

Coursework Guidance

GCE History A

OCR Advanced Subsidiary GCE in History A **H106**

OCR Advanced GCE in History A **H506**

Last updated : 5 June 2009

This Coursework Guidance is designed to accompany the OCR Advanced Subsidiary GCE and Advanced GCE specification in History A for teaching from September 2008.

Contents

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 1 | Introduction | 3 |
| 2 | Summary of Unit Content | 4 |
| | <i>Unit F965: Historical Interpretations and Investigations</i> | 4 |
| 3 | Coursework Guidance | 6 |
| | <i>Unit F965: Historical Interpretations and Investigations</i> | 6 |
| 4 | Specific Guidance: Unit F965: Historical Interpretations and Investigations | 18 |
| | <i>The Age of Justinian</i> | 19 |
| | <i>The Reign of Charlemagne 768 –814</i> | 21 |
| | <i>Alfred the Great 871-899</i> | 24 |
| | <i>The Reign of King John 1199-1215</i> | 26 |
| | <i>The Wars of the Roses, 1450-1485</i> | 28 |
| | <i>Cromwell 1599–1658</i> | 35 |
| | <i>Resources (including texts that may be used in the three Interpretation questions)</i> | 37 |
| | <i>Peter the Great 1689–1725</i> | 38 |
| | <i>Louis XIV 1661–1715</i> | 40 |
| | <i>British India 1784-1878</i> | 43 |
| | <i>Napoleon I 1795–1815</i> | 45 |
| | <i>Gladstone and Disraeli 1865-1886</i> | 47 |
| | <i>Bismarck and German Unification 1815-1871</i> | 49 |
| | <i>Russian Revolutions 1894-1924</i> | 51 |
| | <i>America between the Wars 1918-1941</i> | 54 |
| | <i>The Causes of World War II</i> | 56 |
| | <i>The Cold War 1941-1956</i> | 58 |
| 5 | How to use the Markschemes | 68 |
| 6 | Mark Schemes | 71 |
| 7 | Coursework Administration/Regulations | 76 |
| | <i>Supervision and Authentication</i> | 76 |
| | <i>Submitting marks to OCR</i> | 76 |
| | <i>Standardisation and Moderation</i> | 76 |
| | <i>Minimum Coursework Required</i> | 76 |
| 8 | Resources | 77 |
| | <i>Unit F965: Historical Interpretations and Investigations</i> | 77 |
| 9 | FAQs | 78 |

1 Introduction

The new structure of assessment at Advanced level has been introduced for teaching from September 2008. The specifications are designed to provide candidates with an introduction to History A.

These specifications are set out in the form of units. Each teaching unit is assessed by its associated unit of assessment. Guidance notes are provided with these specifications to assist teachers in understanding the detail necessary for each unit.

It is important to make the point that the Teacher Support plays a secondary role to the Specification itself. The Specification is the document on which assessment is based and specifies what content and skills need to be covered in delivering the course. At all times, therefore, this teacher support should be read in conjunction with the Specification. If clarification on a particular point is sought then that clarification should be found in the Specification itself.

OCR recognises that the teaching of this qualification will vary greatly from school to school and from teacher to teacher. With that in mind, this Teacher Guide/Notes for Guidance is offered as guidance but will be subject to modifications by the individual teacher.

2 Summary of Unit Content

Unit F965: *Historical Interpretations and Investigations*

Interpretations

One piece of work up to 2,000 words long, based on the examination of a number of historians' interpretations in the context of the candidate's knowledge of the area of debate. All candidates in a centre may study the same area of debate. Interpretations tasks are set by OCR on the topics listed below.

Further information about the content of two of these topics can be found in section 4 – Specific Content.

- The Age of Justinian
- The Reign of Charlemagne 768-814
- Alfred the Great 871-899
- The Reign of King John 1199-1215
- The Wars of the Roses 1450-1485
- Phillip II of Spain 1556-1598
- Elizabeth I 1558-1603
- Cromwell 1599-1658
- Peter the Great 1689-1725
- Louis XIV 1661-1715
- British India 1784–1878
- Napoleon I 1795-1815
- Gladstone and Disraeli 1865-1886
- Bismarck and German Unification 1815-71
- Russian Revolutions 1894-1924
- America between the Wars 1918-41
- The Causes of the World War II 1918-41
- The Cold War 1941-56
- The War in Vietnam 1955-1975
- The Development of Rights for Women in Great Britain 1867-1918
- Nazi Germany 1933-1945
- Britain under Margaret Thatcher 1979-1990

The Interpretations element requires candidates to comprehend, analyse and evaluate the ways in which the past has been interpreted in debates between historians. This may be historiographically based or it may reflect different emphases and approaches by different historians, some of whom may have been writing in widely different periods. The passages on which the questions are based are taken from the work of recognised historians and are long enough to provide plenty of opportunity for candidates to assess and evaluate the arguments using their analytical skills and their knowledge of the topic. They can show that they can discriminate between different interpretations to reach a supported judgement on the issue into which they are making their enquiry. Candidates build on and develop the skills used in the Historical Enquiries undertaken in their AS studies. They have the opportunity to develop their arguments to sophisticated levels given the nature of the questions.

Investigations

One piece of work up to 2,000 words long, comprising a personal investigation by the candidate. This will be based on a problem or issue about which there is a variety of views.

The Investigations element gives candidates some choice over the topic to be investigated as long as they do not choose topics which they have already studied at AS or which they are studying for the Themes Unit. Candidates will choose either an approved OCR Investigation question related to the topic selected for their Interpretation element, or they will adapt a generic OCR question so that they can study a particular area of personal interest.

- The role of the individual in History
- Causation

-
- Consequences
 - Military History
 - Economic History
 - Cultural and Intellectual History
 - The nature of regimes or societies
 - Responsibility
 - Local History

Candidates need to make a choice which ensures their studies for this unit are coherent. Not all candidates from the same centre may answer the same Investigation question. OCR requires centres to inform coursework moderators which topics candidates have studied for other units, to ensure these provisions are met.

The investigation is problem-based and questions conform to this requirement. They focus on recognised historical debates or on issues where different viewpoints can be put forward and candidates can reach an argued conclusion based on analysis in relation to the historical context. There are appropriate resources for the topics so that all candidates can have access to them. The nature of the questions means that candidates will be appropriately challenged in writing their answers.

3 Coursework Guidance

Unit F965: Historical Interpretations and Investigations

Prohibited Combinations of Units

Candidates may choose to study any of the set topics which are summarised on page 12 of the specification. The key issues are given in the more detailed list on pages 67-72. There will be three sets of passages set for each topic.

Centres should be aware that there must not be overlap with other units. Teachers might be wise to select the Theme they wish to study and then ensure that the Interpretation and Investigation do not overlap. Guidance on routes through the different topics at AS and A2 is given in the Specification on pages 14-17. However centres are completely free to choose whatever combinations they wish provided there is no overlap.

The following table indicates **prohibited** combinations at both AS and A2 **for the Interpretations and Investigations paper only**. For example, it would not be acceptable to study Philip II for Interpretations or Investigations and to have studied it at AS as a period study. However, the Age of Justinian could be studied with any combination of other AS and A2 papers.

| Interpretation and Investigation | AS Period Study | AS Enquiry | A2 Theme |
|----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| The Age of Justinian | | | |
| The Reign of Charlemagne 768-814 | | | |
| Alfred the Great 871-899 | | | |
| The Reign of King John 1199-1215 | | | English Government and the Church 1066-1216 |
| The Wars of the Roses 1450-1485 | Lancastrians, Yorkists and Tudors 1450-1509 | | |
| Philip II of Spain 1557-1598 | Philip II, Spain and the Netherlands 1556-1609 | | |
| Elizabeth I 1558-1603 | England Under Elizabeth 1558-1603 | | Rebellion under the Tudors 1485-1603 |
| Cromwell 1599-1658 | | The English Civil War and the Interregnum | |
| Peter the Great 1689-1725 | | | |
| Louis XIV 1661-1715 | | | The Ascendancy of France 1610-1715 |
| British India 1784–1878 | | | |
| Napoleon I 1795-1815 | Napoleon, France and Europe 1795-1815 | | The Changing Nature of Warfare 1792-1945 |
| Gladstone and Disraeli 1865-1886 | Foreign and Imperial Policies 1856-1914 Liberals and Conservatives 1846-1895 | The Age of Gladstone and Disraeli 1865-1886 | Britain and Ireland 1798-1921; The Development of Democracy in Britain 1868-1997 |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| Bismarck and German Unification 1815-71 | | The Challenge of German Nationalism 1789-1919 |
| Russian Revolutions 1894-1924 | From Autocracy to Communism Russia 1894-1941 | Russia and Its Rulers 1855-1964 |
| America between the Wars 1918-41 | | |
| The Causes of World War II | Peace and war; International Relations c.1890-1941 | Churchill 1920-1945 |
| The Cold War 1941-56 | The Cold War in Europe from 1945 to the 1990s | |
| The War in Vietnam 1955-1975 | | The US and the Cold War in Asia 1945-1975 |
| The development of rights for women in Great Britain 1867-1918 | | The Development of Democracy in Britain 1868-1997 |
| Nazi Germany 1933-1945 | Democracy and Dictatorship in Germany 1919-63 | Dictatorship and Democracy in Germany 1933-1963 |
| Britain under Margaret Thatcher 1979-1990 | Post-War Britain 1951-1994 | |

NB. When an investigation is chosen on the same theme as Interpretation, this table should show clearly when there might be unacceptable overlap. When an investigation is chosen that links with the Interpretation but is based on a different period or subject, then it is the responsibility of the teacher/lecturer to ensure that there is no overlap. This will be explained further in the section on Investigations.

Historical Interpretations

- Assessing Interpretation answers
 - Teachers must mark their candidates' work using the mark scheme for interpretations on pages 110 – 111 of the specification.
 - Please mark in red.
 - Marks must be awarded for separate skills as indicated on the mark scheme and a final total given.
 - Please ring the final total.
 - The key decision is the **level** for each Assessment Objective; the mark then reflects to what extent the level has been reached and sustained.
 - Where more than one teacher/lecturer has been preparing candidates, then the centre must ensure that internal moderation takes place to ensure consistency.
 - Marks given should be consistent with the descriptions in the mark scheme and phrases from the mark scheme must be used to show the moderator why marks have been awarded.
 - Please do not use ticks.
 - Marking should at all times clearly show why marks have been awarded.
 - Please remember that you are not correcting work for the benefit of your candidates, but showing the moderator why, in your view, work deserves a certain mark.
 - A final summary is recommended, for example,

| | | |
|-------|-------|--|
| A01a | II 5 | Knowledge mostly accurate, relevant and detailed – Interpretations A and B treated better than C and D but knowledge used. Some lack of clarity in C but generally clear |
| A01b | II 5 | Concepts understood e.g. structuralist, genocide. Better judgement on A and B than other interpretations |
| A02b | II 19 | Analyses all interpretations and offers judgement – some unevenness hence II rather than I especially on C and D Focus on issues is good |
| Total | 29 | |

Teacher Support Notes and Guidance.

These notes should be read in conjunction with the Specification pages 65 - 74 and the Appendix B of the Specification pages 109-113.

Nazi Germany, an example question

Nazi Germany 1933-45

Problem: Understanding how the Holocaust came about

Using these **four** passages **and** your own knowledge assess the view that the Final Solution came about more as a result of the War fought in Eastern Europe from 1939 than from pre war plans and intentions within the Nazi State to annihilate the Jews.

Answers should be based on the arguments presented by these historians, any evidence they present and your own knowledge of the topic.

[40 marks]

Interpretation A: From : Lucy Dawidowicz, *The War against the Jews 1933-45*, published in 1975. This historian argues for a consistent intention in the mind of Hitler to wage war on and annihilate the Jews.

War for Lebensraum was associated in Hitler's minds with war against the Jews. War, the Jews and racial utopia were all inter-related in Hitler's mind. Often in foreign policy matters, Hitler shuttled back and forth between a real world of nations and armies and a phantasmagoric universe ruled by Jews. On 21 January 1939 he told the Czech Foreign Minister Chvalkovsky 'We are going to destroy the Jews. They are not going to get away with what they did on 9 November 1918. The day of reckoning has come'.

Some analysts have suggested that the 'final aim' of the Nazis as late as 1940 was not annihilation, but the establishment of a vast Jewish reservation. Yet everything we know of National Socialist ideology precludes our accepting the idea of a Jewish reservation as the last stage of the Final Solution. In the hierarchy of Nazi racial values, the Jews were bottommost, slated for a crueller fate than the Slavs. Perhaps it was no mere coincidence that Philipp Bouhler was intended to become governor of Madagascar (which was a projected site for a Jewish reservation). Bouhler had headed the so called Euthenasia Programme, the first mass murder by gassing, experience that doubtless qualified him to run a reservation for the Jews that would become truly their final destination. Poland was the launching area and testing laboratory not only for the execution of the Final Solution, but for all Hitler's racial and imperial ambitions and would become the arena for the first encounter in the final struggle, the prelude to the millennium.

Interpretation B: From Arno J. Mayer, *Why did the Heavens Not Darken, the Final Solution in History*, published in 1988. This historian argues that the Holocaust of the 'Final Solution' emerged as a result of the war.

The Judeocide was forged in the fires of a stupendous war to conquer unlimited Lebensraum from Russia, to crush the Soviet regime and to liquidate international Bolshevism. Without Operation Barbarossa, there would and could have been no 'Final Solution'. Not that Jews went unscathed in the period between September 1 1939 and June 22 1941. Between 5,000 and 10,000 Jews were murdered individually and twice or three times that number died of

malnutrition and disease, above all in the ghettos of Warsaw and Lodz. But this killing was neither systematic nor comprehensive: it affected a small percentage of several Jewish communities and it was confined to German-occupied Poland.

The Invasion of the Soviet Union brought a quantum leap in the scale and intensity of the suffering inflicted on the Jews. It is certain that Barbarossa and the Judeocide were symbiotically linked. The course of the war accounted for the radical transformation of the initial Commissar Order, calling for the summary executions of agents of 'Judeo-Bolshevism' into the subsequent 'Final Solution'. The unsuccessful race to Moscow in November-December 1941 precipitated the rush to 'The Final Solution'.

Interpretation C: From *Nazism 1919-1945* edited by J Noakes and G Pridham, published in 1988. These two historians offer an analysis of the Holocaust in their collection of original sources which focuses on the immediate problems in Poland by 1941.

The decision to exterminate the Jews almost certainly emerged gradually as what its perpetrators came to regard as the most appropriate solution to a pressing problem, namely what to do with the millions of Jews in Greater Germany and its occupied territories and satellites. During 1940-41 Hitler had encouraged his Gauleiters to purge their territories of Jews. The question remained, however, of what to do with them, since deportation to Madagascar was no longer an option and Poland was already full of Jews. Indeed the most pressing problem was the three million Polish Jews concentrated in the ghettos infested with typhus. To German administrators and police, for whom hygiene and orderliness were the hallmarks of civilization, the Jews appeared an affront, a source of disease. The systematic dehumanization of Jews by the Nazis since 1933 helped to remove the moral inhibitions which would otherwise have prevented a policy of extermination.

Interpretation D: From : Götz Aly and Susanne Heim, *Architects of Annihilation, Auschwitz and the Logic of Destruction*, published in 1991. Two German historians argue that the Holocaust was part of a wider planned policy of population reduction in Eastern Europe.

In the wake of the pogroms of November 1938, the German state turned away decisively from the anti-Semitism of the street and the mob, and delegated its 'Jewish policy' to state institutions, placing it in the hands of experts from a wide range of disciplines. The German bureaucratic machine developed its modern techniques and procedures in the 1930s and 1940s with astonishing rapidity. Modern methods were used to catalogue the victims, marginalize them, isolate them and finally deport them. But no less modern were the arguments invoked by social scientists for reducing the size of Europe's population and changing its structure. To a very large extent this policy of annihilation was the product of rational argument taken to a mercilessly logical conclusion. In 1941 the German population experts identified 30-50 million superfluous people. Their existence and their lack of interest in social advancement – so the experts believed – were standing in the way of rapid modernization. It became 'necessary' to reduce European population numbers by millions. The planners exploited the historic tradition of anti-Semitism in Europe and the hatred of the Jews fomented by the NSDAP.

German officials concluded that mass murder was a feasible option, and that large sections of the German population were prepared to countenance such a crime. The decision to murder the European Jews had been preceded by the decision to leave millions of Soviet prisoners of war to starve to death. It is in this context that the decision was taken to murder European Jewry, the Sinti and Roma (gypsies) and sections of the Polish and Soviet populations. The murder of the European Jews was part of a much larger annihilation project; prioritized because wartime conditions allowed it.

[Notes on Interpretations - these are included for clarification of this exemplar material; they will not be available for candidates or centres]

A argues for a distorted vision in Hitler's mind in which reality and fantasy are not always distinguished. This vision is the motivation for war and so the destruction of the Jews does not follow from war but is integral to it, as the war as a whole is a war against the Jews. **B** is one of the most uncompromising interpretations which associates the Holocaust with frustrations at the failures of the Russian campaign. The captive Jews become a scapegoat and unable to win the

war against the Russians, the Germans are determined to win the war against the Jews. However, this is not pre-planned but emerges from military circumstances. **C** also looks at the Holocaust as emerging from the war, but in a different way. The occupation of Poland has given the Nazis somewhere to dump their enemies, but because of a lack of clarity about policy, there are huge problems – to be made worse with the acquisition of many Jewish areas in Russia. The Final Solution therefore comes to the fore, but the war itself is not seen as being waged to bring it about. **D** argues that there has been since 1938 a more distinct policy (and indeed there is some supporting evidence for this in terms of harsher restrictions in Germany and Hitler's warnings to the Jews). The authors see evidence of wider population policies and the high level of Russian and Polish deaths could be seen as evidence for this – the authors reject irrational fury as a motive, but Davidowicz argues that irrationalism was at the heart of the Fuhrer and his vision.

The debate centres on whether, given what had happened in Germany since 1933 and what the Nazis had said and written, it is likely that the Holocaust had not been considered until the war. Is it likely that the Nazis were surprised by having to cope with large numbers of Jews in Eastern Europe or that some thought had not been given to the consequences of ruling over millions of Jews? Is it likely that serious consideration was given to the Reservation Idea? Given what is known of the fragmentary nature of the Nazi state is it likely that no detailed planning had been made for dealing with the Jewish problem? There is the evidence of Hitler's own words, as quoted by **A**. On the other hand, Hitler's pronouncements should not always be taken at face value. Despite all the rhetoric, anti-Semitism had proceeded fitfully in the 1930s. There are additional debates about the precise date of the decision to murder the Jews and about the local initiatives of 'men on the spot' – but this is focused on the issue of the extent of pre-planning and the impact of the war.

As is explained in 3.5.1 the Interpretations question builds on skills developed at AS and earlier in students' historical studies. Candidates must read the extracts from historians with understanding, using knowledge of the topic. They must be able to comprehend the interpretation and link it to the key issue in the question. They should be able to summarise the view, compare and contrast different views and use knowledge of the topic to evaluate the view. This means that they should judge how convincing the interpretation is and what light it throws on the key issue.

For example, if there are four interpretations of Appeasement in the 1930s, two of which are generally critical and two of which are generally supportive of Chamberlain's policy, what skills must a candidate bring to bear when using the interpretations to consider the issue of whether Appeasement was justified?

1. **Comprehension** Candidates must understand the thrust of the historians' views. They should be able to see which views are similar to each other and which differ.
2. **Interpretation**. They must be able to see how the views are relevant to the key issue.
3. **Evaluation**. They should be able to offer a supported judgement about the interpretations based on contextual knowledge which leads to an overall judgement about the key issue.
4. **Synthesis** – candidates should be able to bring together relevant information from different passages and combine these with their own knowledge to offer sustained support for overall (synoptic) judgement

The passages are referred to as Interpretations and not Sources. While all historical evidence is strictly a source, in this case candidates are not expected to consider the background of the author, nor his or her purpose unless it is obviously relevant to the enquiry. In most cases, the extracts will be from professional historians whose research and use of source material has led them to come to a particular view. It is the view that should be the focus of the candidates' study and discussion, and the personal career and background of the historian should not be researched.

Thus the sort of analysis that might read

Dr.X taught at Yale for some years before moving to Oxford where he researched into the early life of Stalin. Because he taught in the West in the 1970s he will have been influenced by the Cold War and will therefore be biased.

is emphatically **not** what is required when candidates assess interpretations. Candidates should look at the thrust of the argument and consider, in the light of their own knowledge how they consider it to be valid. This may well involve cross referencing with other reading and deployment of additional knowledge. In 2000 words this knowledge need not be extensive, but it should be relevant, carefully selected and convincingly used. The **Stretch and Challenge** will lie in the depth, appropriateness and skill with which knowledge is used to support or question interpretations.

The passages chosen will be from historians and not from the sources they might have used. They will not be from text books but from work which is based on research and the use of primary sources. The questions will allow candidates to develop supported judgements. This is seen as a very important skill – a summary of the interpretations with a general comment that ‘there are many different views and it is difficult to decide’ is unlikely to gain high marks. However, the quality of the judgement and the degree to which it follows logically from an analysis of the interpretations will be a key means of assessing the level of understanding candidates show of the issues.

For the Future

It is hoped that centres will attend INSET about assessment in due course. There will also be exemplar work available to guide assessment.

Where centres can get together in cluster groups to discuss assessment, this is obviously helpful and there will be further advice on this

What help can centres give in preparing candidates for this part of the unit?

Please refer to the guidance on pages 73 – 74 of the specification

The restrictions on teacher input are explained and are binding for both Interpretations and Investigations. The answer on Interpretations must be the candidates’ own work. Teachers **must** not look at the work and show errors or omissions; offer advice on detailed improvements to meet criteria; give outlines, headings or writing frames; offer personal intervention to improve content or presentation or make any written comment. Once a final draft has been submitted, then that draft must not be amended and that is the draft that must be submitted. The points on page 73-4 are binding and must be observed scrupulously. If Moderators suspect that this has not been the case, then they are bound to report their suspicions to the Malpractice unit.

The following comments are intended as **advice** only and centres are not bound in any way to follow it.

It is not the intention that candidates are left alone to study the topic chosen for Investigations nor that candidates in a teaching group choose different Interpretations topics.

It is intended that the Interpretations topic should be taught just as any other part of the Specification. Teachers are at liberty to provide class texts, collections of sources, notes, to set and mark their own exercises to help understanding of the topic.

In addition, teachers may wish to teach the skills needed in understanding, analysing, interpreting, evaluating and synthesising interpretations. They may choose to use one or two of the Board exercises as ‘dummy runs’ which candidates write and they mark, using the mark scheme and show to the candidates.

The restrictions apply to the exercise chosen as ‘the real thing’. Though oral feedback is permitted here, there must not be any detailed guidance or written comments given to candidates.

It is this final exercise that must be the candidates’ own work.

It is strongly suggested that a Scheme of Work is used by teachers which deals with the topic as a whole and shows a progression of both skills and content. The Interpretations unit requires mature and developed judgements and the final exercise will probably be done best **in the later stages** of two terms’ study.

Historical Investigations

Investigations may be undertaken on the same topic as the **Interpretations**, but obviously on a different aspect. The Board will provide questions on each topic.

For example, on Nazi Germany, this sort of question will be set as per list A:

List A

1. Assess the view that the Nazi regime relied more on compliance than repression in controlling the German people 1933-1945
2. To what extent did Nazi Germany succeed in making major social changes in Germany between 1933 and 1945?
3. Assess the view that Hitler was ‘a weak dictator’.
4. Assess the view that the main reason for the failure of internal opposition to the Nazi regime was the power of the Nazi state.
- 5 To what extent was the Holocaust the result of a premeditated plan?
6. To what extent did the economic policies of Nazi Germany succeed in their aims?
7. To what extent can Nazi policies towards women be seen as merely reactionary?

Candidates must not choose an Investigation on the same aspect of Nazi Germany as the topic they have chosen for their Investigation. Thus if they have answered on the exemplar topic, the Holocaust, they must not offer the Investigation on the Holocaust.

This will be clearly set out in a table showing prohibited combinations e.g.

| Interpretation | Prohibited Investigation |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Nazi Social policies | 2, 7 |
| 2. Nazi Government | 3 |
| 3. The Holocaust | 5 |

(this is an example, only – the actual questions will be published on the OCR website.)

The alternative is to choose a title that is linked to the Interpretations topic. This must be in the format given in List B below

List B

This list is intended to provide model framework questions which can be adapted by students with the guidance of their teachers to use in pursuing an investigation of their choice. The investigation **must** make critical use of at least 8- 12 sources of different types (for example, both primary and secondary); it has to be an essay which offers a supported judgement on a historical problem. It should not be based on narrative, or be simply an explanation of different causes or consequences; neither should it be a series of comments on a range of sources.

This list is intended to help candidates make sure that their investigation is likely to lead them towards a supported judgement.

Examples have been included below NOT as suggested questions, but to show how candidates might use a variety of formats and general questions to offer investigations which reflect their own interests and enthusiasms. There must be a link between an investigation of the candidate's own choice and the chosen Interpretations topic.

For example, if Napoleon is chosen, the links could be FRANCE – another French leader from another era; it could be another military leader ; it could be another general who assumes political power; it could be another leader who brought about considerable legal and constitutional reforms; it could be another person who established a substantial European empire.

Some examples (this is certainly not an exhaustive list) which would offer clear links to say **Napoleon (Interpretations) –**

French leaders – *Charlemagne, Louis XIV; Napoleon III; de Gaulle*

Generals with high reputations – *Gustavus Adolphus; Grant or Lee; Montgomery; Henry V; Spinola*

Political generals – *Cromwell; Washington; Nasser; Eisenhower; Grant; Ayub Khan; Wallenstein; Diaz in Mexico; Franco*

Bringers of major legal change comparable to the Civil Code – *Justinian, William of Normandy Empire – Hitler; Stalin and Eastern Europe; Charles V; Charles the Bold of Burgundy.*

There must be some recognisable and evident link, but the aim is to offer candidates the freedom to pursue individual research of their choice if they wish.

There is no obligation to do so, and candidates may investigate a topic linked to the Interpretations and offered by OCR. There is no preference expressed by OCR for candidates either choosing a different, if linked topic or for investigating a board set topic. It is entirely a matter for candidates and teachers to decide. Moderators will not take this choice into account when considering the centre's marking and teachers should not take it into account when assessing their own candidate's work.

Broad Topics

The role of the Individual in History

To what extent has the role ofin.....been exaggerated?

Example *To what extent has the role of Martin Luther King in the achievement of more black Civil Rights in the USA been exaggerated?*

How important was.....in.....

How important was the role of Lenin in the Bolshevik revolution in October 1917?

To what extent was.....a great () leader?

To what extent was Alfred a great leader?

To what extent was Napoleon a great (military) leader?

To what extent was Napoleon a great military leader in Egypt in 1798?

The achievements of.....owed more to favourable circumstances than his/her own abilities. Assess this view.

The achievements of Bismarck owed more to favourable circumstances than his own abilities

How far did.....succeed in his/her aim to.....

How far did Mussolini succeed in his aim to make Italy a great power?

How successful was the.....policy of.....?

How successful was the Irish policy of Gladstone?

How successful was the foreign policy of Philip II?

To what extent does.....deserve his/her reputation for.....

To what extent does Justinian deserve his reputation as a legal reformer?

To what extent does Charlemagne deserve his reputation for the promotion of learning?

To what extent does Richard III deserve his reputation as a selfish usurper?

To what extent does Churchill deserve his reputation as a perceptive critic of appeasement?

Causation

To what extent does the available evidence support the view that the short term causes of.....were more important than the long-term causes?

To what extent were the short-term causes of Collectivisation in the USSR more important than the long-term causes?

Evaluate the view that.....was the most important cause of.....

Evaluate the view that religious belief was the most important cause of the First Crusade.

How important was.....in bringing about.....?

How important was the attitude of the Pope in bringing about the failure of greater unification in Italy 1848-9?

Consequences

Assess the view that the most important consequence of was.....

Assess the view that the most important consequence of the Cuban missile crisis was greater understanding between the USA and the USSR.

Assess the view that the immediate consequences of.....were less/more important than the long-term consequences

Assess the view that the immediate consequences of the Battle of Lepanto were less important than its long term consequences.

Military History

Discuss the view that leadership was the most important factor in thewar(s) of.....(or warfare in the period.....)

Discuss the view that Haig's leadership was the most important factor in causing large British casualties on the Western Front 1916-18.

Discuss the view that leadership was the most important factor in the Napoleonic wars.

Discuss the view that leadership was the most important factor in the success of Gustavus Adolphus's campaigns.

How important was.....in determining the outcome of the.....War(s)/battle of.....

How important was the Battle of Stalingrad in determining the outcome of the war on the Eastern Front in World War II?

How important was faulty planning the most important factor in determining the outcome of the Spanish Armada's campaign of 1588?

How important were internal divisions in determining the failure of the Third Crusade?

Economic History

To what extent did the mass of the people benefit from economic change in the period.....?

To what extent did the mass of the people benefit from economic change during the industrial revolution in Britain 1750-1850?

To what extent did the mass of the people benefit from economic change in the hundred years after the Black Death?

To what extent did the mass of the people benefit from economic developments in the USA 1919-1929?

Assess the view that.....was the major factor in economic change in.....

Assess the view that population growth was the major factor in causing economic change in England 1750-1850.

To what extent was enclosure the major factor in economic development in Tudor England?

To what extent wasthe most important consequence of economic change in the period.....(You may specify a country or countries).

*To what extent was the development of the power of the Federal government the **most** important consequence of economic change in the USA 1920-41?*

Cultural and Intellectual History

To what extent were the arts (or any particular art) influenced by social and or political and or economic developments in the period

A candidate could select, for example, Florence in the Renaissance or Music in the age of German nationalism 1770-1870.

To what extent did any regime that you have studied manipulate the arts?

Candidates might consider Stalin's Russia, for example, or Counter Revolutionary Europe and its use of Baroque architecture/art, or Renaissance Rome – but the emphasis has to be on 'to what extent'.

How far was any particular artist influenced by political developments in any period you have studied?

Candidates might choose, say Shostakovich, or Kipling or any figure where there is a debate possible about purely artistic and more distinctly political influences on his/her work.

'Cultural developments are more influenced by purely artistic considerations rather than external factors' How far is this true for any period of approximately 100 years or any particular society in the past which you have studied?

Impressionism, for instance, could be discussed as either emerging from social changes or from purely artistic considerations.

How important was patronage of the arts in any period/ society you have studied?

Candidates might look at, say Papal patronage in the Renaissance; or royal patronage in the age of Louis XIV.

How important were ideas in bringing about change in any period/society you have studied

How important were the ideas of the Enlightenment in bringing about the French Revolution?

How important were mercantilist ideas in bringing about changes in economic policy in the Seventeenth Century?

How important were the ideas of eighteenth century military theorists to the success of Napoleon?

How important were ideas of Manifest Destiny in westward expansion in the USA in the nineteenth century?

The nature of regimes or societies

To what extent did any successful revolution that you have studied bring about sustained social change?

Candidates could look at Calvin's Geneva; Castro's Cuba; Russia under the Bolsheviks; Iran after the fall of the Shah; Hitler's Volksgemeinschaft.

To what extent did any radical political or religious movement succeed in fulfilling its ideological aims?

Some examples - Communist regimes could be studied, or Mussolini's Fascism, or radical Islamic regimes, or Hindu nationalism in India in the 1990s; Lollards; Swiss cities in the Reformation.

To what extent was the policy ofbased on his/her/their religious beliefs?

It would be acceptable to limit the policy e.g. Philip II's foreign policy, or policy towards England; Gladstone's Irish policy;

Possible examples – Philip II, Gladstone, the First Crusaders; Cromwell.

How great were the constraints of representative bodies on any ruler you have studied?

Elizabeth and her parliaments could be studied; Charles V and Germany; Ferdinand and Isabella and the representative bodies in different parts of the Spanish peninsula.

To what extent was the policy of any ruler/regime you have studied influenced by pressure from below?

For example, was Stalin more influenced by party pressure than has been thought during the Purges; did the Holocaust originate from local initiative; was the English Reformation more influenced by popular feeling or high politics?

How absolute was the power of

How absolute was the monarchy of Louis XIV?

How absolute was the power of Charles I during the 'Eleven Years Tyranny?'

Responsibility

How far was.....responsible for.....?

How far was the USSR responsible for the Cold War?

How far were the weaknesses of the monarchy under Henry VI responsible for the Wars of the Roses?

How far was Harold's leadership responsible for the Norman victory at Hastings?

How far was appeasement responsible for the Second World War?

To what extent doesdeserve to be blamed for.....?

To what extent does King John deserve to be blamed for his own misfortunes?

To what extent does Nicholas II deserve to be blamed for the February revolution in 1917?

To what extent does the policy of Britain and the USA deserve to be blamed for the Berlin Crisis of 1948?

Local History

How important was.....in the development of.....?

How important was the railway in the development of Brighton after 1840?

How important was local entrepreneurship in the development of the Sheffield metal industry?

To what extent did local developments reflect national developments in any period of not more than 100 years in any local area you have studied?

To what extent did conflicts in Exeter in the twenty years before the Civil War reflect conflicts in the nation as a whole?

How far does available evidence support the view that the main reason for
.....in.....was.....?

How far does available evidence support the view that the main reason for the decline in the coal industry in South Wales was the First World War?

This gives considerable scope to centres who wish to give candidates experience in independent research. The guidelines on page 73 3.5.4 are relevant here. Teachers would:

- Ensure that there was an appropriate link between the candidate's choice of title and the Interpretations topic
 - Ensure that the candidate was aware of the implications of any independently chosen topic and that appropriate sources were available.
 - Ensure that the topic was within the capability of the student.
 - Recommend reading and source material (Candidates choosing obscure topics would have to realise that it would be up to them to find material – it would not be reasonable for them to expect teachers to have encyclopaedic knowledge of every topic!).
 - Advise on the structure of an investigation and guide students towards approaches which would demonstrate key skills.
-

4 Specific Guidance: Unit F965: Historical Interpretations and Investigations

Specific Guidance

Interpretation and Investigation:

- The Age of Justinian
 - The Reign of Charlemagne 768-814
 - Alfred the Great 871-899
 - The Reign of King John 1199-1215
 - The Wars of the Roses 1450-1485
 - Phillip II of Spain 1557-1598
 - Elizabeth I 1558-1603
 - Cromwell 1599-1658
 - Peter the Great 1689-1725
 - Louis XIV 1661-1715
 - British India 1784-1878
 - Napoleon I 1795-1815
 - Gladstone and Disraeli 1865-1886
 - Bismarck and German Unification 1815-71
 - Russian Revolutions 1894-1924
 - America between the Wars 1918-41
 - The Causes of the World War II
 - The Cold War 1941-56
 - The War in Vietnam 1955-1975
 - The Development of Rights for Women in Great Britain 1867-1918
 - Nazi Germany 1933-1945
 - Britain under Margaret Thatcher 1979-1990
-
-

The Age of Justinian

Justinian has gained a high reputation across the centuries, being accorded the status of 'the Great'. In part, this was a product of contemporary views, framed in the context of the sturdiness of the Eastern part of the Roman Empire and a strong desire to revive the Western part. That said, the alleged 'greatness' could well be viewed more in terms of what was attempted than what was achieved and indeed bequeathed. Indeed, it is possible to question the levels of success he did achieve. Historians discuss and debate these areas:

1. Justinian: conservative restorer or radical reformer?

What were the aims and objectives of Justinian's domestic programme of imperial renewal? Some historians have argued that Justinian had a highly conservative view of the Roman Empire which, through his legal project and provincial reforms, he sought to restore it to its classical glory. Others have seen him as an innovator whose policies subverted the old order but were presented in a highly conservative way for propagandistic reasons. Was there even a unified policy programme at all?

2. Justinian's military objectives

Did Justinian have a clear set of military objectives? If so, what were they? Historians have debated whether Justinian neglected the needs of the Persian front or the Balkans for his western re-conquests, or whether this is an unfair criticism and war with Persia continued to take priority. Were the western re-conquests again a sign of his long term aim to restore the ancient Roman empire? Or opportunistic campaigns on the cheap aimed to placate domestic critics?

3. Justinian and religion

Religious disputes within the empire were a major preoccupation of the Emperor. Did Justinian make these disputes worse? Or did they persist in spite of his best efforts to deal with them because of the social, national or regional tensions outside his control. Do these disputes mean that Justinian can be criticised with justification, or was it simply too late for any Emperor to do anything about them?

4. The collapse of Justinian's empire

Within fifty years of Justinian's death his empire was in a state of profound military crisis, beset above all by first Persian then Arab invaders. Can Justinian's policies be causally linked to this collapse? Some have argued that it can, while others have argued that external factors, such as the arrival of plague, played a bigger part in weakening the empire.

5. Justinian and Procopius

Justinian is known to us chiefly through the writings of his contemporary Procopius. But what did Procopius really think of Justinian? Some think Procopius' views changed over time. To others he is a staunch critic throughout. He was an eyewitness of many events, wars, building programmes, and has much to offer in his attitude towards Justinian.

Resources (including texts that may be used in the three Interpretation questions)

P. R. L. Brown, *The World of Late Antiquity* (London, 1971)

J. B. Bury, *The History of the Later Roman Empire*, vol. II (London, 1923)

A. Cameron, B Ward-Perkins, M Whitby (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. XIV (A.D. 425-600) (Cambridge, 2000)

R. Collins, *Early Medieval Europe* (London, 1992)

J. A. S. Evans, *The Age of Justinian – The Circumstances of Imperial Power* (London, 1996)

A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1964)

C. Mango (ed.), *The Oxford History of Byzantium* (Oxford, 2002)

M. Maas, *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Justinian* (C.U.P., 2005)

J. Moorhead, *The Age of Justinian* (London, 1983)

New Cambridge Medieval History, vol. I (c500-c700), ed. P. Fouacre (forthcoming)

P. Sarris (ed.), *Procopius, The Secret History* (Penguin, new translation and introduction, 2007)

- A. Cameron, *Procopius and the Sixth Century* (London, 1985)
A. Cameron, *The Mediterranean World in Late Antiquity* (London, 1993)
C. Wickham, *Framing the Early Middle Ages* (O.U.P., 2005)
A. Kaldellis, *Procopius of Caesarea: History, Tyranny and Philosophy at the end of Antiquity* (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004)
C. Mango, *Byzantium: The Empire of New Rome* (London, 1983)
P. Sarris, *Economy and Society in the Age of Justinian* (C.U.P., 2006)

The Reign of *Charlemagne* 768 –814

The broad areas of debate are as follows:

1. The death of Carloman.

There are three linked debates connected with the death of Carloman. How significant was it for the unity of the Frankish lands and their later expansion? How important was it for the authority of Charlemagne and, for example, his eventual assumption of the Holy Roman Emperorship? How far did Charlemagne's response to it undermine the Frankish custom of partitive inheritance? A civil war would have divided the Frankish lands which had suffered from fratricidal strife before and there are examples of Merovingian kings fighting each other and killing their nephews. Charlemagne set aside the claims of Carloman's sons who fled into exile. Bishop Cathwulf congratulated Charlemagne in gaining power *sine sanguinis effusione*, without spilling blood. Would Charlemagne's wars of expansion and 'imperial' style of rule have been possible without Carloman's death? How significant was his death to the future of the Frankish kingdom? To what extent was the custom of partitive inheritance permanently called into question?

2. Charlemagne's Wars

The main debate here is whether Charlemagne's wars were motivated chiefly by religious beliefs and objectives. A variety of motives can be identified and these include strategic, dynastic and personal as well as religious concerns. The debate is complicated by the difficulty of separating out religious from more material motives in this period. Much of the reign was taken up by wars and it may be significant that, for the most part, Charlemagne's opponents were pagan, Muslim or in dispute with the Papacy. In assessing the importance of religious motivation, it can be argued that in the wars in Germany, Spain and Italy in the first ten years of the reign there few signs of religious mission. Motives were entirely or very largely, political. In the later period religious beliefs seem to play an important role with military campaigns being accompanied by forcible conversion and baptisms, missionary activity and the foundation of monasteries in conquered territories. The debate here is, again, in separating out religious from material motives (where possible) and evaluating their relative importance.

3. The Carolingian Renaissance

The linked debates here are: whether the cultural developments of Charlemagne's reign constitute a 'Renaissance'; whether the motives were largely religious or secular; the extent of the personal role of Charlemagne. How seriously deficient was the state of literacy, education and culture on the accession of Charlemagne? The contemporary Monk of St. Gall wrote 'the pursuit of learning had been almost forgotten throughout the realm'. How accurate is this assessment? Clearly much needed to be done and lay culture was almost dead but there were cathedral and monastic schools. How important a part did Charlemagne himself play? He was certainly interested in a range of intellectual fields including astronomy, music and theology. What motives lay behind the revival – to give a consciously Christian inspiration to the state? To provide educated men to run the administration? To revive learning for its own sake? To embellish the reputation of the ruler? A strong motive was certainly to provide educated administrators for an expanding realm and to employ clergy was relatively cheap. At the same time, there was a real attempt to provide an educated class among the lay nobility, in the Palace School, for example. The achievements of the revival of culture and education were impressive in Charlemagne's time but perhaps the real flowering of the Carolingian Renaissance was in the ninth century.

The debates here are: the extent to which Charlemagne's reputation as a great military leader is justified; why his wars were so successful; how the Carolingian was able to sustain the scale of military activity. Should Charlemagne's achievements be seen in the light of his abilities as a field commander or an organiser of victory? How much was owed to his predecessors Charles Martel and Pepin III? What is the balance of successes and failures? As Charlemagne grew older so his active participation in the field declined but, throughout, his personal qualities of leadership, energy and ruthlessness were of major significance. The importance of the perceived righteousness of his cause, especially against non-Christian opposition and in defence of the Papacy, is a good arena for debate. Much of the debate about the remarkable Frankish success lies in an assessment of the relative importance, but also the interconnectedness, of the relevant groups of factors – the

part played by Charlemagne, the role of the nobility, the strengths and weaknesses of the opposition, Frankish military strengths as developed by his predecessors as well as Charlemagne himself, resources and effective administration.

4. The Imperial Coronation

There are two linked debates here.

First, why did the imperial coronation take place at all? What were the motives of those who took part in it? There is a range of competing interpretations as to how and why Charlemagne was crowned Holy Roman Emperor by Pope Leo III on Christmas Day 800. Religious, political and pragmatic motives involving the Pope and Charlemagne and his advisers need to be evaluated. There are four principal extant accounts and they differ. The *Liber Pontificalis* (which expresses a papal point of view); Einhard's *Vita Karoli* (a life of Charlemagne written by a member of his circle); the *Annales Regni Francorum* (which seems to give a largely factual account); the *Annales of Lorsch* (a clerical account but clearly not by an eye-witness). Together, the sources present a variety of ideas and concepts: an Emperor of the Romans with the actual title of 'Emperor' or 'Augustus'; the revival of the (Western) Roman Empire; the idea of Charlemagne as protector of the Church linked to the concept of a Christian and 'universal' Emperor; the explanation that since Irene had been declared Empress in Constantinople the title of Emperor had 'ceased to exist among the Greeks' and should, therefore, be conferred on Charlemagne. How important were these theoretical justifications and concepts as against more pragmatic motives and the context of recent events? How influential were Charlemagne's advisers such as Einhard and Alcuin and how well developed were their visions of a restoration of the Roman Empire? How far was the event planned by Charlemagne and his advisers? Or was he unwilling and surprised by the Pope's action in crowning him (according to Einhard)? How far was the coronation on the initiative of Leo III? What right did he have to carry out such a ceremony? Did this amount to an attempted papal coup d'état? What light does this shed on the powers and influence of the Papacy?

5. The Last Phase of the Reign

The debate here concerns the nature of Charlemagne's rule after 800AD and whether the last years of the reign were a period of 'decay'? Did the direction and tone of the reign change or would changes of emphasis and direction have taken place regardless of the imperial title, as a result of Charlemagne's advancing years and the already large extent of his empire by 800AD. There is certainly evidence after 800 of an imperial style. For example, new coins were issued bearing the legend 'Restoration of the Empire' and documents were dated by Charlemagne's regnal years. How far did the relationship with Byzantium change? Initially, Charlemagne proposed marriage to Irene but demanded recognition of his new title. After 800AD relations with Byzantium became more unstable with clashes in the Adriatic, for example. However, might this deterioration in relations have happened anyway? How far did the acquisition of the imperial title affect Frankish customs of partitive inheritance? Charlemagne made provision for dividing his territories among his three sons. In the event only one son survived. He not only inherited the whole patrimony but was associated with the imperial title in his father's lifetime (and may well have been crowned by Charlemagne rather than by the Pope). An important debate about the post-800 period is the concept of 'decay' as advanced by Ganshof. This thesis has its challengers, notably P.D.King, who has upheld the view of a vigorous approach to policy and government in these last years.

Resources

Books for students and introductory texts

Donald Bullough, *The Age of Charlemagne* (1973)

Roger Collins, *Charlemagne* (1998)

Roger Collins, *Early Medieval Europe* (1999)

P.D.King, *Charlemagne* (1986)

R. McKitterick, *The Frankish Kingdoms under the Carolingians* (1986)

ed. R.McKitterick, *The New Cambridge Medieval History Vo. II c700-c900* (1995R.)

McKitterick, *The Frankish Church and the Carolingian Reforms 789-895* (1977)

Janet Nelson, *The Frankish World 750-900* (1996)

J.M.Wallace-Hadrill, *The Barbarian West 400-1000* (1996) (Revised Edition)

More Advanced Reading

H. Fichtenau, *The Carolingian Empire* (1996)

Robert Folz, *The Coronation of Charlemagne* 1974

F.L.Ganshof, *Frankish Institutions under Charlemagne* (1970)

F.L.Ganshof, *The Carolingians and the Frankish Monarchy* (1971)

P.Riche, *The Carolingians* (1993)

ed. Joanna Story, *Charlemagne: Empire and Society* (2005)

Lewis Thorpe, *Two Lives of Charlemagne* (1969)

Alfred the Great 871-899

Alfred has been seen favourably by historians and few have adopted a persistently critical tone. At the time, he received praise from a select group of sources, very much fashioned in his image and presence. Subsequent West Saxon dominance of the tenth century led to Alfred being praised as a unifier because of that dominance. The effects of the Norman Conquest made him seem to be a great English figure and leader in contrast to the new French-based rulers. This view continued for centuries. The Victorians thought highly of him, according to the status of 'the Great'. That said, there are areas of discussion and debate that allow some questioning of what he did achieve and of his impact and importance, focusing on whether activity areas have been over-rated.

1. The degree and nature of the threat posed by the Vikings and so of the success Alfred achieved.

Many have argued that Alfred's success was substantial and lasting, focusing on the survival of Wessex. Much has been made of the battle of Edington as a turning point and of the military and naval reforms of the 880s. In contrast, there has been argument that these reforms and his military successes have been over-rated: Vikings did return, did settle; 892-6 may have been more of a stalemate than an overwhelming victory for Alfred.

Some have argued that the military reforms and reorganisation may have owed as much to the work of his predecessors as to Alfred himself and that the naval reforms were rather ineffective. The *burhs* perhaps had as much economic as military defence roles. There has been discussion about the role of the *burhs* and whether they had more of an economic as opposed to military defence significance, or were purely military in role.

2. The degree of unity encouraged in the English by Alfred's leadership.

Some have seen this as substantial and important, the product of skilful Kingship. They have argued that Alfred welded together areas and groups in the face of Viking attacks. Others have seen unity as more spontaneous and less extensive in scope. They have argued that unity was limited with much still to be achieved by his successors.

3. The levels of success and effectiveness of Alfred's government.

The debate is about how far did everything in government depended on Alfred's personality and personal skills? Or was there a more developed form of government which could function without his direct personal input? How secure were his relations with political élites, lay and ecclesiastical? Was there a centre of government? How important were London and the non-Viking areas of Mercia? How important were the Laws he created? How secure were his relations with neighbouring areas and with his own political elite?

4. The reasons for and the extent of the revival in education, learning and religion.

Some have seen a major cultural and religious revival, the product of a highly spiritual ruler. The translations, the personal role there, the provision of a Court School, the encouragement of learned clergy to come to Wessex, all are viewed as major successes. Most have seen links to the Viking threat. Some have argued that more overt political and military reasons led to these developments and have even questioned the penetration of the revival. It is possible that Alfred may have played a less important role in these developments than has been thought. Also, it can be argued that more practical considerations such as the need to meet the Viking threat dictated changes in education and learning.

5. The degree of foreign/Carolingian influences on Alfred's rulership.

Increasingly, the importance of these have been appreciated and seen to have shaped military as well as educational and religious areas. Some argue that such influences shaped Alfred's kingship to a high degree. But some believe such influences can be exaggerated and can deflect from native influences and from Alfred's originality and creativity. The predominance of Carolingian influence has been assumed but it is possible that other foreign influences played their part.

Resources (including texts that may be used in the three Interpretation questions)

- R. Abels, *Alfred the Great* (Longman, 1998)
J. Campbell (ed.), *The Anglo-Saxons* (Penguin, 1991)
H. P. R. Finberg, *The Formation of England, 550-1042* (Paladin, 1970)
D. J. V. Fisher, *The Anglo-Saxon Age* (Longman, 1973)
S. Keynes and M. Lapidge, *Alfred the Great* (Penguin, 1983)
M. Lapidge, J. Blair, S. Keynes, D. Scraggs, *Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford, 1999)
R. McKitterick (ed.), *New Cambridge Medieval History*, vol II (c700-c900) (C.U.P., 1995)
D. H Sawyer, *From Roman Britain to Norman England* (2nd ed., Routledge, 1998)
F. M. Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England* (3rd ed., O.U.P., 1971)
D. Sturdy, *Alfred the Great* (Constable, 1996)
J. Campbell, *Essays in Anglo-Saxon History* (London, 1986)
J. Campbell, *The Anglo-Saxon State* (London, 2000)
D Pratt, *The Political Thought of King Alfred the Great* (C.U.P., 2007)
T. Reuter (ed.), *Alfred the Great* (Aldershot, 2003)
J. Story, *Carolingian Connections: Anglo-Saxon England and Carolingian Francia, c750-870* (Aldershot, 2003)
D. Whitelock, *From Bede to Alfred, Studies in Early Anglo-Saxon Literature and History* (London, 1980)
A Williams, *Kings and Kingship in pre-Conquest England, c500-1066* (Basingstoke, 1999)
B. Yorke, *Kings and Kingdoms of Early Anglo-Saxon England* (London, 1990)

The Reign of King John 1199-1215

John is an example of the focus on the role of the individual in the context of his period. At the time and subsequently, he was accorded much criticism, largely the product of contemporary ecclesiastical sources and of the events of 1215 and 1216. He was seen as a 'bad' king, evil, tyrannical, brutal. However, a growing attention to records and administrative history has brought some revision in views of his ability and impact, even if not sufficient to turn him into a 'good' king. Historians have found several areas to debate.

1. The balance between success and failure in John's personality, so influencing his kingship.

In essence, historians have argued how bad he really was. Most admit he was a poor leader, politically and militarily. But some see some successes even there, for example in operations in Wales and Ireland.

He has been viewed as a rather successful administrative king, with a keen interest in records and administration. But, in the eyes of some, that was no recipe for real (political) success. He has been viewed as an intelligent king, whose interventions were of a type familiar from his Angevin predecessors. He has been seen as a prisoner of the Angevin system of government, drawing upon himself anger and criticism because of his predecessors' use of that system. Then again, there is a view that those predecessors would not have failed as he did, culminating in serious revolt in 1215-16.

2. John's relationship with his barons and their own interests and motivations.

Some have seen the barons as patriotic, national-minded, concerned with rights, guardians of the 'community of the realm'. Others argue they were narrow, self-centred and selfish. John's dealings with them have invited debate. Did he ever trust them? Did they trust him? Why did many not support him at key junctures of the reign? How important were issues of patronage? Were there 'ins' and 'outs'? How important were 'the Northerners' after c1212-13? Were they a key group in bring about conflict? Why did rebellion break out and continue, 1215-16? There is debate about why the disputes occurred and to what extent they were John's fault or the barons' fault.

3. The place, role and importance of Magna Carta.

Much has been written about this and about John's attitude and sincerity or otherwise in the signing and aftermath. One view is that the Charter had a role in framing a sense of liberties, even looking ahead, and so was a document of fundamental importance. Another view is that it was a baronial charter, in effect quite narrow and sectional. It failed in the short-term, precipitating more rebellion and a civil war. John can be seen as never intending to uphold the Charter. Then again, he has been seen as unlucky in the manner of baronial responses, with a good number of barons apparently keen to renew conflict.

4. The reasons for the loss of Normandy, its importance and the failure to regain it.

Much debate has been generated here. One view is that John was incompetent; he alienated the Normandy aristocracy, he could not command sufficient support in England. Another is that he was unlucky; no matter what he did, he could not match the financial and therefore military power of Philip Augustus with the result that loss was inevitable, rather than being entirely John's fault.

Then again, there is a view that loss was all the result of John's actions and errors.

All agree that the Loss was a turning point. But there is some debate as to why strenuous efforts at recovery failed. Again, all could be said to relate to John's failings as a King: no matter how hard he and his government tried, how effectively resources were garnered, or how much diplomatic effort was made (and there was much), failure was likely because of weaknesses at the top. But it has been argued that John was unlucky, facing circumstances beyond his control, not least in meeting a formidable adversary in Philip Augustus with even greater resources than in 1203-4. The impact on events in England was massive.

5. John's relationship with the English Church and the Papacy.

John has been seen as relentlessly and crudely anti-clerical, using the Church to gain resources, clashing with the clergy and the Papacy. It has been argued that there was little chance of these policies resulting in anything but failure. The natures of the conflict and the outcomes have been re-evaluated, however. An alternative view is that John was altogether more subtle, having the support of many of the clergy for much of the time, eventually duping Innocent III, to gain his backing against rebellious barons. In all this, Stephen Langton figures large, with different views as to his role and importance, his relations with Innocent III and with the barons; was he a leader of baronial discontents, articulating resistance, or was he overly-ambitious, resulting in his previous patron, Innocent III, turning against him.

Resources (including texts that may be used in the three Interpretation questions)

- F. Barlow, *The Feudal Kingdom of England, 1042-1216* (Longman, 1999)
G. W. W. Barrow, *Feudal Britain* (Edward Arnold, 1956)
R. Bartlett, *From Norman to Angevin Kings: England 1075-1225* (O.U.P., 2000)
D. Carpenter, *The Struggle for Mastery in Britain 1066-1272* (Penguin, 2003)
M. T. Clanchy, *England and its Rulers, 1066-1272* (Blackwell, Oxford, 1998)
J. C. Holt, *King John* (H.A., 1963)
R. Huscroft, *Ruling England 1042-1217* (Longman, 2005)
A. L. Poole, *From Domesday Book to Magna Carta* (O.U.P., 1987)
T. Purser, *Medieval England 1042-1228* (Heinemann, 2004)
R. V. Turner, *King John* (Longman, 1994)
W. L. Warren, *King John* (Yale U. P., 1997)
W. L. Warren, *The Governance of Norman and Angevin England 1086-1272* (London, 1987)
J. Bradbury, *Philip Augustus* (Longman, 1998)
Z. N. Brooke, *The English Church and the Papacy* (repr. 1989)
C. R. Cheney, *Pope Innocent III and England* (C.U.P., 1976)
C. R. Cheney, *The Papacy and England in Twelfth to Fourteenth Centuries* (C.U.P., 1982)
S. D. Church (ed.), *King John: New Interpretations* (Boydell, 1999)
S. D. Church (ed.), *The Household Knights of King John* (C.U.P., 1999)
D. Crouch, *William Marshall* (Longman, 1990)
J. C. Gillingham, *The Angevin Empire* (Arnold, 1984)
J. Gillingham and J. C. Holt (ed.), *War and Government in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge, 1984)
J. C. Holt, *The Northerners* (2nd ed., Clarendon, 1992)
J. C. Holt, *Magna Carta* (C.U.P., 1992)
J. C. Holt, *Magna Carta and Medieval Government* (London, 1995)
J. E. A. Jolliffe, *Angevin Kingship* (London, 1956)
C. H. Lawrence, *The English Church and the Papacy in the Middle Ages* (2nd ed., London, 1999)
S. Painter, *King John* (John Hopkins U. P., Baltimore, 1949)
F. M. Powicke, *The Loss of Normandy* (2nd ed., Manchester U. P., 1961)
D. M. Stenton, *English Justice between the Norman Conquest and the Great Charter* (London, 1965)

The Wars of the Roses, 1450-1485

The broad areas of debate are as follows:

1. The Causes of the Wars of the Roses

The debate can be put in terms of balancing explanations which stress overmighty nobles and those which stress weak kingship, as in K.B. McFarlane's famous comment – 'Only an undermighty ruler had anything to fear from overmighty subjects'.

If viewed as the result of nobles who had got out of control, the Wars could be seen as 'an escalation of private feuds'. Examples might include Yorkists v. Beauforts, Percies v. Nevilles). Fifteenth century kingship required special personal qualities. Henry VI was weak, feckless and incompetent but was not mentally ill until 1453, his right to the crown was not challenged until 1460 and he was not overthrown until 1461. Certainly there was a small group of enhanced upper nobility (in large part as a result of Edward III's policies). However, the nobility can also be seen as a source of potential strength to the King in keeping order in the localities and raising armed forces for the royal service. 'Bastard feudalism', the formation of indentured retainers and armed followings, had both beneficial and damaging aspects. Also, how far the King was to blame by pursuing policies which damaged the interests of the nobility, for example, by maintaining a clique at court (led by Suffolk and later Somerset), by failure in France, by failing to compose quarrels between rivals?

2. The aims and ambitions of Richard, Duke of York

The key issue is whether York had long term plans for the throne or whether he claimed it only after a long period of frustration and the threat presented to him after the Coventry Parliament of November 1459.

Was York largely concerned with real grievances, his recall as commander-in-chief in France; unpaid debts by the Crown; the favour shown to his rivals, the Beauforts? Or was his motivation sheer ambition? In the light of this potential debate, how should we interpret the following:

- York's unannounced return from Ireland in 1450;
- his attempted coup d'état at Dartford, 1452;
- his reaction to the birth of Henry VI's heir, 1453;
- his response to being twice relieved of the Protectorate;
- his retaliation to the actions of Margaret of Anjou in 1459?
- The fact that York captured the King in 1455 but did not seize the throne or attempt to kill the King, only openly claiming the throne in 1460.

3. The relationship between Edward IV and Warwick

This became one of open conflict in 1469. Key issues include:

Did Warwick make Edward King in 1461 (the 'Kingmaker') or did this represent an alliance of mutual interests? Neville support for Edward was highly significant in bringing him to the throne and Warwick's influence was important in the early years of the reign. However, Edward himself won the Battle of Mortimer's Cross whilst Warwick lost at Second St. Albans (where he lost possession of Henry VI). Moreover, evidence for Warwick's power and influence are based largely on foreign accounts.

Why did Edward and Warwick quarrel? Was it Warwick's insatiable ambition or was he badly handled by the young King? When did they become irreconcilable? One view is that it was as a result of Edward's marriage to Elizabeth Woodville in 1464. Was it, then, foreign policy – differing attitudes to relations with France and Burgundy coming to the fore in 1467 – which was chiefly responsible for the breach? The King's treatment of French envoys offended Warwick and led him into an alliance with Clarence. In 1468 Edward's sister, Margaret, married the Duke of Burgundy. Decisions about the relative importance of different factors clearly have to be made here.

The debate centres on balancing the role of the King with that of other factors.

Does the explanation lie with Edward himself – lack of energy, errors in campaigning, loss of popular support in 1470 contrasted with his political and military skill in 1471? Nevertheless, much of the evidence for his successful return is from 'The Historie of the Arrivall' which is propagandist.

Another explanation stresses the role of foreign powers. How much depended upon the part played— Louis XI of France in bringing together Warwick and Margaret of Anjou; also how much consideration should be given to Burgundy's lukewarm support for Edward in 1470, compared with the aid given to Edward by Burgundy in 1471?

Another factor is the attitude of the nobility such as Montagu and Northumberland and, above all, Clarence who allied with Warwick in 1470 but defected to Edward in 1471? Does the answer lie with Warwick who conducted himself with great skill in 1470 but made mistakes in 1471 such as declaring war on Burgundy? Or was the alliance of Neville/Lancaster/Clarence inherently unstable? Again, the discussion centres on the relative importance of different factors

4. Richard of Gloucester's motives in 1483

Fundamental to the debate is whether Richard plotted to take the crown immediately on the death of Edward IV (9 April 1483) or whether he was concerned, initially at least, to preserve his own position as Protector. Relevant to the debate is Richard's character and previous record. For example, he demonstrated great loyalty to Edward (in contrast to Clarence) and served him well. The evidence for and interpretations of Richard's character and actions can be grouped into three main categories: strictly contemporary sources; writers living and working in the Tudor period; and historians. How far was Richard concerned for the welfare of the kingdom in the hands of a minor? Some historians argue that Edward IV's achievements were superficial, he relied upon a small group of nobles who were given great regional authority. But there were rivalries and tensions under the surface. Had a 'path to the throne' been mapped out? Finally, was Edward V indeed illegitimate and thus to be lawfully excluded from the succession? However, why were the princes taken into the Tower and not seen after November 1483?

5. The impact of the wars of the Roses

With an emphasis on evaluating the interpretations presented by contemporary chroniclers, Tudor writers and historians. The traditional view is presented by the Croyland Chronicle: 'The slaughter of men was immense – such was the state of the kingdom for nearly ten years'. Further evidence of calamity can be gathered from, for example, Warkworth's Chronicle, the various London Chronicles and the Paston Letters. The picture of disaster was embellished by Tudor writers such as Polydore Vergil, More, Hall and Shakespeare. There is some dispute among historians as to the severity and extent of the fighting and how long it lasted (Lander calculated 13 weeks, Goodman 61). The size of armies and the number of deaths has been variously calculated (one contemporary foreign observer believed that 300,000 took part at Second St. Albans whilst modern historians regard the combined forces at Towton as being exceptionally large, at 45,000). Did the Wars of the Roses 'destroy' the nobility? How many adult nobles took part, how many were killed and what were the consequences? How serious were the economic and social outcomes? Contemporary English chroniclers tend to provide a picture of lawlessness, devastation and impoverishment, whilst foreign observers comment upon the prosperity of England, particularly London and the South East. How far did the Wars change the relationship between crown and nobility? Were the worst features of 'Bastard Feudalism' reinforced? Did the Wars create unrest, lawlessness and local rebellion or was the potential there anyway?

Resources (including texts that may be used in the three Interpretation questions)

- D. Cook *'Lancastrians and Yorkists: the Wars of the Roses'* Longman 1984
- K. Dockray *'Richard III: A Reader'*. Alan Sutton 1988
- (Ed). E. Hallam *'The Chronicles of the Wars of the Roses'* Weidenfeld and Nicholson 1988
- M. Hicks *'Who's Who in Late Medieval England'* Shephard-Walwyn 1991
- J.R.Lander *'Government and Community: England 1450-1509'* Arnold 1980
- A.J.Pollard *'Late Medieval England'* 1988
- A.J.Pollard *'The Wars of the Roses'* Macmillan 1988
- A.J.Pollard *'Richard III and the Princes in the Tower'* Alan Sutton 1991
- M. Rubin *'The Hollow Crown'* Allen Lane 2005
- J. Warren *'The Wars of the Roses and the Yorkist Kings'* Hodder and Stoughton 1995
- C. Carpenter *'The Wars of the Roses'* CUP 1997
- J. Gillingham *'The Wars of the Roses'* Weidenfeld and Nicholson 1981
- A. Goodman *'The Wars of the Roses'* Routledge 1981
- R. A. Griffiths *'The Reign of Henry VI'* Ernest Benn 1981

M. Hicks '*Edward V*' Tempus 2003
M. Hicks '*Warwick the Kingmaker*' OUP 1998
M. Hicks '*Richard III*' second edition 2000
C. Ross '*Edward IV*' Eyre Methuen 1974
C. Ross '*Richard III*' Eyre Methuen 1981
B. Wolffe '*Henry VI*' Eyre Methuen 1983

Philip II of Spain 1557–1598

1 Philip II and absolutism

Some historians have argued that Philip exercised absolute control over his kingdoms, that he insisted on taking all decisions in domestic and foreign affairs, that he had supreme control of the church in Spain and used the Spanish inquisition as an arm of the government, that he presided over an increasingly centralised administration, and that by conniving at state murders and endorsing summary executions he was above the law both in theory and in practice. A counter-view to these arguments is that he depended totally on his nobility and town authorities for implementing his policies, that he had no police force and only a small army in Iberia to enforce his will, that representative assemblies acted as a brake on his power, that financial difficulties restricted what he could do, that slow communications and long distances within his monarchia impeded his authority, that outside Castile autonomous states resisted centralisation, and that he was always conscious of the need to act according to the law.

2. Causes of the Dutch Revolt in 1572?

Historians have long debated who was responsible for the Dutch Revolt, and whether Philip was a major or minor player. Critics who have blamed him point to his reluctance and at times refusal to compromise or yield to his opponents, his insistence on implementing unpopular ecclesiastical and financial reforms, his treatment of the Dutch nobility and grandees, his appointment of Granvelle and Alva and dismissal of Margaret, and his failure to visit the Netherlands after 1559. Historians writing in defence of Philip have stressed the importance of other factors: Alva's insensitivity and unwise taxation policies, the aggressive behaviour of Dutch Calvinists, the desire by Dutch politicians to wrest autonomy from Spain and defend their civil liberties, and the reaction of Dutch states to the presence of Spanish soldiers, officials and inquisitors.

3. Foreign affairs.

Philip's foreign policy has been the subject of discussion and debate. Some historians have claimed that Philip consistently pursued an aggressive policy, extended his patrimony whenever feasible and sought to achieve a global empire. To this end his policy was coherent, planned and part of a 'grand strategy'. Other historians have taken a different view arguing that he was on the defensive for the first half of his reign, that he preferred peace to war, that he did not have a 'grand strategy' or imperialist dream, and that he was an opportunist who reacted to events as they occurred. Others have argued over his aims: some suggest that he was always intent on defending the Catholic faith; others claim that his country's reputation was his guiding principle, and that though these aims were pursued consistently, they also help to explain why his foreign policy became more assertive in the 1580s. Historians also disagree over precisely when this turning point occurred: 1578, 1580, 1585 and 1588 have all been postulated.

4. The Spanish Church

Philip's relationship with the Roman Catholic Church, the inquisition and religious groups has been the subject of debate. Some historians have seen his devotion to the Catholic faith as the driving force behind many of his domestic and foreign policies. Others have seen him as a secular ruler who used the Catholic faith to fulfil his goals. Some have viewed the inquisition as an extension of his political authority and instrumental in enforcing religious uniformity and improving Christian understanding in Spain. Others have claimed that the alleged autocratic power of the inquisition was a figment of its enemies' imagination, part of the Black Legend, and that little progress was made in propagating the Catholic faith or in reforming the church in Spain. Some have seen Philip's treatment of the Jesuits as detrimental to the welfare of the church and papal relations; others have not seen this as an issue and regard Hispano-papal relations to have been reasonably cordial.

5. The Spanish economy

How strong was the Spanish economy under Philip II? Some historians have claimed that it was strong and cite the large quantities of silver bullion that entered Seville from the New World during his reign, the foreign bankers who queued up to loan money to the government, the massive projects that were funded in this period (eg the Escorial and Armada), the rising industrial and commercial output, the dominance of Spain's woollen industry in Europe, its massive empire and international trade monopoly. On the other hand, critics have pointed to the rising state debts and bankruptcies, Philip's inability to manage finances or support sensible reforms, the stranglehold exercised by foreign merchants over Spain's transatlantic trade, the declining textile industries in northern Spain, and the poor quality of farming and inhibiting influence of the Mesta. Some historians argue that Philip could not have achieved his foreign conquests without a strong economy; others claim that the Spanish economy was never strong and Philip's foreign exploits put it into terminal decline.

Resources (including texts that may be used in the three Interpretation questions)

- H. Kamen, *Spain, 1469-1714: A Society in Conflict*, Longman 1991 (2nd edition)
P. Limm, *The Dutch Revolt 1559-1648*, Seminar Studies, Longman 1989
J. Lynch, *Spain, 1516-98: From Nation State to World Empire*, Blackwell 1991
G. Parker, *Philip II*, Open Court 2002 (4th edition)
P. Pierson, *Philip II of Spain*, Thames and Hudson 1975
S. Randall, *Philip II*, HarperCollins 2004
P. Williams, *Philip II*, Palgrave 2001
G. Woodward, *Philip II*, Seminar Studies, Longman 1992
A. Domínguez Ortiz, *The Golden Age of Spain, 1516-1659*, 1971
A. Duke, *Reformation and Revolt in the Low Countries*, Hambledon 1990
J. Edwards, *The Spanish Inquisition*, Tempus, 1999
J. Elliott, *Imperial Spain 1469-1716*, Pelican 1963
E. Grierson, *King of Two Worlds: Philip II of Spain*, Collins 1974
H. Kamen, *Philip of Spain*, Yale UP 1997
H. Kamen, *The Spanish Inquisition*, Weidenfeld and Nicolson 1997
J. Motley, *The Rise of the Dutch Republic*, 1856
G. Parker, *The Grand Strategy of Philip II*, Yale UP 2000
G. Parker, *The Dutch Revolt*, Penguin 1985 (2nd edition)
H. Rawlings, *Church, Religion, and Society in Early Modern Spain*, Palgrave 2002
R. Stradling, *Europe and the Decline of Spain: A Study of the Spanish System, 1580-1720*, 1981

Elizabeth I 1558-1603

The broad areas of debate are as follows:

1. The power of the House of Commons.

To what extent was the House of Commons able to influence Elizabeth? Some historians, for example Neale, have identified a radical group in the House of Commons, Puritan in outlook, which was attempting to wrest power from the Queen and to insist on freedom of speech, namely the right to discuss all matters of state.

Others have suggested that this is a myth, based on a misreading of the evidence and that Elizabeth and her House of Commons were largely in agreement on aims and often on methods in government. It has also been suggested that the Privy Council exercised some control of the House of Commons.

2. The Roman Catholic threat.

To what extent did the Catholic powers and Catholics in England seriously threaten the throne? It has been argued that the Roman Catholic Church as a powerful international institution was a real threat to Elizabeth and the zeal of Philip II and the personal presence of Mary, Queen of Scots increased the threat, backed by Roman Catholic enthusiasts and seminary and missionary priests in England.

Alternatively it is suggested that the threat was more theoretical than real, and its seriousness exaggerated by protestant members of her Privy Council. Catholic conspiracies in England failed as did the Armada and Mary was executed. It has been argued that the missionary priests only succeeded in maintaining the faith of committed Catholics and their efforts and deaths were largely wasted. The survival of Catholicism was limited to the upper class elite.

3. The question of marriage.

To what extent did Elizabeth remain single because of her own inclinations? There is debate about the reasons why Elizabeth remained single, some maintaining that she never had any intention of marrying that was adversely affected by her adolescent experiences and cherished her image as a Virgin Queen.

Others consider she would have married had she been able to find a suitable candidate who would be supported by her advisers.

4. The control Elizabeth exercised. How far were government decisions made by Elizabeth?

There is a view that Elizabeth was in complete control of her Council and through her court and by the use of her image her power was extended.

Another view is that her ministers, notably William Cecil, later Lord Burghley, made many decisions and that her indecisiveness and petulance hindered government. To what extent did she dominate foreign policy – was she responsible for the war with Spain?

5. The threat of the Puritans to Elizabeth's settlement.

How real was the Puritan threat? There is debate about the extent of Puritan influence in the House of Commons, in government and in the country at large. It is argued that Puritanism became widespread, notably among the ruling classes, and only Elizabeth's determination and the work of her Archbishops preserved her church settlement.

On the other hand is the view, that Elizabeth often exaggerated the threat and it was more perceived than real, since Puritanism depended on literacy and knowledge of the Bible and its strict moral precepts were often unpopular. The more extreme manifestations are seen as having little influence and were easily suppressed and the theological differences between Anglicans and Puritans are seen as relatively minor.

Resources (including texts that may be used in the three Interpretation questions)

- RJ Acheson, *'Radical Puritans in England 1550-1660'*, Longman, 1990, 0-582-35515-X
- A. Dures, *'English Catholicism 1558-1642'*, Longman, 1983, 0-582-35229-0
- M. Graves, *'Elizabethan Parliaments 1559-1601'*, Longman, 1987, 0-582-35516-8
- B. Mervyn, *'The Reign of Elizabeth I', England 1558-1603*, John Murray, 2001, 0-7195-7486-2
- K. Randell *'Elizabeth I and the Government of England'*, Hodder and Stoughton, 1994, 0-340-56547-0
- J. Warren, *'Elizabeth I : Religion and Foreign Affairs'*, Hodder and Stoughton, 1993, 0-340-55518-0
- S. Doran, *'Monarchy and Matrimony; The Courtships of Elizabeth I'*, Routledge, 1996
- S. Doran, *'Elizabeth I'*, The British Library, 2003, 0-7123-4802-6
- S. Doran, *'Elizabeth I and Religion 1558-1603'*, Routledge, 1994, 0-415-07352-9
- JE Neale, *'Elizabeth I and her Parliaments'*, Jonathan Cape 1971
- C. Haigh, *'Elizabeth I'*, Longman 1988, 0-582-02390-4
- Ed C. Haigh, *'The Reign of Elizabeth I'*, Macmillan, 1984
- P. McGrath, *'Papists and Puritans under Elizabeth I'*, Blandford Press, 1967, 0-7137-3275-X

Cromwell 1599–1658

1. Cromwell the Soldier

How did Cromwell gain his high reputation as a commander and how well deserved is it? Was he a military genius or a quick learner and skilled opportunist? It could be argued that his career before Marston Moor was reasonably successful, but not as distinguished as it has sometimes been represented. What were his qualities as a commander? They seem to have been a close relationship with his men, tight discipline, strong religious convictions and the application of the principle of a career open to talent. Nevertheless, his success, certainly before 1649, was as a cavalry commander rather than as a general in overall command.

What was Cromwell's relationship with the Army before 1650 and what part did he play in the political decisions affecting military affairs? He certainly played an important part in the Self-Denying Ordinance which led to the dismissal of the older, aristocratic commanders and which was a key factor in Parliament's eventual success. It was Cromwell who first floated the idea in the Commons in December 1644. However, how far was this an objective plan to win the war and how far a way of safeguarding his own position and outmanoeuvring his rivals and opponents? How far did Cromwell politicise the Army by joining its revolt at Newmarket in June 1647? What was his part in Cornet Joyce's capture of the King shortly afterwards?

2. Cromwell and the English Revolution

How convincing is the view that the revolutionary of the 1640s became the conservative of the 1650s? Cromwell once stated that *'if the King were before me I would shoot him as another'* and he played an important role in the trial and execution of Charles I. But was Cromwell a theoretical Republican or simply a pragmatist? In terms of religious belief Cromwell was regarded as 'the darling of the sectaries'. At a critical point in the summer of 1647 he left Westminster and threw in his lot with the Army, supporting the grievances of the Agitators. This put him into some form of alliance with the Levellers. However, he opposed the Leveller demands for manhood suffrage and took the more conservative line at the Putney Debates in October 1647. In the end he broke with his radical allies

How accurate is this view of Cromwell's role as Lord Protector? Maurice Ashley saw Cromwell as 'the conservative dictator' whilst other historians have identified particular military characteristics of the Protectorate. Nevertheless, clear distinctions need to be made between 'conservative' and 'military'. Cromwell certainly owed his position to the Army, some of his closest associates were his fellow officers. Did Cromwell, then, so much owe his position to the Army that he could not break with it? What is to be made of the rule of the Major-Generals? Was this an attempt to create an overtly military government or to find an effective way of carrying out a programme of reform? How far was the setting up of the Major-Generals a response to genuine fears (possibly exaggerated) about a Royalist resurgence (Penruddock's Rising)?

3. Cromwell and Ireland

With particular reference to the military expedition of 1649-50, how is the brutality of Cromwell's campaign in Ireland best explained, especially compared with his rather different record in England and Scotland? To what extent, if at all, can the events at Drogheda (September 1649) and Wexford (October 1649) be justified? The massacres at these two towns are unprecedented in Cromwell's career and he was personally responsible for them. For a better understanding of Cromwell's attitude and actions, the impact of the Irish Rebellion of 1641 needs to be assessed. Cromwell, and the majority of his fellow MPs, saw it not as a rebellion against oppression but a Catholic rising accompanied by the wanton massacre of Protestants as a preparation for an invasion of England and the restoration of 'Popery'. Cromwell himself played an important part in Parliament's measures to suppress it. Was Cromwell seeking revenge and retribution? On his departure, for Ireland he referred to the Irish as *'the most miserable people in the earth, for all the world knows their barbarism'*. And, again, the massacre at Drogheda was justified as *'a righteous judgement of God upon these barbarous wretches'*. In Cromwell's defence it could be argued: first, in accordance with the contemporary laws of war a garrison which resisted after warnings could be put to the sword; second, civilians were not intended to be involved. However, the evidence for the massacres is controversial and these 'defences' can be questioned.

4. Cromwell as the Champion of Godly Reformation

With particular reference to the debate as to whether he was driven by personal gain ('the ambitious hypocrite') or by a genuine desire for religious reform. How sincere was Cromwell's attachment to the Nominated Parliament/Parliament of Saints (once the Rump had been dissolved)? Cromwell played an important part in setting it up and hoped that it would *'produce the fruits of a just and righteous reformation'*. Why did he agree to its dissolution? Because he saw the opportunity to take power himself, because he was disillusioned with the Nominated Parliament or because all other options had been exhausted? There is very strong evidence that a constant for Cromwell was religious toleration and one reason for his disappointment with the Nominated Parliament was the intolerance of some of its members. How far, as Lord Protector, did Cromwell carry out a Godly Reformation? In terms of foreign affairs how far did the Protector follow a 'Protestant policy'? There is a case for seeing Cromwell as ambitious for power but to what end – for himself or for the cause of Godly Reformation? Finally, was Cromwell a hypocrite as well as being ambitious? Certainly, once he had broken with the Levellers, a Leveller Manifesto put the case. *'He will weep, howl and repent, even while he doth smite you under the first rib'*.

5. The Humble Petition and Advice

With particular reference to why the crown was offered to Cromwell and why he refused it, what was the Humble Petition and Advice? Why was it proposed? It was proposed largely because MPs hated the Instrument of Government and saw it as a military constitution. Cromwell spent five weeks in agonising whether to accept the crown and in the end decided not to. How is this decision best explained? Given his aim of wanting to secure a constitutional settlement why did he refuse one when it was offered by a Parliamentary majority? But would an acceptance of the crown secure the settlement he wanted? Part of the explanation for his decision may lie in the threat of a military revolt by the generals if he accepted. Again, Cromwell may have seen the Army as the best guarantee of religious toleration. Cromwell had certainly been alarmed by the wave of intolerance aroused by the James Nayler case. So, it might be argued that Cromwell accepted the 'godly cause' rather than the 'Parliamentary cause'. In the end, the decision may have come down to one of the other constants in Cromwell's career and that he rejected the crown because *'the providence of God has laid this title aside'*.

Resources (including texts that may be used in the three Interpretation questions)

Cromwell

Cromwell, Our Chief of Men (Paperback)

by [Antonia Fraser](#)

God's Englishman: Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution (Paperback)

by [Christopher Hill](#)

Oliver Cromwell (Heinemann Advanced History) (Paperback)

by [David Sharp](#)

Oliver Cromwell (Profiles In Power) (Paperback)

by [Barry Coward](#)

Cromwell's War Machine: The New Model Army 1645-1660 (Hardcover)

by [Keith Roberts](#)

Cromwell (Flagship History makers) (Paperback)

by [Elizabeth Sparey](#)

Oliver Cromwell (Reputations) (Paperback)

by [J.C. Davis](#)

Oliver Cromwell: Politics and Religion in the English Revolution 1640-1658: Politics and Religion in the English Revolution 1640-1658 (Cambridge Topics in History) (Paperback)

by [David L. Smith](#)

Cromwell: An Honourable Enemy (Paperback)

by [Tom Reilly](#)

Oliver Cromwell (Historical Association Studies) (Paperback)

by [Peter Gaunt](#)

Oliver Cromwell: King in All But Name, 1653-58 (Hardcover)

by [Roy Sherwood](#)

The Interregnum, 1649-60 (Access to History) (Paperback)

by [Michael Lynch](#)

Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution (Paperback)

by [John Morrill](#)

Oliver Cromwell (Routledge Historical Biographies) (Paperback)

by [Martyn Bennett](#)

Old Ironsides: The Military Biography of Oliver Cromwell (Phoenix Press) (Paperback)

by [Frank Kitson](#)

Oliver Cromwell: Soldier - The Military Life of a Revolutionary at War (Hardcover)

by [Alan Marshall](#)

England 1625-1660: Charles I, the Civil War and Cromwell (SHP Advanced History Core Texts) (Paperback)

by [Dale Scarborough](#)

Peter the Great 1689–1725

1. Does Peter deserve the description of ‘the Great’?

Historians who endorse this interpretation point to Peter’s achievements in transforming Russia from a backward country to a modern state, in irrevocably changing the relationship between the tsar, nobility and clergy, in creating a navy and reforming the army to make Russia a major force in Western Europe, in abolishing the Patriarchate and constructing St Petersburg, and in defeating Turkey, Sweden and Persia in war. A counter-view is that much of what he attempted ended in failure or was short-lived, that change was superficial at best and fiercely resisted throughout the country, that he was not a popular ruler, his achievements have been exaggerated, and that only his acolytes regarded him as ‘great’.

2. Were Peter’s domestic reforms ‘revolutionary’ or a continuation of the past?

An argument has arisen over whether Peter began or continued the modernisation and westernisation of Russia. Some historians have seen the abolition of the Patriarchate, the creation of the navy, the building of St Petersburg and its establishment as the capital, and the education of Russian students in western schools as revolutionary developments. They view the changes in central and local administration, the establishment of the collegial system, educational reforms and the introduction of the Table of Ranks, as marking a break with the past. Other historians have been more critical of Peter’s ‘novel’ reforming ideas. They see him as an accelerator of change, one who largely built upon existing foundations, and cite his contacts with western states, his military reforms, and economic developments as evidence. They question how much he genuinely desired western links, and they point to the deep and widespread opposition to most of his policies at all levels of Russian society.

3. Economic developments: success or failure?

Historians debate the impact of Peter’s economic policies. Some have argued that he wasted resources on extravagant and often incomplete projects, that his financial policies were incoherently planned, that state regulations hindered commercial and industrial developments, that the lack of skilled workers and engineers resulted in low quality manufactures, that too much emphasis was put on military needs to the detriment of the country’s low standard of living, and that state initiatives were short-term and failed to provide the foundations to encourage private enterprise. Defenders of Peter’s economic policies have argued that Russia made great progress during his reign. Heavy industry expanded, notably iron and copper works, textiles and shipbuilding; new canals, road networks and ports were established; overseas trade and the export of manufactured goods increased; state funding helped to develop private enterprise, more efficient estate management led to a vast increase in grain production, and after 1709 Russia became less dependent on foreign imports.

4. How effective were Peter’s reforms?

Some historians argue that Peter was very successful in changing the religious, administrative, cultural, naval, military, economic and educational landscape of Russia. Traditional customs and institutions were discarded, government became more centralised along west European lines, and Russia was transformed from a medieval to a modern state. A contrary view is that Peter was limited in what he could do and achieve. The absence of skilled labour and technical expertise, limited financial resources, vast distances and an inhospitable climate hindered progress. Resistance to change from the nobility, clergy, merchants and serfs, meant that most of his ideas were opposed, his reforms only affected a minority of people and their impact was superficial.

5. Causes of opposition to Peter

Historians have argued over the nature and causes of opposition to Peter. Most agree that opposition existed even before his accession, from disgruntled courtiers, disaffected serfs and Old Believers. Some historians emphasise Peter's policies as the prime cause of increasing opposition: high taxation, enforced cultural changes, westernisation, attack on the church, nobility and peasantry, and the speed with which reforms were introduced. Others see Peter's personal behaviour as the main source of widespread opposition: his heavy drinking, smoking, his trips abroad and western habits, his love of sailing and artisan activities, his humiliation of the clergy and boyars, his coarse sense of humour, and his brutal treatment of his own son. These features caused the greater offence and led to his being dubbed the 'tsar stranger', the 'Anti-Christ'.

Resources (including texts that may be used in the three Interpretation questions)

M. Anderson, *Peter the Great*, Thames and Hudson 1962

M. Bogoslovsky, *Peter the Great and his Reforms*, Moscow 1920

J. Cracraft, *Peter the Great Transforms Russia*, D. C. Heath and Co 1991

P. Dukes, *The Making of Russian Absolutism, 1613-1801* Longman 1982

I. Grey, *Peter the Great, Emperor of All Russia*, Hodder and Stoughton 1962

G. Hosking, *Russia: People and Empire, 1552-1917*, Fontana 1998

L. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, Yale UP 2000

S. Lee, *Peter the Great*, Lancaster Pamphlets, Routledge 1993

M. Lentin, *Russia in the Eighteenth Century*, 1973

W. Marshall, *Peter the Great*, Seminar Studies, Longman 1996

R. Massie, *Peter the Great. His Life and World*, Ballantine 1986

C. Peterson, *Peter the Great's Administrative and Judicial Reforms: Swedish Antecedents and the Process of Reception*, Stockholm 1979

R. Pipes, *Russia under the Old Regime*, Scribner's, New York 1974

D. Sturdy, *Fractured Europe, 1600-1721*, Blackwell 2002

B. Sumner, *Peter the Great and the Emergence of Russia*, EUP 1951

E. Williams, *The Ancien Regime in Europe, 1648-1789*, Bodley Head 1970

Louis XIV 1661–1715

1. Absolutism under Louis XIV.

There are two main debates here. First, how should absolutism be defined in this period? Second, how fully was absolutism established and extended under Louis XIV? A possible subsidiary debate is how far Louis intended to establish a form of absolutism. There is a variety of views of how absolutism should be defined in the context of the seventeenth century and whether it equated to tyranny. It should not necessarily be seen as a form of tyranny, although this is how it was regarded by the contemporary English philosopher, Thomas Hobbes. He thus had a moral obligation to govern according to God's principles and that absolutism was to a large extent achieved and, indeed, extended under Louis XIV the nobility no longer constituted a serious threat. Louis took personal control of his own government and oversaw it conscientiously. The power of the law courts, including the Paris Parlement, was curbed and provincial institutions such as the *pays d'état* had their influence reduced. Religious minorities were crushed; royal authority over the Church was asserted in a long-running dispute with the Papacy. The Estates-General remained in abeyance. A series of ambitious wars was fought. The building of Versailles exemplified the power and splendour of the monarch. There is, however, a counter argument that the success of absolutism was limited. Substantial provincial autonomy and sentiments of particularism remained. Venal office-holding continued to flourish. Did Louis XIV's ministers enhance or restrict his power? How different was the 'absolutism' of the late seventeenth century to the 'dynasticism' of earlier periods? Pushed to its extreme, there is an argument that Louis XIV's monarchy was not absolutist at all. On the other hand there is a strong argument for the case that the monarchy was more powerful and France more united in 1715 than in 1661.

2. Louis XIV's Religious Policies

The principal debate here is the extent to which religious and ecclesiastical policies were driven by political rather than religious motives. Central to the argument is the difficulty in separating out religious and political ideas, beliefs, concepts and obligations when dealing with the seventeenth century. Louis XIV's relationship with the Papacy raised important questions about the powers of the monarch in his own kingdom. The defence of the so-called 'Gallican Liberties' could be seen as an extension of royal absolutism. Nevertheless, in his clash with Jansenism, it could be argued that the King was concerned to appear as a faithful son of the Church and, of course, there is the paradox of His Most Christian Majesty (a title conferred by the Pope) being in conflict with the Holy See. How far was this an objection to Jansenist beliefs based on Louis XIV's own religious convictions and how far a matter of political policy?

At the same time religious uniformity was equated with political unity (*une foi, une loi, un roi*), the Parlement of Paris was pro-Jansenist and some of the leading Frondeurs had held Jansenist views. In another area of policy, how far were the Huguenots a serious political threat? How effectively had they been dealt with by Richelieu? To what extent was Louis concerned to establish religious uniformity for its own sake? Or was Louis largely concerned, at a time when external war was a major preoccupation, to create social, religious and political uniformity?

3. Versailles.

There are two important debates here. First, how effective was Versailles, as a form of visual propaganda? Second, and connected, how successful was the building and the concepts surrounding it as a political force for enhancing the King's authority? On the other hand, how far was it counter-productive? Versailles was clearly impressive and was widely copied throughout Europe. Louis was certainly visible, at least to those who attended the Court and to the 'public' which watched the King on public display. Historians have criticised Versailles for its over-formality and artificiality. The etiquette and ceremony of the Court was certainly rigid and formal and courtiers showed deference and respect. This may have enhanced the King's glory but it may also have distanced the King and his Court from his people. The nobility were certainly drawn to the Court and thus may have been 'tamed'. However, it can be argued that the provinces being deprived of the presence, influence and energy of the nobility was damaging the whole kingdom. Historians have argued that Versailles '*ruined and bled the nation*' and that the Court became '*le tombeau de la nation*'. Certainly the great expense of building and maintaining Versailles added to the burden of taxation, already swollen by the cost of war.

4. Louis XIV's Economic and Financial Policies.

Put in simple terms, the debate here is 'Prosperity or Poverty'. How far did Louis XIV's financial and economic policies add to the wealth and prosperity of France and how widely was this shared? A connected debate is the extent and effectiveness of Louis and his ministers in controlling and husbanding the kingdom's finances. Louis and Colbert were concerned to raise the yield of taxation by reducing waste and corruption. How successful was this? Certainly very large sums of money were saved by this means, finances were carefully monitored and were put into good order. After ten years in office Colbert had more or less balanced the books. However, in the second half of the reign the budget moved increasingly into deficit. Attempts to reduce the burden of the *taille* on the peasantry largely failed and the tax privileges of the nobility were largely untouched. It might be argued that the taxation system was in itself a handicap to economic expansion. At the same time, however, there were some important moves for reform and change. For example the profits of tax farmers were reduced. A debate within the larger debate is the extent to which financial and economic policies were designed to benefit the people of France or simply the King himself. Especially under Colbert, there was a considerable programme of economic reform. It must be borne in mind, however, that no significant increase in agricultural production was achieved. There were considerable developments in trade and industry, however, and Colbert played a key role. However, it might be argued that State regulation and intervention could prove counter productive. Furthermore, how serious was the gap between the agricultural sector on the one hand and the industrial and commercial on the other? Again, how far did war undermine Colbert's work? In addition, Colbert's economic and commercial policies could be criticised from the standpoint of free market economic theory.

5. The War of Spanish Succession

The main debate for consideration here is the extent to which Louis XIV was responsible for the outbreak of war in 1702. A connected debate is whether war could have been avoided by more successful and persistent diplomacy. How much of the responsibility should be shared by others, chiefly the Emperor Leopold I and William of Orange, King of England and Stadholder of Holland? A range of factors needs to be fed into the debate: the ambitions of Louis XIV and his record of expansionism; the longstanding opposition to France by William of Orange; the conflicting and colonial aims of France, England and the Dutch Republic; the continuing Valois-Habsburg rivalry; the childlessness of Charles II of Spain. How important to the later outbreak of war was the failure of the powers to consult the Spanish and the failure of Leopold I to sign either treaty? How far can it be argued that Louis XIV's acceptance of the throne was not in itself the cause of war but that his provocative actions between November 1700 and March 1702 were? More widely, how convincing is the argument that the Spanish succession was not the principal cause of the war which bears the name?

Resources (including texts that may be used in the three Interpretation questions)

Jeremy Black *From Louis XIV to Napoleon: The Fate of a Great Power* 1999

Jeremy Black *The Rise of the European Powers* 1990

T.C.W. Blanning *The Culture of Power and the Power of Culture: Europe 1660-1789* 2003

R. Briggs *Early Modern France 1560-1715* 1998

P.R. Campbell *Louis XIV* 1996

ed. W. Doyle *An Old Regime: France 1660-1788* 2000

R. Price *A Concise History of France* 2005

J.H. Shennan *Louis XIV* 1986

David L. Smith *Louis XIV* 1992

D. Sturdy *Louis XIV* 1998

G.R.R. Treasure *Seventeenth Century France* 1966

R. Wilkinson *Louis XIV, France and Europe 1661-1715* 1993

Francois Bluche *Louis XIV* (translated by Mark Greengross) 1990

Peter Burke *The Fabrication of Louis XIV* 1992

ed. R. Hatton *Louis XIV and Absolutism* 1976

ed. R. Hatton *Louis XIV and Europe* 1976

N. Henshall *The Myth of Absolutism: Change and Continuity In Early Modern European Monarchy* 1992

J.J.Hurt *Louis XIV and the Parlements* 2002
Victor Mallia-Milanes *Louis XIV* 1994
ed. J. Miller *Absolutism in Seventeenth-Century Europe* 1990
J.C.Rule *Louis XIV: the Craft of Kingship* 1969
J.H.Shennan *Liberty and Order in Early Modern Europe* 1986
Guy Walton *Louis XIV's Versailles* 1986
John B. Wolf *Louis XIV* 1968

British India 1784-1878

The broad areas of debate are:

1. The role of the East India Company.

How far was the advance of the British in India the work of the company? One view is that the Company was the main reason for the advances in India in the period up to 1815 and that the main impetus was financial and economic, much to the benefit of some individuals like Warren Hastings. The Company was a successful example of capitalism and a profitable undertaking. The alternative view is that the British government, notably by the India Act of 1784 and by the impeachment of Hastings was the main mover, along with independent traders who challenged the Company's monopoly. The government saw the Company as corrupt and inefficient.

2. The nature of British rule in India.

To what extent did the British rule in their own interests? There is an argument that the British both economically and militarily took control of India for their own ends, for profit and for expansion and that acquisitiveness was their main hallmark. Their main aim was to increase the extent of the Empire.

The alternative view is that many administrators hoped to bring enlightenment to India, governing humanely in the best interests of the Indian population. The rule of the Mughals was in decline and the power vacuum was bad for India.

3. The impact of missionaries and religion in India.

How far did the British try to bring a Christian influence to bear in India? On the one hand it is suggested that, especially after 1815, the British became increasingly intolerant of Indian religious customs like *sati* and *thagi* and worked to eradicate them. The evangelical movement in Britain was eager to convert India and believed that what they called the Indian Mutiny resulted from this proceeding too slowly.

On the other hand are arguments that the reformers like Sleeman and Bentinck exaggerated the impact of some customs and that thus they were not that injurious. Many administrators resisted the unrealistic demands of the missionary lobby and attempts to interfere with Indian customs were limited.

4. The nature of the Indian Rebellion in 1857.

What were the main reasons for the Rebellion? The debate here is about the relative importance about different possible causes. Interpretations of the events of 1857 are varied.

The rebellion has been seen as the first war of Indian independence or as a reaction by religious groups in India against the perceived threats to their position. It can be viewed as an attempt to return to the traditional values of the Mughal Empire.

Other interpretations see it as a sporadic and limited protest by a few Indian army units, or a protest originating from social and economic discontent over the westernizing policies of Britain. There is general agreement that the issue of the cartridges was the occasion rather than the root cause of the discontent.

5. The way in which Britain maintained control in India.

What were the reasons for the power exercised by Britain in India? The debate is about the relative importance of the possible explanations. It has been suggested that British rule rested on consent, through agreements with native rulers, the provision of beneficial rule and on the avoidance of contentious issue by officials. For many Indians there was little discernible difference in their lives. On the other hand, British rule has been seen as oppressive and resting on military might and prestige, and advanced by an expansionist policy.

Resources (including texts that may be used in the three Interpretation questions)

- F. McDonough, *'The British Empire, Hodder and Stoughton'*, 1994, 0-340-59376-8
N. Ferguson, *'Empire'*, Allen Lane, 2003, 0-713-99615-3
M. Dash, *'Thug'*, Granta Books, 2005, 1-86207-846-7
S. David, *'The Indian Mutiny 1857'*, Viking, 2002, 0-670-91137-2
L. James, *'The Rise and Fall of the British Empire'*, Abacus, 1994, 0-349-0667-3
L. James, *'Raj, Abacus'*, 1997, 0-349-11012-3
T. Lloyd, *'The British Empire 1558-1983'*, OUP, 1984
Ed. P. Marshall, *'Cambridge illustrated History of the British Empire'*, CUP, 1996, 0-521-00254-0
P. Brendon, *'The Rise and Fall of the British Empire'*, 2007
J. Keay, *'India, A History'*, Harper Collins, 2000, 0-00-2557177
J. Keay, *'The Honourable Company'*, Harper Collins, 1991

Napoleon I 1795–1815

Intensely controversial in his lifetime, Napoleon has been compared to many different types of regime since his death. He has been seen as following an eighteenth century line of enlightened despots as well as anticipating twentieth century dictators. His relationship to the French Revolution which enabled him to rise has been much discussed. His personal abilities even on the battlefield have been questioned and his impact as reformer and moderniser has also been discussed.

The broad areas of debate are as follows:

1. Napoleon as military commander.

To what extent did Napoleon's leadership qualities account for his victories? Historians have disagreed about how great a commander Napoleon was. Arguments which see him as a genius have focused on his ability to inspire his forces; his organisational skills; his 'eye for the battlefield' and tactical abilities and his use of the strategic battle combining movement, deployment and pursuit,

Others have seen Napoleon as depending on the work of others and the development of the French army in the Revolutionary period; they have questioned his organisational abilities, and seen him as an improviser, scrambling to glory. His campaigns have been seen as of variable quality and success with serious weaknesses in his strategic thinking, such as under estimation of naval power being important. His ability to inspire and lead large forces has also been questioned.

2. Napoleon as domestic reformer.

The reforms of the Consulate have been seen as fulfilling the Revolutionary aims of modern administration, meritocracy and providing stability. The Hundred Days has sometimes been seen as a liberal experiment with Napoleon returning to his revolutionary roots. They have also been seen as less concerned with the good of the French people or even the Notables on whom he relied, as with the needs of establishing a personal military dictatorship. The principle of authoritarianism has been seen as an unpleasant thread running through the changes; the increase in personal power has been seen as the main motivation rather than any enlightened motives.

3. Napoleon as the head of a Police State.

There has been debate about whether Napoleonic France was essentially a police state. Defenders point to the survival of constitutional forms and legality and the relatively limited extent of repression by modern standards. Detractors see the only limitations being practical ones and Napoleon having many of the characteristics of later dictatorships – a secret police, censorship, spies, political imprisonment and even execution.

4. The impact of Napoleon on Europe

Did he bring the enlightened and modernising reforms of the Revolution to Europe dominated by kings, princes, nobles and a reactionary church? Did he open up economic possibilities by including the Imperial territories ripe plundered and exploited or developed and modernised with national aspirations being encouraged? Was Napoleon the father of modern nationalism? The originator of the modern German and Italian state? Or did he simply look on Europe as a source of reward for his family and his supporters?

There has been discussion about the main factor in **the fall of Napoleon**. He himself blamed Spain. The so called 'Spanish Ulcer' was a major drain on French resources and acted as a training ground for English forces. Others see the Russian campaign as the main turning point. The enormous losses of horses and men and the end of his reputation for invincibility are important here, but some have not seen it as necessarily leading to his fall. Napoleon was able to raise substantial armies afterwards and there was no certainty that the European powers would stay together. Russia was severely weakened at Borodino, for instance and Austria wavered. British opposition which led Napoleon into the Continental System and which financed coalitions against him, preventing any settlement until final victory has been seen as crucial. Others have taken a wider view, blaming Napoleon's own personality and excessive ambition.

Resources (including texts that may be used in the three Interpretation questions)

- G.Ellis, '*Napoleon: profiles in Power*', 2002 Longmans
A. Grab, '*Napoleon and the Transformation of Europe*', Palgrave 2003
P. Ingram, '*Napoleon and Europe 1889*' Nelson Thorne
A.Stiles, '*Napoleon France and Europe*', 2004 Hodder
DG Wright, '*Napoleon and Europe*', 1985 Longmans
J. Bainville, '*Napoleon*'. Simon Publications 2001
L. Bergeron, '*France under Napoleon*', 1981 Princeton edition 1992
O. Connelly, '*Blundering to Glory*', new ed.2006, Rowman and Littlefield
M. Crook, '*Napoleon Comes to Power*', University of Wales 1998
D. Chandler, '*Napoleon*', 2000 Penguin
S. Englund, '*Napoleon, A Political Life*', 2005 Simon and Schuster
C. Esdaile, '*Napoleon's Wars*', 2007 Allen Lane
P. Geyl, '*Napoleon For and Against*', Peregrine 1965
Sir J. Marshall Cornwall, '*Napoleon as Military Commander*', Penguin 2002 ed
M.Lyons, '*Napoleon and the Legacy of the French Revolution*', Palgrave 1994
F, McLynn, '*Napoleon*', Pimlico 2003
B. Nosworthy, '*Battle Tactics of Napoleon and his Enemies*', Constable 1997

Gladstone and Disraeli 1865-1886

The broad areas of debate are as follows

1. The Second Reform Act.

To what extent was the issue of Parliamentary reform a genuine interest of Disraeli's? One view is that Disraeli had always favoured reform as his early novels indicate and genuinely wanted to extend the franchise to the middle and upper working classes.

Another view is that he lacked any such conviction and was determined to pass the act to further his own career and to frustrate Gladstone and his methods in doing so show he was merely opportunistic and intent on power.

2. The problems of Ireland.

To what extent were the problems of Ireland successfully addressed in this period? Some have argued that Gladstone, as a conviction politician on this issue, went some way to solving the religious and land problems in Ireland and, had Home Rule been accepted by the Liberals, would have solved the whole problem.

Others argue that Gladstone's reforms were less effective and that he was frustrated by changing Irish aims and opposition to his proposals, some of which was personal, and by the activities of Chamberlain on the one hand and Parnell on the other. Some argue that Home Rule would have created more problems than it solved, for instance by alienating Ulster. It can also be argued that the problem was insoluble.

3. The domestic achievements of Gladstone.

To what extent did the Liberal reforms satisfy Liberal aims and public demands? The debate is less over the nature of the reforms, but centres on the outcome and how far they met Liberal aspirations for reform. One view is that the reforms are a turning point and that the institutional reforms made a real difference to the opportunities given to the middle and lower classes and marked an end to privilege, ushering in a more modern Britain.

The alternative view is that the effects were limited and there was much discontent from the radicals about the scope of the measures. Gladstone can be criticised for being fixated on Ireland and for failing to come to terms with the needs of a developing industrial society.

4. The impact of Disraeli's reforms.

How far did Disraeli implement the so-called Tory Democracy? Some have maintained that Disraeli's reforms made a considerable difference to working class lives and energetic reformers like Chamberlain were enabled by them.

Others argue that the permissive nature of the reforms, the continuing belief in laissez faire and the increasing emphasis on foreign affairs in Disraeli's second ministry meant the reforms were not all that effective.

5. The aims and achievements of foreign and imperial policies.

How far did Gladstone and Disraeli promote British interests? This was a fierce contemporary debate. One side argues that Gladstone followed a weak foreign policy and gave in to foreign powers such as the US. He also showed weakness in his emphasis on moral issues and disregarded the threat from Russia. Disraeli's policies dealt firmly with threats to Britain and his 'forward' policy won popularity and territory.

The opposite viewpoint argues that Disraeli exaggerated the Russian threat, acted without proper consultation and allowed men on the spot to take decisions with disastrous results and that his policies were costly in men and money and had no regard for the rights of indigenous people in the Empire.

Some see a complete contrast between Gladstone and Disraeli's imperial policies, while others see similarities.

Resources (including texts that may be used in the three Interpretation questions)

- P. Adelman, *'Great Britain and the Irish Question'*, Hodder and Stoughton, 1996, 0-340-54646-8
- G. Morton, *'Home Rule and the Irish Question'*, Longman, 0-582-35215-0
- D. Paterson, *'Liberalism and Conservatism, 1846-1905'*, Heinemann, 2001, 0-435-32737-2
- D. Watts, *'Whigs, Radicals and Liberals 1815-1914'*, Hodder and Stoughton, 2002, 0-340-80206-5
- D. Watts, *'Tories, Unionists and Conservatives 1815-1914'*, Hodder and Stoughton, 2002, 0-340-80207-3
- S. Lee, *'Gladstone and Disraeli'*, Routledge, 2005, 0-415-32357-6
- DG Boyce, *'The Irish Question and British Politics, 1868-1996'*, Macmillan, 1988, 0-333-66530-9
- TA Jenkins, *'The Liberal Ascendancy 1830-1886'*, Macmillan, 1994, 0-333-59248-4
- TA Jenkins, *'Disraeli and Victorian Conservatism'*, Macmillan, 1996, 0-333-64343-7
- I. St. John, *'Disraeli and the Art of Victorian Politics'*, Anthem Press, 2005, 1-84331-191-7
- J. K. Walton, *'Disraeli'*, Routledge, 1990, 0-415-00059
- M. Winstanley, *'Gladstone and the Liberal Party'*, Routledge, 1990, 0-415-03574-0

Bismarck and German Unification 1815-1871

Like Napoleon, Bismarck wanted to write his own place in History and his memoirs sought to establish a legend which subsequent historians have discussed with varying degrees of scepticism. His own writings are deeply ambiguous and his aims, which were not clear to contemporaries, are still discussed. His role in Unification, itself a concept which is challenged, has been seen by different historians as pivotal and marginal. He has been blamed for the Third Reich and also seen as allowing the emergence of a liberal Germany.

The main areas of debate are as follows:

1. What were the strengths and weaknesses of German national aspirations between 1815 and 1849?

To what extent did the impact of the Napoleonic wars and the growing interest in German nationalism that emerged from them offer realistic hopes of a new German state? Was it the limitations of German nationalism or the power of the repressive apparatus of Metternich supported by Austria's allies inside and outside Germany that meant that there was little progress between 1815 and 1847 towards greater political unification? Did the revolutions of 1848-9 fail because of the divisions and lack of determination of the German liberals or the power of a resurgent monarchy and army?

2. What accounts for the changing balance of power between Austria and Prussia between 1850 and 1862?

To what extent had the rise of German nationalism, the growth of the Zollverein and greater cooperation between the German states, the changes in culture and the experiences of 1848-9 made it likely that there would be a change in the 1815 settlement with Austria being unlikely to maintain her predominance over a loose German confederation? The alternative explanation might be not in the growth of unifying factors within Germany, but the weaknesses of Austria. The war against France over Italy 1859-60 and the effects of the Crimean war in dividing the Great Powers, together with the economic growth of Prussia and the reforms of the Prussian army might be more important than any nationalist developments.

3. How important was Bismarck's diplomacy in bringing about the North German Confederation 1862-1867?

The traditional view is of Bismarck as a master planner who deliberately gained Russian support, who prevented the King of Prussia participating in any reform of the Bund, who used the Schleswig Holstein crisis to undermine the Bund and then to engineer a war against Austria. This was calculated to bring North Germany under Prussian influence and Bismarck used his diplomatic skills to fulfil his plan, ensuring French neutrality and gaining Italian support, while gambling on British neutrality. Alternatively, there is the view that Bismarck merely improvised, unable to predict events or see an overall plan. The miscalculations of Austria were more important than his own plans and he merely used favourable circumstances, adapting his policies and relying on factors outside his own control.

4. Was the war between Prussia and France and the proclamation of the German Empire planned?

Did Bismarck intend to remain contented with the expansion of Prussia by 1867 or was he planning to defeat France and complete unification? Does the Treaty of Prague indicate a desire to rely on Austria's neutrality in a war against France in the future? Does his treatment of Napoleon III indicate a desire to provoke conflict as early as the Luxemburg crisis of 1867. Does Bismarck's promotion of the Hohenzollern candidature reveal a long standing intention to bring about war to give security to his gains of 1867 and consolidate his power over South Germany? The alternative is to see Bismarck as having achieved his major aims by 1867 and having little desire to launch into a war which could easily have led to protracted and unsuccessful conflict. There was no certainty of Austrian neutrality and little interest on Bismarck's part in nationalist aspirations or the addition of large number of Catholics into a new Reich.

5. How liberal was Bismarck's Germany after 1867?

Did the North German Confederation and the German Empire reflect liberal ideas and hopes; or was liberalism defeated just as much as Austria in 1866, and Germany set on a path which was essentially authoritarian? Did Bismarck create a 'special way' for Germany, as some historians have suggested which destroyed hopes for a parliamentary state by creating a new Germany from 'blood and iron' and giving it a constitutional form which gave real power to the Prussian monarchy and its government and little to representative institutions. Were the constitutions merely 'the fig leaf of absolutism' or did they contain liberal elements and did the federal structure offer opportunities for continuing liberalism?

Resources (including texts that may be used in the three Interpretation questions)

- A. Stiles, *The Unification of Germany 1815-1890*, Hodder Access, 1986
- B. Waller, *Bismarck*, Historical Association, 1997
- M. Wells, *Bismarck*, Collins Historymakers, 2003
- D.G. Williamson, *Bismarck and Germany 1862-90* Longmans Seminar, 1986
- D. Blackbourn, *The History of Germany 1780-1918, The Long Nineteenth Century*, Blackwell, 2002
- J. Breuilly, *The Foundation of the First German Nation-State*, Palgrave 1996
- W. Carr, *A History of Germany, 1815-1990*, 4th ed. New York: Routledge, Chapman, and Hall, 1991.
- E. Crankshaw, *Bismarck*. The Viking Press. (1981).
- Craig, Gordon A. *Germany, 1866-1945*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- E Eyck, *Bismarck and the German Empire*, W. W. Norton & Company. (1964).
- W. Feuchtwanger, *Bismarck*, Routledge 2002
- G. Lothar *Bismarck, the White Revolutionary*, London, 1986
- T. S. Hamerow, *Restoration, Revolution, Reaction: Economics and Politics in Germany, 1815-1871*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958.
- H. Holborn, *A History of Modern Germany*, 3 vols. New York: Knopf, 1959-69.
- M. Hughes, *Nationalism and Society in Germany 1800-1945*, London, 1988
- B. Jelavich, *Modern Austria: Empire and Republic, 1815-1986*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987
- K.A. Lerman, *Bismarck: Profiles in Power*, Longman, 2004.
- O. Pflanze, *Bismarck and the Development of Germany*, 3 vols. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.
- A. Ramm, *Germany, 1789-1919: A Political History*, Methuen, 1981.
- H. Schulze, *The Course of German Nationalism From Frederick the Great to Bismarck 1763-1867*, Cambridge University Press, 1990
- J.J. Sheehan, *German History, 1770-1866*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- AJP. Taylor, *Bismarck, Man and Statesman*, London, Hamish Hamilton 1955 republished Sutton, 2003
- H.U. Wehler, *The German Empire 1871-1918*, Berg 1997

Russian Revolutions 1894-1924

Ever since the Revolutions of 1917, enormous debates have surrounded the background to those Revolutions and the immediate consequences. Two important personalities, Nicholas II and Lenin, merit much attention and the issue of how far individuals have shaped history. Then again, larger forces - such as the impact of war and mass unrest – have to be balanced against the role of individuals. Debate continues, no matter the effects of the openness of Russian and other ex-USSR archives since c1989.

1. The significance of the 1905 Revolution.

When explaining the 1905 revolution most are agreed on the causes of 1905, though some focus more on the short-term impact of the War of 1904-5, others on structural factors and others on the personal impact of Nicholas II.

There are different explanations as to why Nicholas II survived and significance of the outcome of the Revolution. There is a debate about the seriousness of the threat to Nicholas II. Some see it as a genuine attempt at revolution; others as a series of revolts, widespread but inchoate.

There has been much argument over any parallels between 1905 and 1917: Lenin saw it as a 'dress rehearsal'; few would agree. Recently, there has been argument that the Revolution should be styled '1905-6', with a focus on consequences well into 1906, if not 1907. It has been argued that much spilt over in 1906, with issues only resolved then.

2. How strong was the Tsarist system before and in 1914?

Even if the Tsar survived that does not mean his position was firmly secured. There has been much argument over the actual strength (or weakness) of Tsardom on the eve of the First World War. Some see it as robust enough, popular, supported and secure. Others believe it was living on borrowed time, facing growing unrest c1911-13, linked in (large) part to underlying structural weaknesses. That said, few would accord that much credence to the strength of opposition from the Left, not least the rather insignificant Bolshevik Party. However there is some debate about how the party developed and grew before 1914.

There are arguments also over the importance of Stolypin's reforms of 1906-11 and over the recovery or otherwise of the economy. There is debate about the significance and effectiveness of changes after 1906. Some see the land reforms as likely to have led to a conservative landowning peasantry, with a very different role and place in society. Others see the reforms as ineffective and too small in scale. Some see industrial growth as likely to lead to modernisation; others see it as simply adding to Russia's social problems with an increase in urban slums and revolutionary activity. Some see the Dumas as the possible birth of Russian parliamentary rule; others see it as merely a sham.

3. How important was the First World War to the collapse of the Tsarist system?

Essentially, the War either precipitated collapse, speeding up existing trends, or was the sole cause of collapse. Most agree on the nature of the War and its many problems, structural deficiencies being exposed. But some see Nicholas II as a key player in the collapse while others see him swept along by almost impossible factors and forces. Attention focuses on 1916 - early 1917 and on the actual fall of the Tsar. All countries involved in the war faced strains, but the debate centres on whether the sheer scale of the war made these strains greater in Russia or whether the existing weaknesses of the regime and the limitations of its ruler were key issues.

4. The significance of the Revolutions of 1917 and the issue of how the Bolsheviks got into power in October 1917.

The causes of the Revolutions of February and October 1917 have excited much debate. Some argue that the Tsar was forced from power by massive popular unrest; others that he was forced out by the political elite, in an attempt to save themselves. There is argument over the meaning of 'revolution' throughout this period as there is over the brief flourishing of democracy. Lenin looms large from April 1917. His importance is undeniable, but there has been much dispute as to the extent of that importance. To some, he was all important. To others, he was no more important than other Bolsheviks, not least Trotsky. The complex relationship of Lenin and Trotsky figures here and the latter has been seen as important as Lenin in the events of October (the Military Revolutionary Committee, and the planning of the take over, for example). All the big events

between April and October are debated. And the events of October 1917 are seen as either a mass, popular uprising or a coup by the vanguard elite, staging a conspiratorial coup rather than a true revolution.

5. The importance of the Civil War to Bolshevik survival and the creation of a dictatorship.

Once in power, Lenin had to legitimise his rule and it was the consequences of this that led on to vicious civil war. Some argue that the civil war arose naturally from spontaneous opposition; others that it was sought actively by Lenin. Some argue that dictatorship arose accidentally; others that it was the natural goal of Lenin and indeed inherent in Marxist-Leninism. The same is true of the Red Terror which Lenin pursued, either it was a necessity or inherent in Lenin's thinking. Focus has also extended to the White as well as the Red Terror. There is debate over the origins and effectiveness of War Communism as over the switch to the N.E.P. in 1921. How far the Reds won the Civil War or the Whites lost that War is an over-arching debate area. And attention has been given to the Greens as well as Reds and Whites and debate attached to the Peasant Revolts of 1920-1921 and the Kronstadt Mutiny of 1921. The mixture of economically liberal elements in the N.E.P. and a clearly dictatorial, illiberal political regime emerging from the Civil War has been debated: how and why was it that Lenin could pursue a policy such as the N.E.P. at a time when he was being severe politically? And the complex relationship of Lenin and Trotsky is another factor here. This axis had much importance to the winning of the Civil War. Trotsky has been seen as pivotal, as much as Lenin. They appeared to need each other but relations were never easy, not least in 1920-1. Yet they allied over the issue of Stalin and Georgia just as they disagreed over the nature and direction of the Party c1921-22. Trotsky was downgraded in Soviet writings but resurrected in role and importance in Cold War era writings. Perhaps he has been over-rated; perhaps not.

Resources (including texts that may be used in the three Interpretation questions)

- E. Acton, *'Re-thinking the Russian Revolution'*, (Edward Arnold, 1990)
E. Acton, *'Russia: The Tsarist and Soviet Legacy'* (2nd ed., London, 1995)
E. Acton and T. Stableford, *'Documents on Russia'*, vol. I (1917-1940) (Exeter U. P., 2007)
C. Corin and T. Fiehn, *'Communist Russia under Lenin and Stalin'* (John Murray, 2002)
S. Fitzpatrick, *'The Russian Revolution 1917-1932'* (2nd ed., O.U.P., 1994)
J. Hite, *'Tsarist Russia 1801-1917'* (Causeway Press, 1989)
G. Hosking, *'A History of the Soviet Union'* (Harper Collins, 1985)
G. Hosking, *'Russia: People and Empire'* (London, 1997)
J. F. Hutchinson, *'Late Imperial Russia 1890-1917'* (Longman, 1999)
D. R. Marples, *'Lenin's Revolution: Russia 1917-1921'* (Longman, 2000)
M. McCauley, *'The Soviet Union 1917-1991'* (Longman, 1993)
M. McCauley, *'Russia 1917-1941'* (Sempringham, 1997)
R. Pipes, *'Russia under the Bolshevik Regime'* (London, 1994)
R. Pipes, *'Concise History of the Russian Revolution'* (London, 1995)
R. Pipes, *'Three Whys of the Russian Revolution'* (London, 1998)
R. Sakwa, *'Documents on the Rise and Fall of the Soviet Union 1917-91'* (Routledge, 1999)
R. Service, *'A History of Twentieth Century Russia'* (Allen Lane, 1997)
R. Service, *'The Russian Revolution 1900-1927'* (2nd ed., Macmillan, 1991)
R. Service, *'Lenin'* (London, 2000)
I. Thatcher, *'Late Imperial Russia'* (London, 2005)
I. Thatcher, *'Trotsky'* (Routledge, 2002)
D. Volkogonov, *'Lenin's Life and Legacy'* (London, 1994)
J. White, *'Lenin'* (Palgrave, 2001)
B. Williams, *'The Russian Revolution 1917-1921'* (Blackwell, Oxford, 1987)
A. Wood, *'The Russian Revolution'* (2nd ed., Longman, 2003)
E. Acton, W. G. Rosenberg, V. Cherniaev, *'Critical Companion to the Russian Revolution 1917-1921'* (Hodder & Stoughton, 2001)
A. Ascher, *'P. A. Stolypin'* (London, 2001)
R. W. Davies, *'From Tsarism to the New Economic Policy'* (London, 1991)
M. Ferro, *'October 1917: A Social History'* (London, 1980)
O. Figes, *'A People's Tragedy: The Russian Revolution 1891-1924'* (Pimlico, 1997)

P. Gatrell, *'The Tsarist Economy 1850-1917'* (London, 1966)
R. Gellately, *'Lenin, Stalin and Hitler'* (London, 2007)
P Kenez, *'A History of the Soviet Union'* (C. U. P., 1999)
R. Pipes, *'The Russia Revolution'* (London, 1990)
R. Pipes, *'The Unknown Lenin'* (Yale U. P., 1996)

America between the Wars 1918-1941

American history in this period is framed around a mixture of individuals (eg Hoover, Roosevelt) and big issues and events ('Boom and Bust', Prohibition, the Great Depression, the New Deal, the direction of foreign policy). At the time, there were disagreements of opinions and views; these have intensified since, even if there has been some developing consensus areas. The interplay of individuals, groups, pressure groups, business interests, trade unions, different ethnic groups, massive 'invisible forces', internal angst and external challenges, offers much to discuss.

1. The reasons for and the nature of the Boom in the 1920s.

The debate here is over the relative importance of different causal factors. Was this induced by the consequences of the First World War? Did it owe much to simple non-government intervention and non-regulation? How far was it fuelled by factors such as mass-production and excessive consumerism? Historians also consider the extent and nature of prosperity. Did it affect all classes, areas and ethnic groups evenly or unevenly? Was there an inevitability that it would come to an end, perhaps spectacularly so? Did it reveal structural weaknesses as well as flawed business ideas and practices?

2. The reasons for the rise and fall of National Prohibition.

Some argue that this was a legacy of the First World War, raising as it did issues of national social awareness and the need to deal with social problems in order to achieve national unity. Some see it as the product of powerful moral and spiritual-religious forces and pressure groups with their origins well before the First World War.

Some see the moral arguments as the major influence, while others argue that it emanated from a powerful W.A.S.P. culture, opposing social changes (mass immigration, socialism, African American civil rights). They link this also to the 'Red Scare' atmosphere.

The impact was mixed, variable and uneven. There is discussion about the major reason for the end of national prohibition: its eventual repeal has been put down to the rise of organised crime, linked in part to mass disobedience activities, flouting the law. Another view is that its perceived failure was the product of the law and order authorities colluding at disobedience. Another view is that big towns and cities and indeed new immigrants overcame W.A.S.P. small town and rural aspirations.

There is a further debate about the extent of the failure of Prohibition. Some argue that it did have some worthwhile achievements, while others say it was an abject failure.

3. The reasons for and impact of the Wall Street Crash and the onset of the Depression.

There has been plentiful debate here. Some have argued for the sheer inevitability of the Crash, given activities in the 1920s, speculation, business over-confidence, apathetic government attitudes. Some point to structural weaknesses (eg over-production, under-consumption, uneven distribution of wealth) as the key. Some see the Crash as being more important than these longer-term factors. Some see global, international factors as crucial. There has also been debate about Hoover's administration. Blamed at the time for the intensification of the Depression, Hoover attracted subsequent criticism. However, there has been some rehabilitation, acknowledging the limitations placed on Hoover by the Constitution and Congress and attempts by Hoover to deal with some of the worst features. Some have even argued that Roosevelt pursued some of Hoover's policy ideas.

There can be no dispute that the effects of the Depression were major, widespread, national and penetrative. Debate centres on the relative importance of different possible causes and the effectiveness of the measures taken to deal with the Depression before 1933.

4. The nature and success levels of the New Deal.

There has been debate about just how successful the New Deal really was. Did it generate real recovery or did it simply halt economic meltdown? Were there two New Deals (1933-5, 1935-7) and how effective were they? Did it operate at a superficial level, or penetrate deeper? How important were financial-fiscal recovery attempts? How many people and regions benefited? Was there much unevenness? Why did it excite opposition? From whom? Did such opposition shape its development? There is debate about whether there was a radical intention to reform the US or merely to prop up capitalism. There is further debate over the criticisms made that Roosevelt

neglected the civil rights of ethnic groups (even if there were uneven benefits). Trade unions made some gains.

The balance between Relief, Recovery and Reform has been debated.

Roosevelt himself has invited much debate. Was he supremely successful, a truly great President, one who banished fear and inspired confidence and recovery? How original were his ideas? Did he rely much on some Hoover ideas as well as his own range of advisers? How far was he shaped by media skills? Was he an idealist or pragmatist? Was he a ruthless political operator? How popular was he and with whom? Who opposed him and why? Did he re-shape American politics?

5. The nature and direction of foreign policy: isolationism.

Some have viewed the period, after the Fourteen Points and the failure to join the League of Nations, as one of definite isolationism, in part a reaction to Wilsonian diplomacy, in part a 'return to normalcy'. Others have questioned the extent of isolation, focusing on such features as the Dawes and Young Plans, Kellogg-Briand Pact, 'good neighbour' attitudes towards Latin America. Even then, it is possible to see the 1930s as strongly isolationist, a response to the Crash of 1929 and World economic crisis. But some see Roosevelt as avowedly internationalist, slowly framing a policy of limited activism and interventionism, more evident in and after 1938-9. The attitudes of Congress, the press and public opinion were important. Perhaps Roosevelt was a pragmatist, reactive to events in Europe and the Far East, gradually extending responses to Hitler and Japan in 1940-1.

There is debate about Roosevelt's real intentions: did he intend to intervene in World War Two? How is the help he offered to Britain to be interpreted? Did his policies make some sort of Japanese and German action against the USA inevitable? Was he an idealist or a pragmatist?

Resources (including texts that may be used in the three Interpretation questions)

- A. J. Badger, *The New Deal*, (Macmillan, 1989)
- H. Brogan, *The Penguin History of the United States*, (Penguin, 1985)
- D. Burner, *Herbert Hoover: A Public Life*, (New York, 1979)
- P. Clements, *Prosperity, Depression and the New Deal*, (Hodder & Stoughton, 1997)
- R. Dallek, *Franklin D. Roosevelt and American Foreign Policy*, (New York, 1995)
- P. Johnson, *A History of the American People*, (Phoenix, 1997)
- M. A. Jones, *The Limits of Liberty*, (2nd ed., O. U. P., 1995)
- T. Kemp, *The Climax of Capitalism*, (Longman, 1990)
- P. Maney, *The Roosevelt Presence*, (New York, 1992)
- M. E. Parrish, *Anxious Decades*, (Norton, 1992)
- T. G. Paterson and D. Merrill, *Major Problems in American Foreign Relations, vol. II: since 1914* (4th ed., D. C. Heath & Co., 1993)
- P. Renshaw, *F.D.R.* (Longman, 2003)
- D. Reynolds, *From Munich to Pearl Harbor*, (Ivan Dee Publ, Chicago, 2001)
- A. Shlaes, *The Forgotten Man: A New History of the Great Depression*, (Jonathan Cape, 2007)
- Studs Terkel, *Hard Times: An Oral History of the Great Depression in America* (Pantheon, N.Y., 1970)
- H. Zinn, *A People's History of the United States* (3rd ed., Longman, 2003)
- M. Bernstein, *The Great Depression*, (1987)
- A. Brinkley, *The End of Reform: New Deal Liberalism in Recession and War*, (1995)
- S. Casey, *Cautious Crusade: Franklin D. Roosevelt, American Public Opinion and The War Against Nazi Germany*, (2001)
- P. Cohrs, *The Unfinished Peace after World War I*, (2006)
- R. Edsforth, *The New Deal: America's Response to the Great Depression*, (2000)
- P. Fearon, *War, Prosperity and Depression: The U. S. Economy 1917-1945*, (1987)
- A. L. Hamby, *For the Survival of Democracy: Franklin Roosevelt and the World Crisis of the 1930s*, (2004)
- B. D. Karl, *The Uneasy State: The United States from 1915 to 1945*, (1983)
- D. M. Kennedy, *Freedom from Fear: The American People in Depression and War*, (1999)
- W. Leuchtenberg, *The F.D.R. Years: on Roosevelt and his Legacy*, (1995)
- G. McJinsey, *The Presidency of Franklin Delano Roosevelt*, (2000)
- J. Schwarz, *The New Dealers: Power Politics in the Age of Roosevelt*, (1993)

The Causes of World War II

Compared with World War I, the onset of World War II seemed a lot less controversial and was blamed in the post-war period fairly on ambitious dictators and militarists. However, new perspectives have cast doubt on some assumptions. There has been more consideration of the continuities in German foreign policy between Hitler and his predecessors. Appeasement and its critics have been the subject of extended debates and Chamberlain's reputation has varied considerably. US foreign policy has been considered more critically and assumptions about the harshness of the Versailles settlement have been challenged.

1. To what extent did the injustices of the Peace treaties 1919-22 bring about World War II?

Was the treatment of Germany and her allies so harsh and were the territorial arrangements made after the war so unstable as to make another war inevitable. Was it 'not a peace but an armistice for twenty years'. Were contemporary critics like Keynes, in *Economic Consequences of the Peace* correct in seeing the treaties leading to economic disaster with the consequences of the rise of revisionist regimes and another war? Were even victor nations poorly rewarded (Italy and Japan) and did the treatment and isolation of Communist Russia lead to further conflict? Or have the treaties been over-criticized. Did they go some way to meeting the conflicting interests of the participants? Have the injustices been over stated and was it lack of firmness in enforcing the Treaties rather than the errors and misjudgements of the Treaties themselves that are most to blame for war?

2. Why were international agreements and institutions not more effective in maintaining peace between the wars?

There is the possibility of debating whether the will to make internationalism work was lacking, whether mechanisms were inadequate or whether the circumstances of the time made the task of peaceful international cooperation impossible. Was it the onset of depression that pushed nations into preserving their own interests at the expense of honouring or defending international agreements? Or were treaties like Locarno and institutions like the League fatally flawed from the outset? Were the European powers too concerned with their own interests to commit to internationalism? Were the isolationism of the USA and the distrust of the USSR fatal weaknesses or could the League and other internationalist elements have worked given time and enough goodwill?

3. To what extent can Appeasement of Germany, Italy and Japan be defended?

To what extent was it a short-sighted policy which did more to make war likely than to prevent it? Did the economic problems of France and Britain, their perception of their military weaknesses and the problems they faced in terms of lack of allies and domestic pressures make Appeasement justifiable; or was Appeasement indefensible? Was it based on a realistic assessment of national resources and interests or an unrealistic expectation that expansionist powers could be satisfied? How valid are arguments that Appeasement bought time for Britain to prepare for war and ensured her survival? How valid were contemporary criticisms such as those of Churchill about the moral and practical aspects of Appeasement?

4. To what extent can Hitler be blamed for deliberately planning for war?

Was Hitler determined on an unjustifiable war of conquest and racial slaughter? Or was Hitler pursuing general objectives based on traditional objectives of German foreign policy without a distinct plan, taking advantage of opportunities as they arose? Was Hitler pursuing a policy that was rooted in previous German foreign policy or was this unique geopolitical fanaticism? Would any statesman have tried to overturn the unfair restrictions of Versailles or did supposedly legitimate grievances act as a cover for unprecedented ambitions? To what extent was he pursuing legitimate national interests and to what extent was his foreign policy to 1941 driven by ideological considerations?

5. To what extent was US policy towards Germany and Japan likely to cause a war by 1941?

To what extent was the US entry into war brought about by the culmination of Japanese aggressive imperialism and Germany's desire for confrontation with a state whose values went against those of the Third Reich? To what extent had US policies before December 1941 made US claims of neutrality difficult to accept? How truly isolationist had Roosevelt's foreign policy been towards Germany and in the Far East? Had the USA forced the Japanese to take action, or were Japanese actions the result of growing extremism and ambition in elements of the armed forces and government?

Resources (including texts that may be used in the three Interpretation questions)

- A. Boxer, *'Appeasement, Questions in History'*, Collins, 1998
PHM Bell, *'The Origins of the Second World War in Europe'*, Longman 2007
G. Darby, *'Hitler, Appeasement and the Road to War'*, Hodder 1994
R. Henig, *'The Origins of the Second World War'*, (Lancaster Pamphlet) 2003
R. Henig, *'Versailles and After 1919-33'*, Lancaster Pamphlet, 2000
F. McDonagh, *'Neville Chamberlain, Appeasement and the British Road to War'*, Manchester University Press, 1998
R. Overy, *'The Origins of the Second World War'*, Longmans Seminar, 1987
E.R. Boyce and J. Maiolo, *'The Origins of World War Two'* Palgrave 2003
John Charmley, *'Chamberlain and the Lost Peace'*, Ivan R Dee 1999
W.S. Churchill, *'The Gathering Storm'*, London 1948
N. Crouchi, RNorth and S Yamakuge, *'The Challenge of Japan'*, Routledge 1992
R. Dallek, *'Franklin D Roosevelt and American Foreign Policy 1932-45'*, OUp 1995
D. Dilks, *'Neville Chamberlain'*, CUP 1984
W. Gruhl, *'Japan's World War Two'*, Transaction Publishers USA 2006
K. Hildebrand, *'The Foreign Policy of the Third Reich'*, Batsford 1973
S. Marks, *'The Illusion of Peace'*, St.Martin's Press 1976
E.G. Martel, *'Origins of the Second World War'*, Reconsidered, Routledge 1999
R. Overy, *'The Road to War'*, Macmillan 1989
R.A.C. Parker, *'Chamberlain and Appeasement'*, Palgrave 1993
G. Stewart, *'Burying Caesar. Churchill, Chamberlain and the Battle for the Tory Party'*, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1999
A.J.P. Taylor, *'The Origins of the Second World War, 1961'*, new ed. 1991
G. L. Weiberg, *'Hitler's Foreign Policy 1993-9'*, 1994

The Cold War 1941-1956

As the perspective has changed so much after 1989 so have historians revised their views about the Cold War. The schools of thought about it have been more formally categorised than in other areas of controversy, mirroring the contemporary accusations and counter accusations of blame for the disputes. There are few unchallengeable judgements possible about the responsibility for the Cold War or the relative importance of the causes of its major elements.

1. Wartime Disagreements between the USSR and the West

Who was more to blame for wartime disagreements among the allies 1941- 1945?

The controversies at the time centred on the Second Front – was Stalin right to see the delays as being motivated in any way by suspicion of the USSR and a desire by the western allies to allow the Soviet Union to take the bulk of the casualties; or were there sound military reasons for delaying the invasion of France. Were the allies rightly distrustful of the expansion of Soviet forces 1944-5 and the decision not to aid the Warsaw rising in 1944? Was Stalin's unwillingness to declare war on Japan until 1945 a justifiable source of concern for the west?

2. Soviet Policies towards Europe 1945-9

Were Soviet policies driven more by the desire for ideological expansion or by the genuine defence needs of the USSR between 1945 and 1949? Does the Soviet expansion in Eastern Europe reflect a desire not to be invaded again or was it a fulfilment of political aims to expand communism? How far did Stalin's policy to Europe reflect traditional Russian aims and how far was it driven by specifically Communist ideas? Does the treatment of Eastern Europe indicate a long term plan to dominate the states bordering on Russia with further plans for expansion? Was the Berlin Blockade established through genuine fears of Western expansion or a wish to consolidate political control over Eastern Germany?

3. The USA and Containment

Did the US policy of Containment after 1947 reflect a genuine desire to protect the freedom of Europe against communist dictatorship or was it more driven by expansionist economic policies dictated by US self-interest. Do Marshall Aid and the Truman Doctrine deserve to be seen more as idealistic and selfless measures or as part of a cynical 'dollar imperialism'? How great an influence was wielded by advisers such as George Kennan and how great was the impact of personal relations between Truman and Stalin?

4. The Cold War and Asia

Why did both the USSR and the West become involved in the Far East and how real was US perception of the threat of communism in the Far East? How far was rivalry in the Far east dominated by ideological conflict and how far was it driven by economic concerns? To what extent can Russia be blamed for the Korean War? To what extent was American acting to protect the interest of the people of Korea, Japan, Tai Wan and Vietnam? To what extent did the Asian communist regimes share goals and interests?

5. The significance of the Arms Race

How important was the arms race in the development of the Cold War? Did the development of nuclear weapons by the USSR account for the increase in tensions after 1949? Was the build up of arms more the result of tensions or was it a major cause? How important was the West's monopoly of atomic weapons in determining the nature of the Cold War until 1949? Did the possession of the Hydrogen Bomb by both sides in 1955 change the nature of the war by offering the prospect of mutually assured destruction? Were the prospects of peaceful coexistence more or less likely by 1956?

Resources (including texts that may be used in the three Interpretation questions)

- O. Edwards, *The USA and the Cold War* Longmans, Seminar, 2002
J. Isaacs and T. Downing, *The Cold War*, Bantam 1998
M. McCauley, *The Origins of the Cold War*, Longmans Seminar 3rd Edn 2003,
M. McCauley, *Russia, America and the Cold War 1949-1991*, 2nd Edn Longmans Seminar, 2004
S. Phillips, *The Cold War*, Heinemann 2001
M. Sewell, *The Cold War*, Cambridge Perspectives in History CUP 2002
DG Williamson, *Europe and the Cold War 1945-1991*, Longmans Seminar 2006 ed.
J.L. Gaddis *We Now Know*, Clarendon 1998
J.L. Gaddis, *The Cold War*, Penguin 2007
T. Judt, *A History of Europe Since 1945*, Pimlico 2007
W. LeFeber, *America, Russia and the Cold War*, McGraw Hill 2006
M. Leffler and D. Painter, *The Origins of the Cold War*, Routledge, 2005 edn
G. Roberts, *Stalin's Wars*, Yale 2006
M. Walker, *The Cold War*, Vintage 1994
O. Arne Westad, *Reviewing the Cold War*, Cass 2000
V.Zubok, *Inside the Kremlin's Cold War from Stalin to Khrushchev*, Harvard 1997
W.D Miscombe, *From Roosevelt to Truman* CUP 2007
Hugh Thomas, *Amid Truce* Sceptre 1986

The War in Vietnam 1955-1975

The Vietnam War invited much attention and debate at the time and there has been little relaxation over the last 30 or so years. Debate has been vigorous, determined, polarised. Views have embraced not just the background to military involvement and that involvement, but also American domestic politics, North and South Vietnamese activities, Asian issues, the politics of the Cold War.

1. Reasons for America's growing involvement, culminating in major military commitment in and after 1965.

In essence, there is debate over choice or circumstance i.e. To what extent US policy responded to changing events and situations. Decision-making has been placed in the context of the time, above all the Cold War, and seen as leading to an unavoidable and inevitable commitment. Thus some see US policy as reacting to events; others see that commitment as the product of choice, the result of decisions made by Kennedy and Johnson and their advisers amidst pressures within Congress, the elites, even some sections of the press.

2. The role of American domestic politics at the time and during the course of the War.

Increasingly, a view has been advanced that Johnson fought the war to protect his 'Great Society' programme, amidst increasingly partisan politics; here was a way to press ahead with and pass his reform programme. It has been argued that he feared the consequences for his domestic policies of not standing up to Communism: if he could not deliver in South-East, could he deliver at home? Not all agree. And, of course, there are links to the whole issue of how, over time, domestic politics shaped the outcome of the War.

3. The reasons why the USA lost the War.

On one level, there is debate whether the USA lost the War or whether the North Vietnamese Army and the Viet Cong. won it: what is the balance of factors? But there is more here. Could the USA have won the War? Some say 'no', some say 'yes'. There is an argument that the War was winnable had the US focused less on firepower, more on counter-insurgency and on human contact ('hearts and minds'). Some have argued that the USA was winning the War, but then lost resolve. Some have argued that Congress played a big part in the loss of the War by failing to fund it adequately. Some argue that, no matter US strategy and tactics, the strengths and resolve of the North Vietnamese Army and Viet Cong. are underestimated. Others argue that the military were let down by their political masters. The debate here is about the relative importance of different factors. Within this arena, there is also the debate over the role of the anti-War movement in the USA. There is a big debate arena here. Was this growingly strident and powerful movement decisive? What of the media coverage? Has this been exaggerated? Just how extensive was this movement? Was it shaped by external views and representations (European allies were always highly critical of the War)? What of the less well-covered pro-War lobby? This arena links to the role of civilian politicians in undermining of the war effort. The US military establishment perceived that it had been undermined by the domestic front, but this view is debatable.

4. What of the importance of a less American-centred view of the War?

Increasingly, areas of attention have shifted to a more Vietnamese view of the War. The North was very determined, active and resilient. The Viet Cong may even have driven the War, being architects of their own success. Even the Southern politicians have been seen in a new light: more determined to wage war; giving direction and shape to policy. Then again, there are views that the North and Viet Cong were fortunate to win the War and that, as above, they benefited from American failures, mistakes and faltering commitment.

5. The larger debate over the role and place of the Vietnam War in American foreign policy and the Cold War.

Some have argued that the War was 'a noble cause', that it was a positive, not immoral or tragic, that anti-Communism was good and that, in the end, Communism did not extend much further. Not all agree, of course. It can be argued that the USA in the end lost the battle over South Vietnam but won the wider (Cold) War. Also, it has been argued that the longevity of the War allowed much of South-East Asia to organise itself into a better defensive, security zone, albeit not always with direct recourse to American help. This argument contradicts the view of the War as pointless, costly and a failure. As a debate, it shows the importance of considering events from different perspectives. The end of Communism in Europe brought about a new look at what had been seen as an episode of humiliation for the USA.

Resources (including texts that may be used in the three Interpretation questions)

- H. Brogan, *'The Penguin History of the United States'*, (Penguin, 1985)
M. K. Hall, *'The Vietnam War'*, (2nd ed., Longman, 2007)
J. Isaacs and T. Downing, *'The Cold War'*, (1998)
P. Johnson, *'A History of the American People'*, (Phoenix, 1997)
S. Karnow, *'Vietnam: A History'*, (Viking, 1983)
F. Logevall, *'The Origins of the Vietnam War'*, (2nd ed., Longman, 2001)
H. Zinn, *'A People's History of the United States'*, (3rd ed., Longman, 2003)
C. G. Appy, *'The Definitive Oral History of the Vietnam War'*, (2006)
W. Colby, *'Lost Victory'*, (1989)
P. Davidson, *'Vietnam at War'*, (1988)
R. Frankum Jr., *'Like Rolling Thunder'*, (2005)
J. Gibson, *'The Perfect War'*, (1986)
G. Herring, *'America's Longest War'*, (4th ed., New York, 2002)
G. R. Hess, *'Vietnam and the United States: Origins and Legacy of War'*, (Boston, 1990)
P. Kattenburg, *'The Vietnam Trauma in American Foreign Policy'*, (1980)
G. Lewy, *'America in Vietnam'*, (OUP, 1978)
M. Lind, *'Vietnam: The Necessary War'*, (1999)
R. J. McMahon, *'Major Problems in the History of the Vietnam War'*, (3rd ed., Boston, 2003)
G. D. Moss, *'Vietnam: An American Ordeal'*, (1990)
M. Moyer, *'Triumph Forsaken'*, (CUP, 2006)
B. Palmer Jr., *'The 25-Year War'*, (Kentucky UP, 1984)
D. R. Palmer, *'Summons of the Trumpet'*, (1978)
N. Podhoretz, *'Why We Were in Vietnam'*, (1982)
J. Record, *'The Wrong War: Why We Lost in Vietnam'*, (Annapolis, 1998)
R. Schulzinger, *'A Time for War'*, (OUP, 1997)
L. Sorley, *'A Better War'*, (San Diego, 1999)
S. L. Stanton, *'The Rise and Fall of an American Army'*, (Dell, 1985)
H. Summers, *'On Strategy'*, (Novato, 1982)
J. Thompson, *'Rolling Thunder'*, (1980)
S. C. Tucker (ed.), *'Encyclopaedia of the Vietnam War'*, (1998)
T. Wells, *'The War Within America'*, (Berkeley, 1994)

The development of the rights of women in Great Britain 1867-1918

The broad areas of debate are:

1. Women and work.

How far did opportunities for paid work expand? One view is that there was a dramatic increase in the female workforce as a result of the Industrial Revolution and that middle class women were also able to find work as teachers and other white blouse jobs, so that by 1918 their position was vastly different. Another view is that more women were working, but they were paid less than men, on whom they were dependent as the breadwinner in the family. Middle class women suffered similarly with lower pay and status in the professions and in shops and the civil service. The main improvements came with the war or at the end of the period.

2. Educational opportunities.

To what extent were women able to obtain an education in this period? There is one interpretation that for all classes throughout this period the prime aim of education for women was to prepare them for marriage and family life and hence domestic skills were paramount and higher education seen as unnecessary or even inimical to the acquisition of domestic accomplishments.

It has been argued, in contrast, that for middle and upper class women educational opportunities increased, even if they were a minority, and that this widened their employment choices. The debate about the role of women in general in this period influenced the development of opposing contemporary views.

3. The political role of women.

How far could women, deprived of the vote, exert a political influence? Some argue that there were numerous ways in which women could play a political role, on school boards, behind the scenes in political parties, in pressure groups, as local government electors and as Poor Law Guardians.

But, says the other view, only a few, mostly wealthy women, could participate and they had difficulty in being taken seriously by men. Only the Labour Party treated women as equals.

4. The impact of the militant campaign.

Did the militant tactics used by the WSPU (Women's Social and Political Union) advance or damage their cause? One view is that no progress had been made towards the franchise by the use of less militant tactics by the NUWSS (National Union of Women's Suffrage Society) for example, so that stronger measures and a tight knit movement were necessary.

The alternative view is that the violence was counter-productive and hindered or even prevented the coming of the franchise, notably by alienating the Liberal government, the only possible source of the granting of the vote. The domineering Pankhursts are also seen as a disadvantage.

5. The impact of the First World War.

How far was the War the decisive factor in gaining the franchise for women? It has been argued that the devoted work of women during the war made it inevitable that they should be given the vote, helped too by the cessation of suffragette violence.

There is another view that, even without the War, women would have achieved the vote since the Liberals had largely accepted the idea, although they were reluctant to be seen to give in to force. The vote for all men over 21 was generally agreed. Most women returned to a traditional role at the end of the War.

Resources (including texts that may be used in the three Interpretation questions)

- P. Bartley, *The Changing Role of Women 1815-1914*, Hodder and Stoughton, 1996, 0-340-61135-9
- H. Smith, *The British Women's Suffrage Campaign 1866-1918*, Longman, 1998, 0-582-29811-3
- M. Phillips, *The Ascent of Woman*, Abacus, 2003, 0-349-11660-1
- J. Liddington and J. Norris, *One hand tied behind us*, Virago, 1978
- M. Pugh, *The Pankhursts*, Penguin, 2001
- J. Rendall, *Women in an Industrialising Society*, HA, 1990
- J. Purvis, *A History of Women's Education in England*, OU, 1991
- M. Pugh, *Women's Suffrage in Britain 1867-1928*, HA, 1980, 0-85278-225-X
- E. Roberts, *Women's Work 1840-1940*, Macmillan, 1988, 0-333-36610-7
- M. Pugh, *The March of the Women*, OUP, 2002, 10-0199250227

Nazi Germany 1933-1945

Nazi Germany has exerted a unique fascination and there have been a number of intense and acrimonious debates which have gone beyond academic confines and reached the courts, in the case of David Irving. The post-war assumptions of small numbers of fanatics seducing a nation and then relying on coercion to maintain control have been challenged. There are at least forty explanatory models for the Holocaust. Modern management theory has been applied to the government of Nazi Germany to cast doubt on whether Hitler can even be seen as a strong dictator. Views of German compliance with the regime have produced some bitter debate and for all the information available on Nazi Germany, few explanations and judgements can be said to be final.

1. To what extent did the Nazi regime rely on coercion and propaganda and to what extent did its policies have the broad support of the German people?

This is a highly contentious issue. After the war, there was a consensus in the west that Germany had almost been an occupied country which had been liberated from the minority of extremists who had held the country captive. They had gained power in an unprecedented crisis, misled the people, never had a majority, relied on the Gestapo, SS and SA to crush any opposition and constantly bombarded the people with propaganda. By these means an unrepresentative clique held down the population until the war came, when people had little choice except to support Hitler as he stood between them and total defeat and occupation. This made it easier for the western powers to support West German democracy and it was very acceptable to Germans needing to go forward and defend themselves against Russia. However, this view has been seriously challenged. It has been argued that dictatorial traditions in the nineteenth century set Germany on a 'special road' towards Nazism, and the Nazi outlook was acceptable because of this special development – the so-called 'Sonderweg' school. Then research cast doubt on whether support was so limited. Local studies revealed that the population acquiesced in many aspects of Nazi Germany to such a degree that Gestapo forces were quite limited and relied a lot on denunciations by the population. Resistance has been seen as quite limited not so much because of repression, but indifference. Propaganda has been seen as unlikely to persuade as to confirm existing views and outlooks. There have been claims that anti-Semitic policies were popular.

2. To what extent did the Nazis create their vision of a 'National Community'?

This is not so much a debate about why there was not more opposition or whether there was broad acceptance of policies, but how far the Nazis brought about social change in such a way to create a new ethos of community and racial solidarity.

Were there new social opportunities or merely restrictions on the social developments in Weimar? For example were women reduced to a pre-industrial domestic slavery or actually empowered by their role in the community? Were the opportunities open to the young so increased as to lead to massive changes in outlook, or do limitations in the success of youth policies and the existence of pockets of dissent indicate that the community was not really established? Were class barriers reduced by educational policy, valuing party loyalty above wealth and class, the greater modernisation of society; or was this merely an impression, with the traditional class barriers still intact and the wealthier and better educated merely taking advantage of the new system?

3. Was the Holocaust planned from the beginning and driven by clear intention by Hitler and other leading Nazis to institute mass murder?

Or was the policy a result of the radicalization of the regime by war and also a result of pressure from below – from 'middle management' in the party, among economic planners and those running the occupied areas? Do the anti-Semitic policies seem to lead inexorably towards annihilation, or does their fitful progress in the 1930s indicate a lack of overall direction and intention? There are at least 40 'models' in the historiography of the Holocaust which may be the most debated historical phenomenon ever.

Candidates should focus firmly on the evidence when assessing broadly contrasting explanations rather than merely being drawn into categorising views into 'structuralist' or 'intentionalist'

4. Was Hitler a 'weak dictator'?

Given the special character of government and administration in Nazi Germany, with its competing agencies and overlapping responsibilities, is it valid to see Hitler as a 'weak dictator' whose system encouraged a confused and dilatory response and policies which often contradicted each other. The alternative view is to see this system encouraging the power of the Fuhrer, standing above disputes and playing off powerful elements in the Third Reich against each other to confirm his overall supremacy and control.

5. How successful was Nazi economic policy in meeting the problems inherited in 1933 and preparing for war?

The regime pointed proudly to achievements – low unemployment, rebuilding of the infrastructure, purposeful planned rearmament, higher living standards and technological and scientific advance. Critics have seen limited improvements in living standards, an over heated economy dependent on rearmament, a resort to short term expedients such as the new Plan; reliance on removing groups from the labour market initially; then being faced with labour shortages. The efficiency and performance of the German economy in the initial stages of the war has been questioned and the regime has been criticized for taking a long time to gear itself to long term war, again hoping that short term military successes would solve its problems. Its economic exploitation of occupied territories has been the subject of debate. Did it make the best use of the new resources, given the problems of war; or did it waste opportunities to forge an effective central European economy?

Resources (including texts that may be used in the three Interpretation questions)

- M. Collier and P. Pedley, *'Hitler and the Nazi State'*, Heinemann 2005
- G. Layton, *'Germany: The Third Reich'*, Hodder Access 2000
- F. McDonough, *'Hitler and Nazi Germany'*, CUP 1999
- J. Noakes and G. Pridham, *'Nazism Vol 2-4'*, University of Exeter Press 2001 Ed.
- D.G. Williamson, *'The Third Reich'*, Longmans Seminar 1995
- G. Aly, *'Final Solution'*, Hodder 1999
- G. Aly and S. Heim, *'Architects of Annihilation'*, Phoenix, 2nd ed.2003
- C. Browning, *'The Origins of the Final Solution'*, Arrow 2005
- M. Burleigh, *'The Third Reich'*, Pan 2001
- L. Davidowicz, *'The war against the Jews'*, Penguin 1975
- G. Ely, *'The Goldhagen Effect'*, University of Michigan 2000
- R. Evans, *'The Third Reich in Power'*, Penguin 2006
- R. Gellately, *'Backing Hitler'*, OUP 2002
- D.J Goldhagen, *'Hitler's Willing Executioners'*, Abacus 1997
- R. Grunberger, *'A Social History of the Third Reich'*, Penguin, 1971
- M. Hughes and C. Mann, *'Inside Hitler's Germany'*, Brasseys Inc. 2004
- I. Kershaw, *'Hitler'*, (2 vols) Allen :Lane 1998 and 2000
- I. Kershaw, *'The Nazi Dictatorship'*, Hodder 4th edition, 2000
- P. Longrich, *'The Unwritten Order, Hitler's Role in the Final Solution'*, NPI Media 2005
- A. Owings, *'Frauen'*, Penguin, 1993

Britain under Margaret Thatcher 1979-1990

1. Thatcherism

The principal debate here is the extent to which Thatcherism was a coherent political philosophy as distinct from a pragmatic and developing response to a political, economic and social context. Was it opportunistic for example? Closely connected is the extent to which Thatcherism can be defined and how far it achieved its objectives. The main components of Thatcherism might be seen as follows: an attempt to 'remoralise' society along the lines of what might be described as 'Victorian values' – secure family life, thrift, restraint and hard work; a policy of monetarism, the control of the money supply as a way of dealing with inflation; curbing the power of the trade unions; the privatisation of nationalised companies and industries; tax cuts; 'rolling back the frontiers of the State'.

To what extent were principles actually put into practice, for example in policies towards unions? To what extent was there a return to 'Victorian values' or was there merely consumerism and self indulgence?

Thatcherism has been seen as having lasting importance. *That Thatcherism had a huge impact, however, is undeniable. Thatcher herself raised Britain's profile and status in the world. Even outside the Soviet Empire, Thatcherism became widely valued as a valid set of precepts to halt the long and sterile march of state authority and influence.* (Eric Evans)

2. The Falklands War.

First, what were the Prime Minister's motives – the opportunity for glory or a genuine concern to free the Falklands? Second, how far did the war rescue the political fortunes of Thatcher and her government? Third, was the decision to go to war a prudent one? Failure would almost certainly have ruined Thatcher's career as Suez ruined Eden's. In terms of the wisdom of the operation, there were very great risks in undertaking an expedition 8000 miles away with an underfunded Royal Navy. Initially, public opinion was hostile but, perhaps, more because the invasion should have been allowed to happen rather than that of a reckless adventure had been embarked upon. The attitude of some European powers was, at best, equivocal. However the SDP gave clear support and Labour, on the whole, was also in favour. What were the electoral and political consequences? How far was the General Election of 1983 (in which the Conservatives won a majority of 144 compared with 43 in 1979) the result of 'the Falklands factor'? Up to May 1982 (when the Falklands war began) the government's record had been very mixed. Certainly with success in the war the Conservative position in the opinion polls soared. At the same time, however, the economic tide had begun to turn by the end of 1982 and the election campaign of 1983 revealed the weaknesses of Labour and its leadership. Politically, the Falklands War and the subsequent landslide election victory gave Thatcher almost complete dominance in the Conservative Party (by no means the case before). It also gave her a renewed confidence. So, in political terms, did the successful outcome to the Falklands War make Thatcher a more divisive character and leader?

3. The Miners' Strike.

There are two debates here. First, was this a political strike brought about by opposition to Thatcher and her values or did it have its origins in genuine industrial concerns? Second, why did the miners' strike fail? The failure of the Strike (which lasted from March 1984 until March 1985) needs to be seen in the context of the previous Conservative government being brought down by a miners' strike, and the careful handling of the miners in the earlier part of Thatcher's prime ministership. Should it, therefore, be a cause for surprise that the strike failed? Was its failure the result of skilful handling by the government or by mistakes on the part of the National Union of Mineworkers? How important were other factors? Beyond the roles of the government and the NUM, other factors contribute to the argument. The support of public opinion was largely in favour of the government, the miners, or perhaps Scargill himself did not enjoy the wholehearted support of the Labour Party; other unions failed to come out in sympathy. How important was the miners' strike for the trade union movement and Thatcher's authority? It could be argued that, after the victory in the Falklands her authority was further confirmed anyway but did victory over the miners make her more confrontational and thus contribute in the long run to her final overthrow?

4. The Fall of Thatcher

The main debate here is how the fall of Margaret Thatcher is best explained. How satisfactorily can it be explained by reference only to the events of 1990? Or, do the origins of the eventual demise of the prime minister go back earlier? There is an argument to suggest that the prime minister's fall can convincingly be traced to the Westland affair in 1986. Thatcher won the General Election of 1987 with a majority of 102 (a convincing mandate for a third term). It might be argued, however, that this made Thatcher more confident and therefore more authoritarian and confrontational. Westland, then, is not the only explanation for Thatcher's fall. The resignations of Norman Tebbit in 1987 and Nigel Lawson in 1989 were blows to the government as was the leadership challenge by the pro-European backbencher Sir Anthony Meyer, although he was heavily defeated. How important a part did the poll tax play in Thatcher's fall? The government was further damaged by further resignations, including Norman Fowler and Peter Walker, but especially by that of Geoffrey Howe (Deputy Prime Minister) who finally and openly rebelled against the prime minister's authoritarian style. Meanwhile inflation was rising. In the leadership election of November 1990, Thatcher won, but 178 Conservative MPs failed to support her.

5. The Thatcher Legacy

There are two connected debates here which deal with the focus of this Study Topic upon the extent of the 'Thatcher Revolution'. First, what were the consequences of Thatcher's long ministry and subsequent fall for the major political parties – Conservatives and Labour? How importantly did she influence the policies and attitudes of her two immediate successors – Major and Blair? How far, if at all, could her work be reversed or substantially changed, certainly in the medium term? It might be argued that her fall split the Conservative Party so badly that, even though it won the General Election of 1992, it became unelectable. How convincing is the argument that Thatcher's policies and style were so divisive that Labour was made electable (but not before it was transformed into New Labour, perhaps)? How valid is this judgement? Was New Labour closer to Thatcherism than it was to Old Labour? Blair had certainly abandoned Clause 4 as early as 1995. New Labour largely embraced the culture of the private sector and the free market economy. Re-nationalisation was not really contemplated. Blair kept the key elements of Thatcher's tax policies. Trade union legislation was not fundamentally changed (although 'union bashing' largely ceased). Blair's response to Cabinet government was very similar to Thatcher's and both were natural centralisers.

Resources (including texts that may be used in the three Interpretation questions)

- P. Clarke, *'Hope and Glory: Britain 1900-1990'*, 1996
E.J. Evans, *'Thatcher and Thatcherism Second Edition'*, 2004
P. Hennessey, *'The Prime Minister: The Office and its Holders'*, 2001
D. Kavanagh and A. Seldon, *'The Thatcher Effect: A Decade of Change'*, 1989
B. Maddox, *'Maggie: the First Lady'*, 2003
Andrew Marr *A History of Modern Britain* 2007
K.O. Morgan, *'The People's Peace: British History, 1945-1990'*, 1990
A. Seldon and D. Collings, *'Britain under Thatcher'*, 2000
H. Young, *'One of Us: a Biography of Margaret Thatcher'*, 1991
K. Baker, *'The Turbulent Years'*, 1993
J. Campbell, *'Margaret Thatcher Volume II: The Iron Lady'*, 2003
A. Clarke, *'Diaries'*, 1993
J. Cole, *'The Thatcher Years: A Decade of Revolution in British Politics'*, 1987
I. Gilmour, *'Dancing with Dogma: Britain under Thatcherism'*, 1992
K. Harris, *'Thatcher'*, 1988
M. Heseltine, *'Life in the Jungle'*, 2000
P. Jenkins, *'Mrs. Thatcher's Revolution: The Ending of the Socialist Era'*, 1987
P. Riddell *'The Thatcher Era and its Legacy'*, 1991
N. Tebbit, *'Upwardly Mobile'*, 1989
M. Thatcher, *'The Downing Street Years'*, 1993

5 How to use the Mark schemes

Interpretations:

The mark scheme looks daunting at first, but there are key decisions which will help assessment

- 1. How far the candidate has actually answered the question**
- 2. How far the candidate has made a judgement.**

It will be helpful to take Level III as your starting point for assessment

For Level III there will be an answer to the question and an understanding of the passages with some attempt to evaluate them (16 or 17) A0 2b.

The concepts will be grasped and there will be explanation and some analysis (4) A01b.

There will be some relevant knowledge and the answer is structured and can be understood clearly A01a (4).

Once these criteria have been met, then a decision can be taken whether it is level III or above, or falls below these criteria. It may be perfectly obvious that the answer is a lot better or a lot worse, but a good starting point in assessment is to consider what is level III and whether the candidate has at least achieved it.

If the answer seems clearly to go beyond Level III, then the next judgement is how far beyond. The key words are 'good analysis and evaluation' which is focused on issues and offers a judgement. (A02b level II) The next stage up offers this but also includes a SYNTHESIS - there is a sense that the candidate is going beyond sequential judgement of each passage and weaving the passages and own knowledge into a clear argument.

(Level 1 B) At the very top Level 1 A there is 'excellent' synthesis and a clear 'synoptic' or overall judgement, using all the passages with perception. Note that unexpected judgements MAY be made – they do not have to be made, but marking should note judgements which show some originality and the ability to 'think outside the box'. An excellent synthesis and judgement does not HAVE to have this additional quality to reach top marks, but very strong candidates may reach supported independent-minded judgements.

Below Level III there will be less well supported and developed arguments. The key phrase is limited judgements – that is limited because they are not supported by much contextual knowledge. There will have to be some to gain IV in A0 I

Level V will offer no judgements and will largely be explanations based on the passages with limited use of knowledge. Assertions will dominate.

Level VI will reflect a lack of understanding of the question's requirement – even if there is some understanding of the topic. Level VII is for very weak answers – 'no explanation or judgement' really does mean 'no' and not 'weak'. This level will be used for very, very poor work only.

So if the first judgement is based on A0 2 b and is based on how far above or below the answer is from Level III, this will be a 'way in'. If judgements are then made on concepts, the use of knowledge, analysis, judgement and synthesis with comments linking what is written to the phrases in the mark scheme, it should be possible to reach uniformity of judgement.

It is extremely important to establish a sound rank order and for the centre to agree on this. It is the task of moderation to ensure consistency overall and to ensure fairness by checking centres' application of the mark scheme. It is much easier to do this if centre comments are very firmly linked to the mark scheme and candidates' marks reflect the order of the merit of their work.

Investigations:

As with Interpretations, it may well be useful to take Level III as a starting point and then assess whether a candidate's work falls above or below.

At level III

A01a

Some relevant evidence has been selected from personal research
Most of the answer is structured and coherent
There are footnotes and a bibliography

A01b

Key concepts have been understood (e.g. using a Hitler example, Volksgemeinschaft, social class.)

There will be some analysis and explanation – even if part of the answer is descriptive. Support for answers which are predominantly analytical may be thin.

AO2a

There is critical evaluation and analysis of a range of sources. This is an important discriminator – for AO2a answers which do not refer to a range of sources and do not offer any evaluation cannot get Level III. There is also good understanding of sources in context. The crucial element which keeps the answer at Level III is uneven judgement.

To go beyond this, the quality of analysis and critical evaluation of a range of sources has to be good. (Level II) Very good (Level I B) or Excellent (Level I A)

The descriptive elements that characterise Level III will not be present; support will not be thin, but at Level II may be variable, with some sources being better treated and the analysis not as searching as for level 1.

At level 1 there is a good level of discrimination in the range and selection of sources and supporting material will be very well used. At the very top there will be a high level of discrimination and a critical use of sources will be well sustained throughout.

Below Level III understanding of the relevance of sources and evaluation will be more limited, but candidates will still apply sources to the question. At Level V there will be little more than assertions about sources at Level VI the sources will be weakly understood and Level VII will have no relevant knowledge, understanding and poor use of sources.

The mark scheme offers the bulk of marks for the handling of sources. An essay answer without reference to sources will therefore gain little credit. An investigation cannot be a 'standard' A-level essay. It must involve the critical use of source material.

When marking Investigations, teachers should indicate

- The relevance of points made
- The way sources are used and referenced
- The extent to which supporting knowledge is used to evaluate sources
- How well structured the answer is
- The quality of the overall judgement
- The quality of expression

Judgements about the levels reached in each AO should be made first and then a mark awarded. Start at the top mark in the range and work downwards, rather than starting in the middle of the band. If the main elements in the band have been sustained, then award the top mark in the band.

At the end of the answer give totals

| | | |
|----------|-------------|--|
| A0 1 (a) | Level 1B 6 | Clear structure – case for and against the argument/ has selected 10 relevant pieces of evidence/ footnotes and bibliography |
| A0 1 (b) | Level II 5 | Concepts grasped (e.g. People’s Community; Polycratic regime) Developed judgements about Hitler’s aims, but some unevenness in explanation of possible ‘weaknesses’ |
| A0 2 (a) | Level II 18 | Critical evaluation of most sources and has selected well, some unevenness in using Broszat but able to put sources into context |
| Total | 29 | |

Please remember that comments should help the moderator understand why work has been put into a particular level – comments are not to help your students develop but merely to explain a summative judgement. It is particularly important that all judgements are explained and that the correct order of merit has been established by a centre.

Future guidance will follow in the form of marked exemplar material, insets on assessment and help in forming support groups.

6 Mark Schemes

Maximum mark 80. 1 assignment. 2 parts.
Part (a) Interpretation. Maximum mark 40.

| | A01a | A01b | A02b |
|-----|------|------|-------|
| IA | 6 | 6 | 24–28 |
| IB | 6 | 6 | 20–23 |
| II | 5 | 5 | 18–19 |
| III | 4 | 4 | 16–17 |
| IV | 3 | 3 | 14–15 |
| V | 2 | 2 | 12–13 |
| VI | 1 | 1 | 6–11 |
| VII | 0 | 0 | 0–5 |

Part (b) Investigation. Maximum Mark 40.

| | A01a | A01b | A02a |
|-----|------|------|-------|
| IA | 6 | 6 | 24–28 |
| IB | 6 | 6 | 20–23 |
| II | 5 | 5 | 18–19 |
| III | 4 | 4 | 16–17 |
| IV | 3 | 3 | 14–15 |
| V | 2 | 2 | 12–13 |
| VI | 1 | 1 | 6–11 |
| VII | 0 | 0 | 0–5 |

Unit F965: Historical Interpretations and Investigations – Part (a) Interpretations

| ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES | AO1a | AO1b | AO2b |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Total mark for each question = 40 | <p>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.</p> | <p>Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; • the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied. | <p>Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways.</p> |
| Level IA | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses an appropriate range of accurate, detailed and relevant knowledge • Answer is clearly structured and coherent; communicates accurately and legibly (6) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very good level of understanding of key concepts in their historical context • Very good level of explanation / analysis, and provides valid judgements (6) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answer is fully and consistently focused on the question set and provides a clear argument • Excellent synthesis and synoptic judgement of historical interpretations • May make unexpected but supported judgements linked to the question (24–28) |
| Level IB | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses an appropriate range of accurate, detailed and relevant knowledge • Answer is clearly structured and coherent; communicates accurately and legibly (6) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very good level of understanding of key concepts in their historical context. • Very good level of explanation / analysis, and provides valid judgements. (6) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answer is consistently focused on the question set and provides a clear argument • Very good synthesis of historical interpretations (20–23) |
| Level II | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses mostly accurate, detailed and relevant knowledge • Answer is structured and mostly coherent; writing is legible and communication is generally clear (5) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good level of understanding of key concepts in their historical context • Good attempt at explanation / analysis but overall judgements may be uneven (5) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answer focuses on the issues in the question set and provides a judgement of different historical interpretations • Good analysis and evaluation of an appropriate range of interpretations (18–19) |
| Level III | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses appropriate and relevant knowledge but there may be some inaccuracy • Most of the answer is structured and coherent; writing is legible and communication is generally clear (4) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows a sound understanding of key concepts in their historical context • May be a mixture of analysis and explanation but also description and narrative coupled with some uneven overall judgements; OR arguments may provide more consistent analysis but the quality will be uneven and its support often general or thin (4) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the answer is focused on the question set and provides some judgement. There is some evidence of synthesis • Answer provides a sound analysis and evaluation of historical interpretations (16–17) |

| ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES | AO1a | AO1b | AO2b |
|-----------------------|---|---|--|
| Level IV | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is deployment of relevant knowledge but level/ accuracy of detail will vary Some unclear and/or underdeveloped and/or disorganised sections; mostly satisfactory level of communication (3) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Satisfactory understanding of key concepts May be largely descriptive / narratives of events, and links between this and analytical comments will typically be weak or unexplained (3) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Satisfactory focus on the question and mostly satisfactory analysis / explanation Makes limited synoptic judgements about historical interpretations (14–15) |
| Level V | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deployment of basic and general historical knowledge but also some irrelevant and inaccurate material Often unclear and disorganised sections; adequate level of communication but some weak prose passages (2) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> General understanding of key concepts Attempts an explanation / argument but often general coupled with assertion, description/narrative (2) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate focus on the question but provides only a basic analysis / explanation Makes no synoptic judgements about historical interpretations (12–13) |
| Level VI | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of relevant knowledge will be limited; there will be much irrelevance and inaccuracy Answers may have little organisation or structure; weak use of English and poor organisation (1) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very little understanding of key concepts Explanation will be very brief / fragmentary, the answer will be characterised by generalised assertion and / or description/ narratives, often brief (1) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some understanding of the topic but not the question's requirements Weak explanations and judgements about historical interpretations (6–11) |
| Level VII | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No relevant or accurate knowledge Very poor use of English (0) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No understanding of key concepts No explanation (0) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Weak understanding of the topic or of the question's requirements No explanation or judgements about historical interpretations (0–5) |

Notes:

- (i) Allocate marks to the most appropriate level for each AO
- (ii) If several marks are available in a box, work from the top mark down until the best fit has been found
- (iii) Many answers will not fall at the same level for each AO
- (iv) Candidates will demonstrate synopticity through the drawing together of knowledge and skills in order to demonstrate overall historical understanding. It involves the explicit assessment of understanding of the connections between the essential characteristics of historical study. (See section 4.5 of the specification.)

| ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES | AO1a | AO1b | AO2a |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Total mark for each question = 40 | <p>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate clear and effective manner.</p> | <p>Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; – the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied. | <p>As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.</p> |
| Level IA | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answer is clearly structured and coherent; communicates accurately and legibly • Selects an appropriate range of accurate, detailed and relevant evidence from personal research • Includes accurate footnotes and a bibliography (6) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very good level of understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic • Argument is relevant and analytical and provides supported judgements (6) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent analysis of the problem in its historical context • Critical use of a range of research materials • High level of discrimination – ie judgement of relevance and relative significance of research materials in relation to the problem (24–28) |
| Level IB | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answer is clearly structured and coherent; communicates accurately and legibly • Selects an appropriate range of accurate, detailed and relevant evidence from personal research • Includes accurate footnotes and a bibliography (6) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very good level of understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic • Argument is relevant and analytical and provides supported judgements (6) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very good quality of analysis and evaluation of a range of research materials with a good level of discrimination (20–23) |
| Level II | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selects mostly accurate, detailed and relevant evidence from personal research • Answer is structured and mostly coherent; writing is legible and communication is generally clear • Includes accurate footnotes and a bibliography (5) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good level of understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic • Argument develops explanations but overall judgements may be uneven (5) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good quality of analysis and critical evaluation of a range of sources with discrimination • Good understanding of sources in context (18–19) |
| Level III | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selects some relevant evidence from personal research • Most of the answer is structured and coherent; writing is legible and communication is generally clear • Includes accurate footnotes and a bibliography (4) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows a sound understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic • Argument may be a mixture of analysis and explanation but also may include description and narrative coupled with some uneven judgements; OR the argument may provide more consistent analysis but the quality will be uneven with support often general or thin (4) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good quality of analysis and critical evaluation of a range of sources with discrimination • Good understanding of sources in context but some judgements may be uneven (16–17) |

| ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES | AO1a | AO1b | AO2a |
|-----------------------|--|---|--|
| Level IV | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is deployment of relevant knowledge but level / accuracy of detail will vary • Some unclear and/or underdeveloped and/or disorganised sections; mostly satisfactory level of communication • There will be footnotes and a bibliography, but not always used appropriately (3) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfactory understanding of key concepts relevant to the topic • Some argument but evidence not always linked to the question • Assertion, description / narrative will characterise part of the answer (3) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mostly satisfactory application of sources to the question but little ability at discriminating between them • Limited understanding of the importance of sources in their context of the topic (14–15) |
| Level V | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deployment of basic and general historical knowledge but also some irrelevant and inaccurate material • Often unclear and disorganised sections; adequate level of communication but some weak prose passages • Some attempt to use footnotes and provide a bibliography (2) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General understanding of key concepts • Attempts an explanation / argument but often general coupled with assertion, description / narrative (2) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate application of sources to the question without ability to discriminate between them • Points made about the importance of sources in the context of the period will often be little more than assertions (12–13) |
| Level VI | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of relevant evidence will be limited; there will be much irrelevance and inaccuracy • Answers may have little organisation or structure; weak use of English and poor organisation • Footnotes should they appear may be poorly used. Bibliography may be inappropriate (1) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very little understanding of key concepts • Limited explanation, mainly assertion, description / narrative (1) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weak application of sources to the question • Weak understanding of the importance of sources in their context (6–11) |
| Level VII | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No relevant or accurate knowledge • Very poor use of English • No footnotes or bibliography (0) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No understanding of key concepts • No explanation (0) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor ability at using the sources • Poor awareness of sources in their context (0–5) |

Unit F965: Historical Interpretations and Investigations – Part (b) Investigations

Notes:

- (i) Allocate marks to the most appropriate level for each AO
- (ii) If several marks are available in a box, work from the top mark down until the best fit has been found
- (iii) Many answers will not fall at the same level for each AO

7 Coursework Administration/Regulations

Supervision and Authentication

As with all coursework, teachers must be able to verify that the work submitted for assessment is the candidate's own work. Sufficient work must be carried out under direct supervision to allow the teacher to authenticate the coursework marks with confidence.

Submitting marks to OCR

Centres must have made an entry for a unit in order for OCR to supply the appropriate forms or moderator details for coursework. Coursework administration documents are sent to centres on the basis of estimated entries. Marks may be submitted to OCR either on the computer-printed Coursework Mark Sheets (MS1) provided by OCR (sending the top copy to OCR and the second copy to their allocated moderator) or by EDI (centres using EDI are asked to print a copy of their file and sign it before sending to their allocated moderator).

Deadline for the receipt of coursework marks are:

10 January for the January session

15 May for the June session

For regulations governing coursework, centres should consult the *OCR Handbook for Centres*. Further copies of the coursework administration documents are available on the OCR website (www.ocr.org.uk).

Standardisation and Moderation

All internally-assessed coursework is marked by the teacher and internally standardised by the centre. Marks must be submitted to OCR by the agreed date, after which postal moderation takes place in accordance with OCR procedures.

The purpose of moderation is to ensure that the standard for the award of marks in internally-assessed coursework is the same for each centre, and that each teacher has applied the standards appropriately across the range of candidates within the centre.

The sample of work which is submitted to the moderator for moderation must show how the marks have been awarded in relation to the marking criteria.

Minimum Coursework Required

If a candidate submits no work for a unit, then the candidate should be indicated as being absent from that unit on the coursework mark sheets submitted to OCR. If a candidate completes any work at all for that unit then the work should be assessed according to the criteria and marking instructions and the appropriate mark awarded, which may be zero.

8 Resources

Unit F965: Historical Interpretations and Investigations

Assessment criteria.

The mark scheme showing the assessment criteria is shown on pages 110-113 of the Specification. A02a refers to the analysis and evaluation of appropriate source material. 28 out of 40 marks are given for this, so the use of sources is the crucial element in the investigation. The investigation is in essay form and candidates should not merely comment on a range of given sources – sources have to be used critically as part of a historical enquiry. A01a requires the selection and deployment of knowledge and communication which is clear and accurate. A01b requires an understanding through explanation, analysis and the arrival at substantiated judgements.

The mark scheme for A02a refers to ‘a range of research materials.’

A range will not be fewer than 8-10 sources. A range also implies using a variety of sources, both primary and secondary. Primary sources may appear in collections or may be referred to in extracts in secondary sources. Secondary sources may include specialist monographs, studies or biographies. They may also include texts designed for A-level students and articles in academic journals and magazines for A-level students. When appropriate, artefacts, paintings, photographs, buildings, archaeological remains may be considered sources. There is no intention to restrict the range of research materials which students may use and evaluate in their investigations. The discriminating use of websites is acceptable, but teachers may need to offer some guidance here.

Sources should be used relevantly and with discrimination. There is little point in lengthy transcription of sources, and appendices should only be added when reference is made to visual material. Documents should not normally be appended.

The critical evaluation of source means that there is a judgement made about the source in relation to the argument. The nature of the evaluation will differ depending on the nature of the source being discussed. If an academic historian’s work is referred to, it will not be necessary to refer to his or her personal background unless it is very obviously relevant to assessing his/her view. Generalisations about schools of history are often of limited use. For example ‘Dr X is a revisionist and his work may be unreliable’ or ‘Professor Y gives an orthodox view of...’ or ‘Mr Z is a post-revisionist and therefore more reliable’ are comments which offer little. However, understanding that ‘the research of Dr. Y has confirmed Dr. X’s view and both base their views on the evidence that...’ offers cross-referencing and the use of contextual knowledge. When dealing with primary material, it may be very relevant to understand the nature, origin and purpose of the author. Monastic views of King John or Tudor views of Richard III, Stalinist views of Trotsky’s role in 1917, or Trade Union views of Mrs Thatcher have to be seen in their context. Sometimes this may be true of historians, but assumptions must not be made that every American historian, for instance, writing in the 1970s will have been influenced by Vietnam. If there is a view that a historian is ‘biased’ then his or her arguments must be shown to be unsound – mere reference to the circumstances in which he wrote will not convince.

Sources should be identified in footnotes in the usual way

A.J.P. Taylor, Bismarck, the Man and the Statesman, London, 1958 p.125

9 FAQs

Quick answers to FAQs

| | |
|--|--|
| Must I choose a board set Interpretations Topic or can I devise my own? | Yes, you must choose a board set topic |
| Can my students choose their own Investigation? | Yes, but it must link with the Interpretations and it must not overlap with study in any other AS or A2 unit. |
| Do I mark candidates work? | Yes, but in the 'final piece' you do not show the candidates your comments – they are for the moderator |
| Do my candidates work entirely on their own? | No – you can teach the topic chosen for the Interpretation but the coursework must be their own work. The restrictions on helping the students refer to the actual exercise. |
| Do candidates have to use sources in their Investigations? | Yes – at least 8-10 to establish a 'range' |
| Does this mean just primary sources? | No – it will depend on what is chosen, but there can be a mixture of sources. |
| How can I be confident that I know the standard when marking for the first time? | There will be INSET, examples and more support materials. |
| What if different colleagues mark to different standards? | This must be addressed by internal standardisation and time should be set aside for this. |
| What is critical evaluation of sources? | It is judgement made about sources using contextual knowledge and where appropriate knowledge of the nature, origin and purpose of the source. |
| Are these two source-based exercises? | No – the Interpretations are not sources, but extracts or passages from historians containing distinct interpretations. |
| Am I allowed to provide sources or suggest possible sources? | Yes |