refer to the extract and your knowledge to explain your answer. **[30]**
- (b) When studying post-conquest England some historians have used a top-down approach while others have concentrated on studying the lives of ordinary people.

What are the advantages and disadvantages of these two approaches. **[30]**

SPECIMEN

## 2 The debate over Britain's 17th Century Crises 1629-89

**Read the following extracts about economic change in the mid-seventeenth century, and then answer the questions that follow.**

Historians are coming more and more to recognise the decisive significance of the 1640s and 1650s in the economic history of England. Restrictions which had hampered the growth of capitalist economic activity were removed, never to be restored. After 1640, employers and entrepreneurs were freed from government regulation and control in various ways. Attempts to supervise the quality of manufactures and to fix prices were abandoned; industrial monopolies were abolished. Greater freedom was established in relations between employers and workmen. The government stopped trying to regulate wage rates, to compel employers to keep their employees at work in time of slump. Taxation became regular, if heavy, and (except under Army rule) it was controlled by representatives of the taxpayers. Henceforth employers were limited in expanding or contracting their businesses solely by economic considerations. 'The relation between masters and servants,' wrote the Earl of Clarendon nostalgically, was 'dissolved by the Parliament, that their army might be increased by the apprentices against their masters' consent.' The Act of 1563, insisting on a seven-year period of apprenticeship, was not enforced. The common law, so favourable to absolute property rights, triumphed over the prerogative courts.

During these decades crown lands and rents were sold to the value of nearly £2 million. The capital value of Church lands sold is estimated at nearly £2 million. The lands of more than 700 Royalists were confiscated and sold, for over £1.25 million. It was an upheaval comparable with the dissolution of the monasteries under Henry VIII in the 1530s. Purchasers of the confiscated lands were anxious to secure quick returns. Those of the tenants who could not produce written evidence of their titles were liable to eviction. The land transfers must have had the effect of disrupting traditional relationships between landlord and tenant, of replacing them by purely monetary relations.

In trade and industry the revolutionary decades were no less decisive. Before 1640 many wage labourers could not legally depart from their place of work without a testimonial. Between the breakdown of royal government and the establishment of new and more drastic restrictions by the Act of Settlement in 1662, there was a greater period of mobility. The period was in general one of great mobility. The marches of armies were succeeded by those of demobilised soldiers seeking work and of itinerant Quakers seeking the salvation of souls. The self-contained units of English society broke down at all levels. The Statute of Apprentices, which excluded three-quarters of the rural population from the clothing industry, was no longer enforced. After 1660 unemployment declined. Men ceased to think of England as overpopulated.

The Long Parliament abolished industrial monopolies. It did not abolish the right of merchants to form privileged trading companies to which access was restricted. But after 1647 the companies' privileges came increasingly under attack. The Levellers made themselves the spearhead of this attack, demanding freedom from all restrictions on competitive production and sale, and the right of the small producer to dispense with the middleman, who took much of the profit. This was in effect a call for state intervention on behalf of small master craftsmen against the great merchant specialists as well as against local and monopoly privileges.

**(a)** What can you learn from these extracts about the interpretations, approaches and methods of this historian? Refer to the extract and your knowledge to explain your answer.

**[30]**

**(b)** Some historians have focused on lower class radicalism in their study of the mid-seventeenth century. Explain how this has added to our understanding of the mid-seventeenth century crisis. Has this approach any disadvantages or shortcomings?

**[30]**

SPECIMEN

**[Turn over**

### 3 Different interpretations of British Imperialism 1850-1950

**Read the following extracts about economic change in the mid-seventeenth century, and then answer the questions that follow.**

It is open to Imperialists to argue thus: 'We must have markets for our growing manufactures, we must have new outlets for the investment of our surplus capital and for the energies of the adventurous surplus of our population: such expansion is a necessity of life to a nation with our great and growing powers of production. An ever larger share of our population is devoted to the manufactures and commerce of towns, and is thus dependent for life and work upon food and raw materials from foreign lands. In order to buy and pay for these things we must sell our goods abroad. During the first three-quarters of the nineteenth century we could do so without difficulty by a natural expansion of commerce with continental nations and our colonies, all of which were far behind us in the main arts of manufacture and the carrying trades. So long as England held a virtual monopoly of the world markets for certain important classes of manufactured goods, Imperialism was unnecessary.

After 1870 this supremacy was greatly impaired: other nations advanced with great rapidity and their competition made it more and more difficult to dispose of the full surplus of our manufactures at a profit. The encroachments made by these nations upon our old markets, even in our own possessions, made it most urgent that we should take energetic means to secure new markets. These new markets had to lie in undeveloped countries, chiefly in the tropics, where vast populations lived capable of growing economic needs which our manufacturers and merchants could supply. Our rivals were seizing and annexing territories for similar purposes, and when they had annexed them closed them to our trade. The diplomacy and the arms of Great Britain had to be used in order to compel the owners of the new markets to deal with us: and experience showed that the safest means of securing and developing such markets is by establishing 'protectorates' or by annexation.'

It was this sudden demand for foreign markets for manufactures and for investments which was avowedly responsible for the adoption of Imperialism as a political policy. They needed Imperialism because they desired to use the public resources of their country to find profitable employment for their capital which otherwise would be superfluous.

The process, we may be told, is inevitable, and so it seems upon a superficial inspection. Everywhere appear excessive powers of production, excessive capital in search of investment. It is admitted by all business men that the growth of the powers of production in their country exceeds the growth in consumption, that more goods can be produced than can be sold at a profit, and that more capital exists than can find remunerative investment.

It is this economic condition of affairs that forms the taproot of Imperialism. If the consuming public in this country raised its standard of consumption to keep pace with every rise of productive powers, there could be no excess of goods or capital clamorous to use Imperialism in order to find markets.

The driving forces of class interest which stimulate and support this false economy we have explained. No remedy will serve which permits the future operation of these forces. It is idle to attack Imperialism or Militarism as political expedients or policies unless the axe is laid at the economic root of the tree, and the classes for whose interest Imperialism works are shorn of the surplus revenues which seek this outlet.

- (a) What can you learn for these extracts about the interpretations, approaches and methods of this historian? Refer to the extract and your knowledge to explain your answer. [30]
- (b) Some historians have recently focused on the experiences of indigenous peoples in the Empire including women. What are the advantages and disadvantages of this approach? [30]

SPECIMEN

4 The debate over British appeasement in the 1930s

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

Those who supported appeasement after October, 1938 did so for two reasons. Munich 'bought a year of peace, in which to rearm. It brought 'a united nation' into war, by showing Hitler's wickedness beyond doubt. Both these reasons were put forward by the Government, and accepted by many who could not check them. Both were false.

If a year had been gained in which Chamberlain could have strengthened Britain's defences and equipped the country for an offensive war, there should be evidence of growing strength, growing effort, and growing unity. But while some members of the government sought to use the 'bought' year, others did not.

Chamberlain and his advisers did not go to Munich because they needed an extra year before they could fight. They did not use the year to arouse national enthusiasm for a just war. The aim of appeasement was to avoid war, not to enter war united. Appeasement was a looking forward to better times, not to worse. Even after the German occupation of Prague, Chamberlain and those closest to him hoped that better times would come, and that Anglo-German relations would improve.

Much of our material comes from the Documents on British Foreign Policy, 1919-1939. These documents, published after the war, contain the letters and telegrams which the Foreign Secretary sent to his Ambassadors abroad, and the replies and reports which they sent home. This publication is one of the most remarkable windfalls that has come into the hands of the historian. It gives a clear and detailed picture of the working of the Foreign Office day by day, often hour by hour.

Appeasers ignored the Nazi record, and made Anglo-German friendship seem more capable of successful evolution than the record gave reason to suggest. Many were revolted by stories of Nazi brutality. But those who considered Anglo-German friendship a vital interest were willing to close their eyes to excesses.

A sense of guilt drove the appeasers into a one-sided relationship with Germany, in which Germany was always to be given the benefit of the doubt. Hitler's outburst were not treated as the ravings of a wicked man; they were the understandable complaints of a man who had been wronged. He was a man who had been a wild revolutionary, but now, in power, he had surely acquired the responsibility that comes with power. He was older now, and had long mixed with statesmen. With age and wise companions, there is always maturity and moderation.

Appeasement resulted from mental laziness, not from political immorality.

- (a) What can you learn from these extracts about the interpretations, approaches and methods of this historian? Refer to the extract and to your knowledge to support your answer. **[30]**
- (b) Some historians have focused on structural factors such as the constraints that limited the British government's choices in the 1930s. Explain how this has contributed to our understanding of Appeasement. Has this approach any disadvantages or shortcomings? **[30]**

**Total Paper [60]**

### Copyright Acknowledgements:

#### Sources

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

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

© OCR 2007

SPECIMEN

SPECIMEN

SPECIMEN

**Specimen Mark Scheme**

The maximum mark for this paper is **60**.

SPECIMEN

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
<b>The debate over the impact of the Norman Conquest 1066-1216</b>		
1(a)	<p><b>What can you learn from these extracts about the interpretation, approaches and methods of the historian. Refer to the extract and your knowledge to explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Knowledge and understanding</b>  Knowledge and understanding of monarchy, barons, feudalism, social structure, culture immediately before and after 1066 demonstrated and used to support the answer. Knowledge and understanding of the extent of the changes that took place.</p> <p><b>Knowledge and understanding of the different views of historians about the change/continuity debate over 1066 and of the different approaches, evidence and arguments used by the historians. Knowledge and understanding of why these different interpretations have been produced.</b></p> <p><b>Understanding of interpretations</b>  Key points - argues that post-conquest England demonstrates both continuity and change. The combination of English and Norman produced something new that was made up of components of both. Argues that extreme views that stress continuity to the exclusion of change, and change to the exclusion of continuity, are wrong. Thus an understanding of what happened after 1066 must depend on a proper understanding of both societies before 1066. Argues that monarchy and feudalism were the most important features of post-conquest England and that everything was shaped by them.</p> <p><b>Understanding of approaches/methods</b>  An empirical approach and a rejection of theories is encouraged. There is a reliance on 'facts' and the need to study societies in detail. Better answers should explain empiricism as a historical method and develop the explanation by reference to the extracts. Answers should explain that the author rejects a 'Whig' approach to history where historians see the past inevitably working towards the present. The author argues that Victorian historians did this. They saw the freedoms and democracy of the nineteenth century evolving in a steady line of development from the Anglo-Saxons. Is also critical of those who over-reacted to the Victorians and saw 1066 as a time of great change. Better candidates might detect a hint of history from top down when the historian states that the two crucial factors were monarchy and feudalism.</p>	<b>[30]</b>

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
<b>The debate over the impact of the Norman Conquest 1066-1216</b>		
1(b)	<p><b>When studying post-conquest England some historians have used a top-down approach while others have concentrated on studying the lives of ordinary people. What are the advantages and disadvantages of these two approaches?</b></p> <p><b>Knowledge and understanding</b>            Knowledge and understanding of English monarchy, government, church, society and everyday life before and after the Conquest.            Knowledge and understanding of the evidence relating to each approach particularly in relation to the extent of change after 1066.</p> <p><b>Understanding of approaches/methods</b>            Explanations could include: why some historians have focused on history from above - this might include reference to the availability of sources, the types of sources used, a belief in the significance of human agency especially of great men; why some historians have focused on history from below - this might include the belief that the lives of ordinary people were just as important as those in power, the idea of redressing the balance because this area of history had been traditionally ignored, the belief in structural factors. The different types of sources used, the different questions asked. Better answers will explicitly compare these two approaches.</p> <p><b>Evaluation of approaches/methods</b>            Explanations could include: what has been learned from each approach that could not be learned from the other approach, the idea that the two approaches are not in conflict but complement each other providing a richer picture. History from above usually presents a narrative of rapid change while history from below shows more continuity - so they provide different perspectives on the debate and provide different answers. One emphasises human agency, the other broader social and economic factors.</p>	<b>[30]</b>

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
<b>Britain's mid-17<sup>th</sup> Century Crises</b>		
2(a)	<p><b>What can you learn from these extracts about the interpretations, approaches and methods of this historian? Refer to the extract and your knowledge to explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>  Knowledge and understanding of economic relations between employers and their employees, the constraints placed on these relations by legislation and the way in which these and other restrictive practices exercised by craft and merchant guilds and companies hindered the development of a mercantile/capitalist economy should be demonstrated and used to support the answer. Knowledge and understanding of the relevant approaches to studying the mid-seventeenth century should be demonstrated and used to support the answer e.g. the differences between focus on economic changes, especially those associated with economic relationships, and the distribution and control of wealth, as demonstrated in this extract, and constitutional changes.</p> <p><b>Understanding of interpretations</b>  Key points – the most significant impact of the mid-seventeenth century crises was on the distribution and wealth, and the control over relations between the dominant economic class and the workers. This enabled Britain to develop a capitalist economic system in a way that had previously been restricted by the persistence of the feudal relationships between rulers and ruled. In the mid-seventeenth century these were swept away, allowing a capitalist economy to develop. The explanation should be supported by clear references to the extract.</p> <p><b>Understanding of approaches/methods</b>  This extract clearly employs a Marxist approach, emphasising the role of economic structures in determining other characteristics of society. This approach focuses on identifying the stage of economic growth of the society as demonstrated by the dominant methods of production and who controlled the means of production. In this case the historian is focusing on changes that mark Britain's break with its feudal past, with its largely agrarian economy, land-based wealth, and feudal relationships between rulers and ruled incorporating a paternalistic element, to a capitalist economy in which the amount of money (capital) held determined both economic and political power and social relationships depended on the control exercised by the dominant class over the lives of the workers. The explanation should be supported by clear references to the extract. Better answers should explain how these approaches have led to what is written in the extract, in particular the overall conclusion of the historian i.e. how far does the approach influence the conclusion that has been reached.</p> <p>The explanation could be developed by comparing this approach to other approaches e.g. explaining a constitutional approach focusing on the changes in the relative power of different institutions in government such as monarchy and parliament. Further knowledge and understanding of the approaches adopted in the extract could be used as additional support.</p>	<b>[30]</b>

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
<b>Britain's mid-17<sup>th</sup> Century Crises</b>		
2(b)	<p><b>Some historians have focused on lower class radicalism in their study of the mid-seventeenth century. Explain how this has added to our understanding of the mid-seventeenth century crisis. Has this approach any disadvantages or shortcomings?</b></p> <p><b>Knowledge and understanding</b>            Knowledge and understanding of the evidence relating to the 'history from below' approach to investigating and explaining the significance of changes in the mid-seventeenth century. Knowledge and understanding of radical groups such as Levellers, Diggers and Quakers, their origins, ideas and impact on events and changes; their longer term significance.</p> <p><b>Understanding of approaches/methods</b>            Explanations could include: why historians have investigated 'history from below' in preference to/as well as 'history from above'; the idea that history was what was experienced by people at the time and that the investigation of the contribution of ordinary people has equal validity to that of the rulers. The idea of redressing the balance so that the history written does not only concern those who obviously benefited from the events at the centre of government. Higher level responses should contrast the 'top down'/'bottom up' approaches in order to inform their understanding.</p> <p><b>Evaluation of approaches/methods</b>            Evaluations could include what has been learned about the ideas of ordinary people and what this has contributed to our understanding of the development of political ideas about democracy, rights and freedoms and religious ideas and practices regarding conformity, dissent and toleration. Candidates might consider the methodology of investigating those who necessarily left relatively few written records and the problems associated with drawing conclusions from what is extant e.g. the debate about the Ranters. Candidates might also consider the problems of establishing a history of radicalism such as the validity of links drawn between earlier, mid-17<sup>th</sup> century, and later radicals.</p>	<b>[30]</b>

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
<b>Different interpretations of British Imperialism 1850-1950</b>		
3(a)	<p><b>What can you learn for these extracts about the interpretations, approaches and methods of this historian? Refer to the extract and your knowledge to explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Knowledge and understanding</b>            Knowledge and understanding of the main features of British Imperialism in the second half of the nineteenth century particularly the part played by economic factors.            Knowledge and understanding of different explanations of British Imperialism in the second half of the nineteenth century particularly the Marxist interpretation. Knowledge and understanding of why these different interpretations have been produced.</p> <p><b>Understanding of interpretations</b>            Key points - this is a Marxist interpretation of imperialism based on the 'surplus capitol' theory of expansion. When domestic industry produced more capital than could be profitably invested in the domestic economy, financiers sought overseas outlets for their money. With competition from other countries new markets had to be found abroad and these markets had to be protected by Britain. This led to imperialism. Capitalists claim that this is inevitable. It isn't. If there was more economic equality in Britain it would not be necessary.</p> <p><b>Understanding of approaches/methods</b>            The author is providing an explanation based on Marxist ideas. Some explanation is provided of these ideas. The approach of the author is seeing the root cause of imperialism as being metropolitan economic forces in Britain. Better candidates might point out that has been a return to economic explanations but in a different guise ie 'gentlemanly capitalists'. Candidates might explain the many aspects that this intepretation fails to account for in its explanation of imperialism.</p>	<b>[30]</b>

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
<b>Different interpretations of British Imperialism 1850-1950</b>		
3(b)	<p><b>Some historians have recently focused on the experiences of indigenous peoples in the Empire including women. What are the advantages and disadvantages of this approach?</b></p> <p><b>Knowledge and understanding</b>  Knowledge and understanding of the impact of imperialism on indigenous peoples and their varied experiences. Knowledge and understanding of the role indigenous peoples played in the Empire and in struggles for independence. Knowledge and understanding of attitudes towards indigenous peoples.  Knowledge and understanding of the evidence available about the experiences of indigenous peoples.</p> <p><b>Understanding of approaches/methods</b>  Explanations could include: coverage of indigenous peoples, or lack of it, by earlier historians of the Empire, why historians, particularly nationalist historians have recently paid indigenous peoples more attention. The belief that marginalised peoples have a story of their own to be told. The belief that narratives should be produced by historians from countries that were part of the Empire and not just by western historians. The impact that the ending of empire, and the achievement of independence, has had on the way historians write about indigenous peoples. The ways in which this approach has influenced the way that empire and the achievement of independencies now presented by historians.</p> <p><b>Evaluation of approaches/methods</b>  Explanations could include: what has been learned from this approach that could not be learned from other approaches, the new questions that have been asked and the new perspectives on empire that have been discovered. The way that this approach has changed the way in which empire is now written about. The discovery of marginalised communities. The major criticisms of this approach e.g. has it led to subjective accounts?</p>	<b>[30]</b>

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
<b>Appeasement in British Foreign Policy 1920s-1939</b>		
4(a)	<p><b>What can you learn from these extracts about the interpretations, approaches and methods of this historian? Refer to the extract and to your knowledge to support your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>  Knowledge and understanding of Hitler's rise to power, his ideas and beliefs, his foreign policy during the 1930s, reactions to this policy by Britain and the general international situation in the 1930s should be demonstrated and used to support the answer.  Knowledge and understanding of the relevant approaches to studying appeasement should be demonstrated and used to support the answer e.g. the differences between placing the emphasis on human agency and placing it on structures. Other examples of these approaches could be explained.</p> <p><b>Understanding of interpretations</b>  Key points of this interpretation - the appeasers were not bad men but they completely misunderstood Hitler and his policies. This is inexcusable because the evidence was there to be seen. Their actions are explained by their desire to keep Germany on their side (fear of communism). They wasted the time gained by not building up Britain's armed forces because they refused to accept the likelihood of war. The explanation should be supported by clear references to the extract</p> <p><b>Understanding of approaches/methods</b>  This approach is internationalist, placing the emphasis on human agency in two ways - (i) it is assumed that Hitler had a long term plan, and (ii) the appeasers were a few men who had freedom of action but made misjudgements. Particular importance is placed on newly released documents that show the government was being warned about Hitler. The explanation should be supported by clear references to the extract. Better answers should explain how these approaches have led to what is written in the extract, in particular the overall conclusion of the historian i.e. how far does the approach influence the conclusion that has been reached.  The explanation could be developed by comparing this approach to other approaches e.g. considering how far the government actually had any freedom of action. Further knowledge and understanding of the approaches adopted in the extract could be used as additional support.</p>	<b>[30]</b>

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
<b>Appeasement in British Foreign Policy 1920s-1939</b>		
4(b)	<p><b>Some historians have focused on structural factors such as the constraints that limited the British government's choices in the 1930s. Explain how this has contributed to our understanding of Appeasement. Has this approach any disadvantages or shortcomings?</b></p> <p><b>Knowledge and understanding</b>  Knowledge and understanding of the evidence relating to explanations of appeasement that focus on structural issues. Knowledge of the international situation in the 1930s, Britain's international position, the strength of Britain's armed forces, factors within Britain such as public opinion. Attitudes at the time towards Germany, the Treaty of Versailles and the Soviet Union.</p> <p><b>Understanding of approaches/methods</b>  Explanations could include: why there is more of a focus structures (reference to general trends in history), the nature of this approach and how it relates to explaining appeasement. The impact of the evidence (government documents showing perception of the government at the time and its concern about other factors such as public opinion).</p> <p><b>Evaluation of approaches/methods</b>  Explanations could include: examples of how a structuralist approach has contributed to our understanding of appeasement e.g. the government did not have complete freedom of action; examples of criticisms of this approach and of some of the conclusions; the possible bias of the historians, the limitations of this approach and why other approaches are still important e.g. recent emphasis on Chamberlain's personal responsibility.</p>	[30]
<b>Paper Total</b>		<b>[60]</b>

Copyright Acknowledgements:

Sources

**The debate over the Impact of the Norman Conquest 1066-1213**

G O Sayles 'The Medieval Foundations of England', pp. 212-8, 277. 1948.

**The debate over Britain's mid-17th Century Crises 1629-89**

Christopher Hill, The Century of Revolution, Taylor and Francis 1603-1714. ISBN 0 442 30678 4. Published in 1961.

**Different interpretations of British Imperialism 1850-1950**

*J A Hobson 'Imperialism: a study', 1902.*

**The debate over British appeasement in the 1930s**

Appeasement - Martin Gilbert and Richard Gott, The Appeasers, Weidenfled and Nicolson, 1963, pages xii - xiii, 9

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

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

© OCR 2007

SPECIMEN

BLANK PAGE

SPECIMEN