

A LEVEL
Candidate Style Answers

HISTORY A

H505
For first teaching in 2015

Unit 3 **(Y302, Y305 – Y307, Y311 –** **Y312, Y314 – Y321)**

Version 1



Contents

Introduction	4
Y302 – The Viking Age c.790–1066	5
Section A Medium level response	5
Section A High level response	7
Section B Medium level response	8
Section B High level response	10
Y305 – The Renaissance c.1400–c.1600	12
Section A Medium level response	12
Section A High level response	13
Section B Medium level response	14
Section B High level response	15
Y306 – Rebellion and Disorder in Tudor England 1485–1603	18
Section A Medium level response	18
Section A High level response	20
Section B Medium level response	21
Section B High level response	23
Y307 – Tudor Foreign Policy 1485–1603	25
Section A Medium level response	25
Section A High level response	26
Section B Medium level response	27
Section B High level response	29
Y311 – The Origins and Growth of the British Empire 1558–1783	31
Section A Medium level response	31
Section A High level response	32
Section B Medium level response	33
Section B High level response	35
Y312 – Popular Culture and the Witchcraze of the 16th and 17th Centuries	37
Section A Medium level response	37
Section A High level response	39
Section B Medium level response	40
Section B High level response	42
Y314 – The Challenge of German Nationalism 1789–1919	44
Section A Medium level response	44
Section A High level response	46
Section B Medium level response	47
Section B High level response	49

Y315 – The Changing Nature of Warfare 1792–1945	51
Section A Medium level response	51
Section A High level response	53
Section B Medium level response	54
Section B High level response	56
Y316 – Britain and Ireland 1791–1921	58
Section A Medium level response	58
Section A High level response	60
Section B Medium level response	61
Section B High level response	63
Y317 – China and its Rulers 1839–1989	65
Section A Medium level response	65
Section A High level response	66
Section B Medium level response	67
Section B High level response	69
Y318 – Russia and its Rulers 1855–1964	71
Section A Medium level response	71
Section A High level response	72
Section B Medium level response	73
Section B High level response	75
Y319 – Civil Rights in the USA 1865–1992	77
Section A Medium level response	77
Section A High level response	78
Section B Medium level response	79
Section B High level response	81
Y320 – From Colonialism to Independence: The British Empire 1857–1965	83
Section A Medium level response	83
Section A High level response	85
Section B Medium level response	86
Section B High level response	88
Y321 – The Middle East 1908–2011: Ottomans to Arab Spring	90
Section A Medium level response	90
Section A High level response	91
Section B Medium level response	92
Section B High level response	94

Introduction

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

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

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

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

Y302 – The Viking Age c.790-1066

Section A

Evaluate the interpretations in both of the two passages and explain which you think is a more convincing explanation for the success of the Great Heathen Army in 865.

Medium level response

The two passages offer a variety of reasons as to why the Great Heathen Army of 865 was successful. Both Passages suggest that one reason was the division and disunity within Northumbria, which is given emphasis in Passage A than Passage B. Passage B stresses that it was the sheer size of the Viking force that enabled it to initially succeed, although it also mentions the ability of the Vikings to negotiate. Passage A also emphasises that Viking success was due, at least in part, to a willingness of the king's to buy off the raiders, a tactic that had been successfully used by the Carolingians. Both Passages therefore offer a range of reasons and although they agree on some of the factors, Passage A emphasises the disunity and civil war in Northumbria, whilst B sees the sheer size of the force as being the most important factor.

Passage A argues that the disunity and civil war within Northumbria was the most important factor for Viking success and this factor is also mentioned in Passage B, which uses the Anglo Saxon Chronicle to support this view. Passage B states that the Chronicle says that the Northumbrians had deposed their king, Osberht and replaced him with Alla and that this created disunity. Passage A also focuses on the strengths of the Viking force and notes that it was a co-ordinated force that, because of its experience of fighting in the Carolingian empire meant they were formidable and knew how to build defences and use them to raid nearby areas. Not only that, but the Vikings were also great negotiators and were able to win over aristocrats and kings who collaborated with them, making their task that much easier. This was also aided by the fact, as A suggests, that the first idea of many kings was to make peace, this may have been because of the size of the force or because the Viking force was so skilful and they would be unable to resist it. However, there are some limits to the explanation offered in Passage A as the first part of it does not focus on the success of 865 but instead looks at later developments, making it less useful as an explanation for their success.

Passage B, as mentioned in the Introduction offers very similar explanations for the success, however its emphasis is on the sheer size of the force that came in 865. The Passage argues that earlier raids had been by much smaller forces and that they were really just raiding forces, but that a change had taken place since about 850 with the size of the force increasing. The Passage also argues that the forces instead of just raiding had begun to overwinter in England. One reason that Passage emphasises is that the force that came in 865 was a co-ordinated group made up of forces already operating in Britain, Ireland and Francia, which would have increased the manpower available. This in itself would have made it difficult to resist and the Passage goes on to imply that resistance would have been more difficult because of the civil war and divisions in areas such as Northumbria. However, Passage B implies, unlike Passage A, that disunity in Northumbria was a less important factor because it argues that later Northumbrian sources claim that Osberht and Alla were brothers, suggesting that perhaps A has exaggerated the divisions. Despite this, A's view appears to have some credence as B does go on to say that they were soon able to seize York and within two years had control of Northumbria, suggesting that it was quite weak. Passage B also suggests that Viking success was aided by the arrival in 871 of the 'great summer army' and implies that this gave them the numbers and confidence to over-run virtually all of Anglo Saxon England. However, neither Passage mentions that Alfred was able to resist the advance.

Although both Passages offer similar reasons, with slightly different emphasis, Passage B is more convincing in its explanation as there is greater focus on the army of 865 and it provides more detail about the weakness of Northumbria, which made their task that much easier. However, Passage A is useful in providing the context for their success, but that is also covered in B. Passage B is also more convincing as it provides statistical support for the claim that the Viking forces attacking England had grown in size. Therefore, although A is useful in providing context, B is more convincing because of the details it provides.

Examiner commentary

The response explains the views of the two Interpretations with detailed reference to both. There is a clear understanding of the similarities between the two Passages, but the response also recognizes that they have a different emphasis as to the most important reason. The response is also able to use the Passages to both support and challenge each other, which gives the answer greater credibility. There are some hints as to the limitations, but the own knowledge that is present could be better linked to the actual Passage. There is a judgement, which is linked to the earlier material, but again would benefit from the application of own knowledge.

High level response

The two Passages offer a variety of reasons for the success of the Great Heathen Army of 865, and as Interpretation B notes the second army, or Great Summer Army of 871. Although both Interpretations offer similar reasons for the success of the Vikings, the Interpretations do emphasise different reasons for their success, with Interpretation A suggesting that there were a range of factors that were responsible for its success, but that the coming together of these factors at the same time was the most important reason, namely the weakness of Northumbria, the co-ordinated Viking group that attacked, Viking experience gained in attacks on the Carolingian Empire, Viking ability as negotiators and the willingness of kings and aristocrats to make terms. However, Interpretation B whilst acknowledging many of these factors, argues that it was the sheer size of the Viking force that ultimately brought it success.

Interpretation A offers a number of factors to explain the Viking success of 865. The initial focus of Interpretation A is on the weakness of Northumbria, which according to the Interpretation was weakened by civil war, which made it harder for it to resist the attacks. There is certainly some truth in this claim as Passage B uses the Anglo Saxon Chronicle to also support the claim that there was civil unrest in Northumbria, which the Viking were able to exploit. However, there may be some limitations to this explanation as B also argues that the disunity might be exaggerated as later Northumbrian sources claim that Osbert and Alla were brothers. Interpretation A also argues that the Viking force was well coordinated and that this meant that the force was very large and also experienced, as they fought on both land and sea in the Carolingian Empire. Moreover, such a view of the strength of the Viking army is reinforced by an examination of its leadership, which comprised of Halfdan, Ubbe and Ivarr, who were skilled warriors and royal leaders, with Ivarr probably being the infamous Ivarr the Boneless 'king of the Norsemen in all Britain and Ireland. Although Interpretation A is also correct in outlining the success of the Great Heathen Army in the 860s, it fails to acknowledge that after 871, despite the arrival of the Great Summer Army, Alfred had success against them, most notably at Edington and forced Guthrum to make peace and would later retake London. Interpretation A is also correct to argue that the Vikings were skilled negotiators and were able to exploit the willingness of English aristocrats and kings to collaborate with them, as was also seen later by Alfred in his dealings with Guthrum.

Interpretation B also focuses on the 860's, although it also acknowledges the arrival of the Great Summer Army in 871. Much of Interpretation B focuses on the reasons for the success of the Vikings in Northumbria and does not really explain its success elsewhere. However, its emphasis on the size of the Viking force of 865 is valid. The Interpretation argues that there had been a change in the scale of the forces attacking England, with the number of vessels increasing from 30-35 ships to well in excess of 250, which with each ship carrying between 40 and 60 warriors gives an indication of the challenge faced. The Interpretation is also correct to argue that the nature of the attacks changed as earlier attacks had simply been to gain moveable wealth, but these attacks were to grab and share out the land. The Interpretation, similar to Interpretation A also argues that the scale of the force was made possible by the confederation of groups that were already operating in Britain, Ireland and Francia and that it was a success because it contained royal leadership, such as Halfdan, Ingwaer and Ivarr, which meant that it was a massive threat. This unity, according to Interpretation B was more important than Northumbrian disunity, which the Interpretation also acknowledges may have been exaggerated. However, there are some limitations to the view of Interpretation B as its focus is largely on explaining the Viking success in Northumbria and does not explain why the Vikings were successful in Mercia and East Anglia.

In many ways Interpretation A is more convincing in explaining the success of the Great Heathen army in the period after 865. Although Interpretation B offers some explanation as to why it was successful in Northumbria, it is limited to that region. However, Interpretation A considers why the Vikings were successful in the 860s and offers a range of reasons, although, like B it ignores the later period and the impact of the Great Summer Army. Therefore, although both Interpretations have some limitations to their explanation, they also have some validity. However, Interpretation A is more convincing as it considers a range of reasons and discusses the reasons for Viking success across much of England, whereas the focus of B is on Northumbria.

Examiner commentary

The Interpretations are fully explained and similarities and differences between the two views are explored and comparisons are made. The response uses information from the other Interpretation to either support or challenge the Interpretation under discussion. However, unlike the previous response the answer applies own knowledge to the Interpretations to either support or challenge the views offered.

There is some impressive detailed own knowledge about the leadership of the Great Heathen Army, which is used to support the argument as to how formidable a force it was and similarly knowledge of developments in Wessex under Alfred is also used. The judgement is clear and the response sees the limits and strengths of both before reaching a supported balanced judgement.

Y302 – The Viking Age c.790-1066

Section B

'The Viking capture of York in 866 was the most important turning point in the Viking settlement of England from 790 to 1066.' How far do you agree?

Medium level response

There is little doubt that the Viking capture of York in 866 was an important event, but whether it was the most important turning point in the Viking settlement of England is a matter for debate. Until the period around 865 Viking attacks had not resulted in settlements being established in England, but instead had just been raids for plunder and moveable wealth. However, after 850 both the scale and nature of the Viking attacks changed and therefore the capture of York could be seen as clear evidence of a change in the nature of the attacks from raids to settlement and therefore a major turning point. However, there are other events in the period from 790 to 1066 which could also be seen as turning points in the settlement, such as the arrival of the Great Heathen Army in 865, the death of Eric Bloodaxe in 956 or the Viking victory at Maldon in 991.

The capture of York was an important turning point in the Viking settlement of England as it could be argued that it signalled the conquest and ultimate settlement of Northumbria and would lead to the virtual establishment of a Viking kingdom in the north. This was a complete change to the raids for booty that had afflicted the area in the past and began the process of settlement in the east and north of England, characterised today by the place names and in the past by the establishment of Danelaw. It therefore provided a blueprint for the establishment of other settlements, but more importantly it acted as an example of how Viking settlements could become national and regional trading centres. However, although the Viking settlement of York was important for its development it should be remembered that York was already established as a political, religious and local commercial centre and therefore it could be argued that they were simply building on or revitalizing the settlement. Despite this, it was an important development as York was transformed under the Vikings and excavations in the Coppergate region have revealed it was soon transformed into a centre of trade and commerce. York also soon became a major manufacturing centre, with evidence of goods being made from iron, copper, gold and silver, which also had an impact on the surrounding countryside and other areas where there was Viking influence. The importance of York is also evident from the fact that by 900 York was minting its own coins. This is clear evidence that the settlement was important commercially and that there were a large number of transactions taking place and that the Vikings had established a stable control in the region. The importance of the capture of York is also evident from the growth of York. Although population figures should be treated with caution it appears that York became one of the largest cities in medieval Europe after the Viking conquest, suggesting that they helped to transform it, with suggestions that the population rose to about 10,000 by c1000 and even reached 15,000 by the time of the Norman Conquest in 1066. Such developments in both population and commerce are therefore clear evidence of the importance and significance of the Viking capture of York, suggesting it was an important turning point.

However, it could be argued that it was the arrival of the Great Heathen Army in 865 and the Great Summer army in 871 that was the most important turning point. These events were important as they represented not only a change in the size of the attacks on England, but also a change in their nature. These armies no longer simply raided England for loot and moveable goods, but seized and shared out land in Northumbria in 876, Mercia in 877 and East Anglia in 880. The success of these armies gave the Vikings impetus and confidence to attack places, such as York and London. The success of these armies and the settlements that were established were a direct threat to the Anglo Saxon state and was therefore more important than the taking of York, which was simply part of this process. The settlement of Guthrum in East Anglia was the final stage in the establishment of Danelaw and was cemented by the treaty made with Alfred sometime between 886 and 890, thus giving permanence and acceptance to Viking settlement in the east, which was far more significant than the capture of York.

The taking up of winter quarters and the development of the settlement at Repton in 873-4 might also be considered to be a turning point. This was important as the Vikings had been able to reach Mercia and were able to capture a royal centre. More importantly, they did not simply raid it, as would have happened in the past, but they were able to establish

a secure base, complete with fortifications, suggesting that not only was the force they had brought quite substantial, but that they intended to use it to subdue the surrounding area, an indication of the pattern and nature of Viking settlement that would occur over the next few decades, suggesting that the establishment of such fortifications was a more important turning point in the settlement of England.

The death of Eric Bloodaxe, probably at the Battle of Stainmore in 954, was also an important turning point in the Viking settlement of England as after his death charters start to refer to Eadred as 'king, emperor of the Anglo-Saxons and Northumbrians, governor of the people and defender of the Britons'. It appears that his death was important as not was England united, but that it marked the start of Viking withdrawal from England. However, the significance of this should not be over-estimated as the withdrawal was only short-lived and it appears that even Eadred expected their return as is evident from his will, which left money to help repel a heathen army should it be needed.

The victory of Olaf Tryggvason at Maldon in 991 was an important turning point as 991 represented a return to the more permanent Viking settlement of the past, suggesting that 954 was a short-lived change from the pattern that had been established since the arrival of the Great Heathen Army in 865 and is therefore not an important turning point. It could also be argued that 991 was less important as it simply continued a process that had been evident since 865.

The capture of York was undoubtedly important as it signified the permanent establishment of a Viking presence not just in the north, but in England. However, this was the result of the invasion of 865 and therefore it was the arrival of the Great Heathen Army in 865 and to a lesser extent the great summer army that was more important as they signified a change in the nature of Viking attacks.

Examiner commentary

The answer explains the importance of a number of key events in the settlement of England by the Vikings. There is some quite detailed knowledge about the impact and importance of the capture of York, which is used to show why it might be considered a turning point. The importance of other events are also discussed and towards the end there is some limited attempt to compare their relative importance, but this needs to

be developed if it is to reach the higher levels. Some of the later events that are discussed, such as Maldon, also need greater development in order to show clearly their significance. There is an argument but a lack of comparison between the events prevents the response getting into the higher levels, instead it is rather a list of some possible turning points with some explanation.

High level response

The Viking capture of York in 866 was undoubtedly a significant turning point in their settlement of England, but whether it was the most significant is debatable. Although it resulted in the first significant settlement following Viking raids, there were other events, such as the capture of London, probably in 871, which were also important. Similarly, it could be argued that it was the arrival of the Great Heathen Army in 865 and the later Great Summer Army which were the most important events as they represented a significant change from the Viking raids of the eighth century and early ninth to a process of settlement that led to the capture of places such as York. It might also be argued that it was the establishment of fortifications, such as Repton, or the establishment of the Danelaw that were more significant turning points as they provide clear evidence of the permanence of Viking intentions. However, there was not complete continuity to the Viking settlement and therefore the death of Eric Bloodaxe might be considered an important turning point as it started a Viking withdrawal from England, although victory at Maldon ended that withdrawal and witnessed a continuation of settlement, suggesting that victory might be seen as more significant. There are therefore a variety of incidents and developments that were important turning points, but it was the arrival of the great armies in 865 and 871 that were the most important turning points as they represented the most significant change in the nature and scale of Viking attacks on England and gave them the confidence to establish a virtual 'Viking state' in the east.

The capture of York was an important turning point in the Viking settlement of England as it resulted in the dramatic growth of the town and its establishment as both national and international trading centre, becoming one of the largest Viking settlements and one of the largest towns in Early Medieval Europe. Although the seizure by the Vikings of London in 871 could be considered more significant, it was used only as a winter base and by 886 there is limited evidence that their control of it was any more than weak, suggesting that the taking of York was a greater turning point as it was more permanent and saw them use it to establish control over Northumbria. Despite this, the seizure of London was still important because Alfred showed an increasing concern about the strategic value of the town once the Vikings had taken Rochester in 885 and there are suggestions that he attempted a siege in 882-3, as well as sending envoys to Rome to ask for a blessing in attempt to remove the Viking presence, suggesting that its capture was a greater concern to Wessex than the capture of York, which was beyond his potential control. Yet in terms of trade the capture of York was a significant turning point as it led to York becoming a major manufacturing centre, which had a great impact on the neighbouring area. It resulted in York becoming a centre iron, copper, silver and gold and this evidently led to the development of large scale trade as by 900 the Vikings were minting their own coins in York to meet the high level of transactions that were taking place. Not only was that a clear indication of the development of a new trading centre following its capture, but also a sign that the Vikings had been able to use its capture to develop a strong economy in the region, suggesting that their presence was far more secure than in more southerly regions. The significance of this is made even more apparent by archaeological work at Coppergate in York, which has shown how the town was transformed as a centre of trade, further supporting the view that this was of greater significance than their temporary seizure of London. However, although York certainly developed under Viking rule, with its population reaching possibly 10,000 by 1000 and 15,000 by 1066, the impact of the Viking capture might be seen as less important as it was already a well-established political, religious and commercial centre and the Vikings simply revitalized it.

Although the capture of York was important, it might be argued that it was the capture of places such as Repton in 873-4 that were a more important turning point. It could be argued that militarily this was more important than York as not only was the Viking army over-wintering much further inland, but archaeological evidence suggests that they were establishing fortifications well inland from which to establish control and settlement over the countryside. This was also more significant as they were establishing settlements in Mercia, not just in the more coastal districts such as York. Such development set the pattern for future Viking advances in settlement in the region away from the coast where they had traditionally raided. It could also be argued that this was more important than the capture of York as such settlement in Mercia led on to the treaty that Alfred made with Guthrum at some time between 886 and 890 which gave Guthrum authority over Essex, East Anglia and parts of Mercia and Northumbria and established Danelaw, therefore confirming the initial gains and giving them a greater sense of permanence than their original capture suggests. The establishment of Danelaw was more significant than the capture of York because it recognized that there was more than a geographical area where the Vikings were present, but that there was an area with a distinct Viking economic, social, political and cultural character which emanated from Scandinavia. Moreover, even when land was recaptured by Edward, the area of Danelaw still retained a distinct Danish feel, which has led some to argue that it did not disappear until 1066, giving it importance even greater significance.

In terms of establishing settlements in England the capture of York was important, but it was not the most important turning point. It was the arrival of the Great Heathen Army in 865 and later, in 871 the Great Summer army that were more important. Not only were they symbols of the change from raiding to seize moveable goods, but the scale of the invasions was such that settlements could be established, which had not been the case when earlier raids consisted of no more than 25 to 30 ships, but in 865 it was in excess of 250, allowing the development of settlements to occur. The sheer size of the invasion was the crucial turning point as it allowed the Vikings to defeat Saxon armies and gave them

the confidence to establish permanent settlements rather than simply raid or even over winter. The importance of this event cannot be over-estimated as, although following the death of Eric Bloodaxe in 956 at Stainmore Viking withdrawal from Britain began, such a development was only short lived and permanent settlement started again following the victory of Olaf Tryggvason at Maldon in 991. Therefore, it was the success of the Great Heathen Armies of 865 and 871 that were the most important turning point as without their success settlement would not have been possible.

The capture of York was a turning point, representing the seizure of an important English settlement in Northumbria and leading to the establishment of Viking control in the north, that is still evident through place names and even in its loyalties during the Norman period. It was however not the most important turning point, that was a year earlier with the arrival of the first large scale Viking invasion force which allowed the seizure of land and capture of towns such as York and resulted in a process of virtual continuous Viking settlement in the tenth and early eleventh centuries. The earlier Viking attacks, perhaps consisting of no more than a few hundred men had simply been raids, the scale of this invasion made settlement possible and the later development of Viking fortifications at places such as Repton is a clear indication of the change that had taken place.

Examiner commentary

The answer is consistently focused on the question and there is a clear argument throughout the essay. The response is balanced with arguments for and against the capture of York as the most important turning point discussed. The importance of the capture of York is compared to a range of events and a convincing judgement is reached, which is well supported. The issues that are discussed are compared in importance with the capture of York and evidence is drawn from across the period.

Although there is little reference to the period before 865 that is because there is no evidence of Viking settlement and the answer makes that very clear, but instead notes that 865 was a turning point away from the raids of that period. The supporting detail is good and is relevant to the question, with a good range of examples of both settlements and individuals. The response does show clear evidence of synthesis, with comparison and explanation and would therefore be a high level response.

Y305 – The Renaissance c.1400-c.1600

Section A

Evaluate the interpretations in both of the two passages and explain which you think is more convincing about Savonarola's attitude to the Renaissance.

Medium level response

The two interpretations by Hole and van Paassen are not completely different in their view of Savonarola's attitude to the Renaissance. Both interpretations stress that he attacked works of art, literature and statues, with the bonfire of the vanities, but Interpretation B also notes that his opposition to the Renaissance was complex and that not all work of art or literature were destroyed.

Interpretation A is more negative in its view of Savonarola's attitude towards the Renaissance. It stresses the large number of works that were destroyed in the bonfire and that this caused incalculable damage to art. The interpretation is aware that the burning saw works by Botticelli and Boccaccio destroyed, along with many others. However, the interpretation does acknowledge that the attack was largely aimed at Humanists who wanted to celebrate pre-Christian societies' and therefore destroyed art which he considered immoral in the way that they portrayed people's behaviour. The scale of the attack was such that the Venetian ambassador offered him 20,000 ducats for the works. The interpretation does also accept that there was some public support for his actions and youth squads were able to collect offensive works with little apparent resistance. The interpretation puts forward the view that this was because he wanted to bring about a true Christian republic in Florence and that such works detracted from his aim as they caused lust.

Interpretation B also acknowledges that the bonfire destroyed large amounts of art and books. However, it suggests that works which were used for Christian purposes of devotion and meditation were not destroyed, but just those that he considered indecent. In some ways this agrees with Interpretation A that his attack was on those works which celebrated pre Christian societies and were often immoral in their content. It also suggests that such action was not new as there had been burnings before in order to show contrition. This interpretation is therefore more complex than Interpretation A and this claim is supported by the fact that von Paassen mentions that Savonarola also encouraged learning. This view is given some support in the Interpretation as it goes on to mention that he ensured the Medici library was saved when they fell from power in 1494 by incorporating it in into San Marco's library. The Interpretation also points out that his opposition to the Renaissance was not complete as leading humanist scholars became friars at San Marco. As a result Interpretation B is less negative in its attitude towards Savonarola and his view of the Renaissance.

Interpretation B is more convincing in its view because it is more balanced and acknowledges that whilst works of art were destroyed in the bonfire, Savonarola did not simply destroy everything associated with the Renaissance. Interpretation A partially agrees with this, suggesting it was just those works which were immoral that were destroyed. However, Interpretation B does also argue that Savonarola protected some important works, saving the Medici library by incorporating it into the friary at San Marco and promoting some humanist scholars, a point that is not picked up on by Interpretation A, which is focused entirely on the his negative impact on the Renaissance.

Examiner commentary

The response shows a good understanding of the two interpretations and picks up that they do not completely disagree in their views about Savonarola's attitude towards the Renaissance.

The interpretations are clearly explained, but the only attempt at evaluation is using material from within the actual Passages; no knowledge is used to evaluate either Interpretation. A judgement is reached and some justification is provided, but again it would benefit from the use of own knowledge to support the claim made. The response would reach the lower end of Level 4.

High level response

The two Interpretations agree that Savonarola destroyed many works of art and literature in the bonfire of the vanities, but Interpretation A is more negative in his view of his impact on the Renaissance. Interpretation A focuses entirely on the destructive impact of his rule on the art work of Florence, whilst Interpretation B, whilst acknowledging that considerable amounts of art were destroyed also comments on the fact that he saved the Medici library after they fell from power in 1494. Both Interpretations suggest that Savonarola's main concern was to destroy art which celebrated pre-Christian societies and values, but Interpretation A is much more explicit in this view, with interpretation B simply commenting that he supported art and literature provided it was used to support Christian purposes.

Interpretation A suggests that Florence lost a great deal of art, such was the value that the Venetian ambassador offered 20,000 ducats for the works that were to be burnt, which included paintings by Botticelli and writings by Boccaccio. This view is certainly valid as Botticelli himself surrendered paintings for the bonfire of the vanities. However, Interpretation A claims that Savonarola attacked humanism, but this view can be challenged as humanists became friars at San Marco during his period in power, which would have been improbable had his attack been on humanism as whole. However, the Interpretation is more valid when it claims that the bonfire of the vanities was directed against obscene literature, pornographic pictures and paintings. The Interpretation also suggests that there were groups of youths who went round collecting in the works and whilst this is partly true, painters such as Botticelli did surrender their works and there was also some opposition within the city to the actions as there was an attack on some of those who had carried out the burning as they returned to San Marco. The Interpretation also ignores the point made in Interpretation B that such burnings were not new and that they had been witnessed before as acts of contrition, suggesting that Savonarola was simply carrying on a tradition of Florentine life. The negative view of Savonarola's attitude towards Renaissance work in Interpretation A is further challenged by Interpretation B, which stresses how important a role he played in saving the vast Medici library after their fall from power in 1494, again hardly an action of someone who was completely opposed to the Renaissance. This action does reinforce the view in A that his main concern was to attack those who celebrated pre-Christian societies and not other elements of the Renaissance.

The view that Savonarola was not an enemy of all aspects of the Renaissance is given greater credence by Interpretation B, which gives more attention to his actions in defending certain aspects of it, notably the Medici library. Interpretation A gave the impression that Savonarola attacked humanism as it challenged Christian thought, but Interpretation B qualifies this by mentioning the promotion of humanist scholars as friars at San Marco and this is given further support by his relationships with both Ficino and Mirandola. Interpretation B is much clearer that his attack was on works of art which were out of sympathy with Christian values and did not encourage devotion and meditation and this is reflected in that he burnt only that which he considered 'indecent' and not everything. Moreover B is also more valid in its view that the bonfires were not a new occurrence used just by Savonarola to impose his views on the city. Interpretation B is therefore correct to argue that he was not completely opposed to the Renaissance; he wanted it to be used for Christian purposes, hence his attack on pagan writings.

Interpretation B is more valid in its view of Savonarola's attitude towards the Renaissance. It clearly sees the limits to his attack, which is less apparent in Interpretation A. Interpretation B offers a more balanced account of his views and this is most obviously reflected in his attitude and support for the Medici library, which is again ignored by Interpretation A. Although A is correct in its comments about what was burnt, this is not denied by B and therefore Interpretation B gives a more complete view of his attitudes towards the Renaissance.

Examiner commentary

The response clearly explains the views of the two passages and is aware that they do not offer completely different views about Savonarola's attitude towards the Renaissance. Some own knowledge is used to test the views offered in both Interpretations, although the response would benefit from this being developed. There is good use made of Interpretation B to challenge some of the ideas put forward in Interpretation A. The judgement is clear and is supported and this would help take the response into the top level, albeit at the lower end.

Y305 – The Renaissance c.1400-c.1600

Section B

'Classical influences were the most important factor in the development of the Renaissance throughout the period from 1400 to 1600.' How far do you agree?

Medium level response

There were a number of factors that affected the development of the Renaissance, and classical influences were certainly important. However, there were other factors that played an important role, particularly patronage of individuals and institutions, such as the church or guilds, the political structure, the economy and the artists themselves. This essay will analyse the role of each of these factors in order to reach a judgement as to their importance.

Classical influences had an impact on all aspects of the Renaissance. Classical models for Renaissance historians were provided by the Greeks, Herodotus and Thucydides, and the Romans Livy and Tacitus. Their writings were important as they not only told stories, but they also attempted to interpret and explain, and it was this, that the humanist historians of Renaissance Italy, such as Salutati, Bruni and Machiavelli recovered and followed when producing their works. Art and architecture was also influenced by the classical tradition. The art of the Renaissance reflected the features of classical civilization, even religious art was often set in a classical context, or paintings portrayed classical scenes such as the Triumph of Caesar or the great classical allegories of Botticelli or copied Roman sculptures, such as the painting of Sir John Hawkwood in the Duomo in Florence. This evidence of classical influence was even more apparent in the architecture, with Brunelleschi's dome in Florence being influenced by the Pantheon in Rome. Similarly classical influences were seen in the sacristy of San Lorenzo and the church of San Marco. Artists flocked to Rome to study classical remains and it is therefore not surprising that it was reflected in their works, particularly in some of the sculptures such as Michelangelo's David. The range of areas that were influenced by the classical past supports the argument that it was an important factor in the development of the Renaissance, at its very heart was the revival of antiquity and the books and study of classical languages and texts.

However, it was not just the classical world that influenced the Renaissance. Venice, in particular, was influenced by its trade links to the east, seen most clearly in some of the architecture and because after the fall of Constantinople many scholars fled there, often bringing manuscripts with them, which encouraged further scholarship and whose ideas were spread by the introduction of the printing press to the city. The Northern Renaissance was also less influenced by classical influences, with artists such as Holbein and Durer trained in Gothic workshops, although they did travel to Italy but their work reflected a variety of influences – wealth, metals and Italian know-how. However, Classical ideas did influence some of the developments in the Northern Renaissance, with English scholars such as Colet and More influenced by the humanist ideas of the classics.

Perhaps one of the most important influences on the Renaissance was the Church. They played a significant role in society and many Christian ideas conflicted with the classical past, with their different views of human nature and public life. However, many were able to fuse the two. Michelangelo in his painting for the Florentine merchant family, the Doni, set the foreground figures of Jesus, Mary and Joseph in front of a row of classical, naked youths. Similarly, in the Sistine Chapel he juxtaposed the classical and Christian. However, it was not just in style and content that the Church influenced the Renaissance, but also in patronage. The large demands for works of art made by the Church ensured that Christian themes, or as Hole states, 'Virgins continued to outnumber Venuses'.

Patronage was also important in the development of the Renaissance, both in the form of individuals, but also guilds. Individuals often wanted works to contain representations of their family. Guilds competed against one another, with the Cloth guild in Florence commissioning the Baptistery doors, whilst the Wool guild organized the competition for the dome. Communal governments also commissioned works of art, usually to glory the city, whilst court patronage

involved acquiring the constant services of a painter to portray whatever was needed. All of this was often done to reflect their own glory, but by increasing the demand for works of art it encouraged the development of the Renaissance and ensured large amounts of work was produced.

The development was further encouraged by the political structure of Italy. The individual states or cities, such as Florence, Venice and Milan wanted to display pride in their city and with the money available to them through the economic prosperity of the time, works of art and sculptures provided the means. Each state wanted to portray its own civic virtues and show its strengths. Similarly, the Papacy wanted to show its power and reassert the influence of Rome that had been in decline with schism. They were all therefore keen to use the art of the Renaissance to reflect their power and strength.

Although many painters were limited in what they could paint by their patrons, without the large numbers of artists and a willingness to experiment, new techniques and the development of symbolism, seen in the works of Botticelli and Michelangelo would not have occurred. It was also the artists who were responsible for some of the most important artistic developments, such as perspective, which would significantly influence artistic development.

As was suggested a number of factors were important in the development of the Renaissance. It was the coming together of a number of different factors, particularly a group of talented men at the same time and in close proximity that allowed the Renaissance to develop. They inspired each other and this led to an outpouring of art, writing, sculpture and architecture.

Examiner commentary

Although the essay covers a range of issues and themes and is focused on the question, there is no evidence of synthesis across the period. The question asks 'throughout the period' and this is not addressed and therefore what appears to be quite a strong response, with mostly good detail (it is a little weaker at the end, perhaps because of the time factor), would not reach the top levels. There needs to be comparison of the issues and contrasts between classical influences, and different regions could also be stronger – there is some, but it is not developed. More could have been made about the changing influences, which again would have helped to take the response into the higher levels. This would be a good period study answer, but it lacks the synthesis for the Themes paper.

High level response

The development of the Renaissance was influenced by a number of factors, but their influence varied over the period and between different areas. Although classical influences were present throughout the whole period and played a significant role in the development of the Renaissance, its influence did vary over the period and played a less important role in areas such as Venice and in Northern Renaissance, where influences from the East and Gothic influences were particularly important. It must also not be forgotten that other factors such as patronage, the role of the Church and the political and economic structures in Italy were also important. However, probably the most important factor in the development of the Renaissance was the coming together of a number of different factors, particularly a group of talented men at the same time and in close proximity that inspired each other, as this allowed an out pouring of art, writing, sculpture and architecture.

At the very heart of the Renaissance was the revival of antiquity and the books and study of classical languages and texts, therefore it would be difficult to argue that classical influences were not important in the development of the Renaissance. Renaissance culture and ideas throughout the period were based on the study of Greek and Latin texts by humanist scholars. Classical models for Renaissance historians were provided by the Greeks, Herodotus and Thucydides, and the Romans, Livy and Tacitus. Their writings were important as they not only told stories, but they also attempted to explain and it was this that the humanist historians of Renaissance Italy, such as Salutati, Bruni and Machiavelli recovered. Artists flocked to Rome to study classical remains and this was reflected in work throughout the period with Brunelleschi's Dome in Florence inspired by the Pantheon and Michelangelo's David inspired by classical sculptures. Similarly, classical influences were seen in the architectural developments, such as the sacristy of San Lorenzo and the church of San Marco in Florence. However, the development of the Renaissance in Venice owed as much to its links with the east, reflected in Venetian architecture, and also following the fall of Constantinople in 1453 with the influx of scholars and their manuscripts, which encouraged further scholarship and whose ideas were spread by the introduction of the printing press to the city. Similarly, the Northern Renaissance owed less to classical influences as artists such as Holbein and Durer were trained in Gothic workshops, although they did travel to Italy to study classical works, but they were affected by a variety of influences, including wealth, metals and Italian know-how. Therefore, it would be incorrect to suggest that it was just the classical past that was important, although Northern Renaissance scholars, such as Colet and More were influenced by the humanist ideas of the classics.

The classical past played a crucial role throughout the period in influencing artistic developments. Art often reflected the features of classical civilization, even religious art was often set in a classical context or paintings throughout the period portrayed classical scenes, such as the 'Triumph of Caesar' or the great classical allegories of Botticelli, or copied Roman sculptures, such as the painting of Sir John Hawkwood in the Duomo in Florence. However, although the classical past did influence artistic developments throughout the period, religion and the church was probably more important, as Hole has argued 'Virgins continued to outnumber Venuses'. Although Christian ideas often conflicted with the classical past, with their different view of human nature and public life, many artists were able to fuse the two. Michelangelo in his painting for the Florentine merchant family, the Doni, set the foreground figures of Jesus, Mary and Joseph in front of a row of classical, naked youths. Similarly, in the Sistine Chapel he juxtaposed the Classical and Christian, with one panel showing five Old Testament prophets and five pagan Roman sibyls, whose prophecies were believed to have foretold the birth of Christ; a clear example at the bringing together of the classical and Christian influences. It is hardly surprising that the Church was so significant in the Renaissance as it was a major patron of the arts, with the Papacy not only redeveloping Rome, but also the papal apartments and employing artists such as Michelangelo and Raphael.

The wealth and political structure of Italy were also crucial in the development of the Renaissance. However, the Renaissance did not affect the whole of Italy in the same way, or to the same degree or at the same time, with Florence playing a crucial role in the 1420s or 1490s, Rome in the 1510s and Venice in the 1530s. The development of the Renaissance depended upon a small clusters of talent coming together and feeding off each other, such as Brunelleschi, Masaccio and Donatello in Florence in the 1420s, or in the 1490s when Lorenzo de Medici dominated the state, Savonarola influenced ideas from the pulpit, Ficino worked on Plato and Botticelli and Michelangelo were both working or in Rome under Julius II when Michelangelo and Raphael worked in the Vatican. It was therefore not just classical influences that influenced the development, but the coming together of these talents was also encouraged by patronage made possible by the wealth of the states and individuals, with guilds competing against one another, with the Cloth guild in Florence commissioning the Baptistery doors, whilst the Wool guild organized the competition for the dome. Communal governments also commissioned works of art, often to glory the city and further ensured large amounts of works of art were produced. City states wanted to display their power and its civic virtues.

Patronage may have limited the development of art, as some patrons controlled what was painted, but without the large numbers of artists and a willingness to experiment, new techniques and the development of symbolism, seen in the works of artists, such as Botticelli and Michelangelo, would not have occurred. It was also the artists who were responsible for artistic developments such as perspective, seen clearly in the difference between works of art of the late fourteenth and sixteenth centuries.

It would therefore be wrong to suggest that classical influences were the most important factor throughout the period. Without the study of the past many of the ideas, particularly the study of classical texts would not have happened, and classical ideas influenced all elements of the Renaissance, but without the range of talent that came together it is unlikely that the Renaissance would have developed as it did. Moreover, the development of Renaissance ideas and art was not uniform and in some areas, such as Venice, other influences were as, if not more important.

Examiner commentary

As with the mid-level response the answer is focused on the question and is analytical throughout. It uses largely the same material as the mid-level response, but in this answer there is clear evidence of synthesis. The response is much more aware of how different influences affected different areas and compares those influences with the classical past. It is also aware that the Renaissance varied over time and that different influences played different roles at different times. There is a clear comparison of the factors and their relative importance, with a consistent line of argument pursued throughout the answer.

Y306 - Rebellion and Disorder in Tudor England 1485-1603

Section A

Evaluate the views in both the passages and explain which you think is more convincing in explaining the reasons for the Pilgrimage of Grace.

Medium level response

The two passages offer different views about the main cause of the Pilgrimage of Grace. Passage A argues that it was due to court faction, whilst Passage B argues that religious motives were at the heart of the rising. However, there are some similarities between the two passages as both acknowledge that the rising had more than one cause, even if they disagree about the main cause.

Passage A argues strongly that court faction, rather than religion and the dissolution, was the main cause. It goes as far as to state that 'the truly popular rising in the north west made no issue of the Dissolution', whilst arguing that the rebellion 'originated in a decision by one of the court factions to take the battle out of the court into the nation, to raise the standard of loyal rebellion as the only way left to them if they were to succeed in reversing the defeats suffered at court and in Parliament.' There is some evidence to support this view as many of the leaders of the rising, such as Hussey and Aske had connections with Catherine of Aragon and her daughter, Mary Tudor. They had lost influence as Mary had been excluded from the succession and the changes in policy appeared to ensure that they would remain out of favour. This interpretation is also supported by the grievances in the Pontefract Articles. It is also true that the Imperial ambassador had been involved in plotting and was encouraging Charles to invade. However, Passage A is wrong to argue that the rising was due to court faction as it was a popular rising led by the commons who turned to the gentry for leadership out of deference and their belief in a society of orders. The Passage is also wrong to ignore the dissolution as a cause. Although the passage states that the monks in the north had retained more popularity, it does not go on to note that the rising saw the restoration of monastic houses in Lancashire and Cumbria, or that monks were involved in the rising, even writing the Pilgrim's Ballad. The Interpretation is correct to state that there were a great variety of issues that agitated the northern counties and this can also be seen in the Pontefract Articles.

Passage B argues that religion, particularly the desire to restore monasteries and traditional religious practices were the main cause of the rising. However, it also argues that there were a wide range of interests with the articles containing 'three economic articles, six on legal and administrative matters, six political articles and nine dealt with religious grievances.' The Passage is correct that the 'commons defended and restored monasteries' as was seen in Cumbria, where all were restored, and in Lancashire, where the areas where monasteries were popular were the first to rise and the last to be put down. Also, on a national scale, the rising occurred soon after the dissolution of smaller monasteries had begun and therefore ordinary people would be noticing the first real local impact of the Reformation, which further supports the view of Passage B. There were also a significant number of monks involved in the rising and they even provided one of its symbols, the Pilgrims Ballad. Passage B also suggests that the restoration of traditional religion was important as the rebels did protest against the abolition of St Wilfrid's day. The importance of the monasteries as a cause is made clear in the final sentence of Passage B when it states that the rebels restored 'at least sixteen of the twenty-six northern monasteries that had actually been dissolved.' This importance is supported by Aske in his examination. The importance of religion was even seen at the start of the rising which began in the church at Louth. Passage B also argues that the rebels were not concerned about 'refusing rents or pulling down enclosures', but this is debateable as both appear as grievances in the Pontefract Articles.

In conclusion, Passage B offers a more convincing view of the causes of the Pilgrimage. Although suggest that there was more than one cause, B's view that it was the impact of local religious changes appears the most convincing in explaining why nearly 40,000 people rose as monasteries played a very large role in people's lives, providing employment, education charity and often a place of worship. It is unlikely that 40,000 people would rise in support of a factional struggle that did not really affect them.

Examiner commentary

Although this response would not score full marks, it is still a good answer. It covers many of the points raised in the first response, but they are not as developed. The response does not use the same depth of detail as the first answer to evaluate the Interpretations – it could have made specific mention to some of the grievances in the Pontefract Articles or the Act of Succession – the first answer also uses material from the second passage to challenge the first and has a clearer and more developed and well supported judgement which weighs up the two passages, whereas the second response refers only to the first Interpretation.

High level response

The two passages acknowledge that the rising in the north of England in the autumn of 1536 was caused by a variety of reasons. However, they differ in their view as to the most important factor in bringing about the Pilgrimage. Passage A argues that the Pilgrimage 'originated in a decision by one of the court factions to take the battle out of the court into the nation', whilst Passage B puts forward the view that religious change, or rather it was the 'local impact of Henry's Reformation which produced the rebellion', most notably the dissolution of the smaller monasteries and the loss of traditional religious practices, rather than the suppression of papal authority.

Passage A is correct to argue that one of the court factions, the Aragonese, had suffered defeats at court with the passing of the 1534 Succession Act which excluded Mary from the throne in favour of Elizabeth. It is also true that the key figures in the rising, Aske, Darcy and Hussey were closely associated with Catherine of Aragon and her daughter, with Hussey having been Mary's chamberlain. It is possible that Passage A is correct in that these men were willing to use rebellion to restore their positions as Hussey had lost his office and his wife was imprisoned, but if this was the case they seized on general popular discontent. More importantly, Passage A ignores the fact that Hussey was stayed largely on the side-lines. There is evidence of talks between the Imperial ambassador and some of the rebels from 1534 onwards, supporting the claim in Passage A that the ambassador would be able to compile a long list of disaffected noblemen willing to join a rebellion against Henry. However, it should be noted that talk of risings and foreign invasion and should not be given too much credence. Similarly, there are some weaknesses in the claim that the rising was led and organised by this faction. In light of this claim, Aske's deposition that he had been forced into the rising makes no sense, unless one accepts that he was trying to save himself. Passage A also argues that rebellion was the only way left to reverse the defeats this group had suffered, yet the initiative for the rising lay not with this group, but with popular unrest and this is seen clearly in Lincolnshire, where the rising surprised many of the gentry who later became involved. Therefore, although some of the grievances make more sense if court politics were the main cause, Passage A undermines its own view by stating that 'there must be grave doubts about the extent to which the articles constitute anything like a representative programme, and worse doubts about the extent to which rebellion as a whole arose from the issues they enshrined'. Passage A also states that 'different parts of the north did not all rise for the same reason' and issues such as enclosure were only important in places such as the Vale of York, where there was pressure on the land.

Passage A also argues, in contradiction to Passage B, that the dissolution of the smaller monasteries was of little importance. Passage A argues that 'the truly popular rising in the north west made no issue of the Dissolution'. However Passage B challenges this view and comments that 'the rebels restored at least sixteen of the twenty-six northern monasteries that had actually been dissolved' and this was seen not just in the actions of the Pilgrims in Cumbria, where all four monasteries were restored. The centrality of the dissolution to the Pilgrimage, put forward in Passage B is justifiable. It was after all the monks of Sawley who composed the Pilgrims ballad and in Lancashire the first areas to rise and the last to be suppressed were in areas where there were monasteries, suggesting that the geography of the rising supports the view of Passage B. This view is given further credence by the Pontefract articles which specifically mentioned their restoration, but symbols such as the badge of the Five Wounds of Christ, and comments made by Aske under examination also support the view that religion was at the centre of the rising. It is perhaps not surprising that the dissolution was at the centre as the monasteries played more than a religious role in the lives of people, they provided employment, charity, education and were often local landowners; thus although Passage B is correct to stress their importance as the main cause, this claim could have been taken further to include not just their religious and spiritual role, but their social and economic importance. Passage B is also correct in arguing that people were concerned about the loss of traditional religious practices as was seen in the East Riding and at Kirkby Stephen, where they complained about the loss of saint's days. The rebellion was largely a protest against the attacks on the old religious practices, which Passage B correctly suggests through its focus on the importance of the dissolution and the loss of traditional practices.

Both Passages correctly acknowledge that the rebellion was multi causal and refer to social and economic concerns, which are reflected in the rebels' demands. However, they differ in their view of the main cause and whilst Passage A is useful in presenting a political interpretation, there are too many flaws in this argument to be convincing. Passage B, however, argues for religion as the main cause and given the dominance of religious grievances in the demands, the symbolism and the actions of the rebels in restoring monastic houses this is more convincing as an interpretation of the rising.

Examiner commentary

This answer would be awarded full marks and it is possible to envisage an answer of slightly less quality also gaining full marks. It evaluates both passages very fully, applying detailed own knowledge to judge the validity of the views in the two passages and reaches a clear and developed judgement.

However, it should be noted that the detail in the answer is no more than that found in a chapter on the Pilgrimage of Grace in a standard book used for teaching Tudor Rebellions.

Y306 - Rebellion and Disorder in Tudor England 1485-1603

Section B

'The Western Rebellion, more than any other rebellion, presented the most serious threat to Tudor government.' How far do you agree?

Medium level response

The Western rebellion was a serious threat to the Tudor government as it took the government a long time to defeat the rebellion, forced them to bring troops back from Scotland and raise mercenaries to tackle the unrest. It also occurred at a very dangerous time for the government as they faced unrest in many other counties in the south and east of England, as well as Kett's rebellion in East Anglia. This, along with the threat of invasion from France meant that the government's military position was weak. The government was also weak as it was a period of royal minority and the Protector, Somerset, lacked the royal authority that a monarch would have. It is also clear that the rebellion was a threat as it took the government five attempts to finally defeat the rebels, with major battles at both Clyst Heath and Sampford Courtenay.

The rebellion was also a direct challenge to the policies of the regime. It wanted the government to abandon its religious policies and restore the religious situation as it had been in 1529 before the break with Rome, which would have been a considerable climb down for a regime that seemed determined to introduce a reformed religion. All elements of the government's religious policy were attacked and there were demands for the restoration of traditional practices and even the restoration of some monasteries.

The rising was also serious because the region was notorious for unrest. The Cornish had risen in 1497 in protest about being taxed for a war against Scotland, arguing that they were exempt, but also suggesting that the region did not have a national identity. It would appear that little had changed by 1549 as the rebels claimed that they did not understand English and would therefore rather have the Prayer Book in Latin. This lack of integration made the rebellion a serious threat.

The rebellion was not as serious as some rebellions because it did not aim to remove the monarch. In 1487 Simnel, a Yorkist pretender aimed to overthrow the new king, Henry VII and forced him to battle at East Stoke. This was a serious threat as the Tudor dynasty had come to the throne only in 1485 with its victory against the Yorkist, Richard III at Bosworth. There was still much support for the Yorkist cause, with Margaret of Burgundy supplying troops, meaning that Simnel was able to force Henry into a major battle that could easily have turned out in a similar way to Bosworth, with the defeat of the monarch. Northumberland's attempted coup was also a serious threat as he had the initial support of the Privy Council to remove Mary and install his daughter-in-law, Lady Jane Grey as queen. He was able to raise a force to confront Mary and although this force subsided he had brought the country close to civil war suggesting it was a threat.

Some rebellion had far greater numbers than the Western rebellion and were a greater threat. The Pilgrimage of Grace raised over 30,000 troops, many of whom were well-armed and trained. If they had decided to move south they would have been a serious threat because they outnumbered royal forces by some 8:1 and it would have been very difficult for the government to stop them reaching London. Kett's rebels were also a serious threat because he was able to raise 15,000 men and set up a range of camps across East Anglia. The threat of the Pilgrimage was made stronger because they were able to gain support from all classes, including the nobility and gentry, with men such as Lord Darcy joining the rebellion, which gave it leadership and credibility. The Northern Earls could also be seen as a threat as they were led by the Earls of Northumberland and Westmorland. Essex also had the support of a number of nobles, which made him a threat.

The rebellions that were close to London, such as Wyatt and Essex were a threat. Wyatt was able to enter London and reached as far as Ludgate before the gates were close on him, largely in response to a rousing speech from Mary at Guildhall. Essex's rebellion took place in London, which made it a threat and much easier for it to seize key buildings. The

Cornish rebels of 1497 were also a threat as they reached Blackheath before they were soundly defeated by government forces.

Some rebellions were a threat because they were able to capture the regional capital, unlike the Western. The Pilgrims took the regional capital of the north, York and issued a manifesto from there. Kett's rebels were able to capture Norwich and set fire to part of the city, suggesting that they were a particular threat.

There were many rebellions that were a threat. Some aspects of the Western rebellion made it a threat, but aspects of other rebellions, such as the size, aims and location meant that they were an even greater challenge to the government.

Examiner commentary

The content is very good and there is support for the points made. However, although the Western rebellion is considered in the first half of the essay there is no attempt to compare its seriousness with other rebellions. Similarly, in the second half of the essay the seriousness of other rebellions are discussed, but again they are not compared with the Western to reach a judgement, nor are they compared with each other, instead the threats are simply listed. Synthesis, which is the key for the highest levels is largely absent – just a hint towards the end.

High level response

The Western rebellion of 1549 did present Edward VI's government with a serious challenge, particularly given the context within which it took place. However, in order to assess whether it presented the greatest threat of all Tudor rebellions issues such as the numbers involved, its aims, support and location must be analysed. Given the problems that the government faced in 1549 with widespread unrest and the threat from overseas it was certainly a threat, but as it did not aim to overthrow the Tudors, unlike the dynastic rebellions of Henry VII's reign, it was not the most serious challenge.

Although the Western rebellion was unable to raise the largest force of the Tudor rebellions, with the Pilgrimage of Grace raising some 40,000 and Kett 15,000, it was still a military threat as is evident from the number of battles, such as Clyst Heath and Sampford Courtenay, that it took government forces to finally defeat it. Other rebellions that required military force, such as Simnel or the Cornish rebels of 1497 were defeated and dispersed as a result of one battle, but the Western rebels proved a much more resilient force and therefore could be seen as the greatest threat.

The threat was even more serious because of the timing. The rebellion occurred at the same time as Kett's rebellion and trouble in some 25 other counties in eastern and southern England. This, along with the government's campaign in Scotland and the threat of invasion from France meant that military resources to put the rising down were limited and this allowed the rebellion to develop. This was certainly more serious than the situation in 1536 when, despite the offer of foreign help to the Pilgrims, the government did not face other unrest. However, although the rebellion was during the minority of Edward VI, the Tudors were more secure on the throne than Henry VII had been in 1487 when Simnel invaded with the help of Irish soldiers and German mercenaries paid for by Margaret of Burgundy. As Henry had only just seized the throne and there was much support, particularly in the north for the Yorkists, the situation in 1487 was a greater threat, coming just two years after Bosworth than that in 1549, as in 1549 the Tudor dynasty had been on the throne for over fifty years.

The rebels in 1549, unlike those in 1487, 1491 and 1553 did not aim to overthrow the monarch and this meant that 1549 was less of a threat to the government. The rebels in 1549 wanted the government's religious policy to be abandoned and Catholicism to be restored, whereas Simnel, Warbeck and Northumberland all aimed to overthrow the monarch. Simnel and Warbeck aimed to bring about a 'Yorkist' restoration and had the support of a number of nobles, which was not the case in 1549 when noble support for the Western rebels was absent. In 1553 Northumberland aimed to place Lady Jane Grey on the throne and initially at last had the support of the Privy Council, whereas in 1549 the Western Rebels lacked support from outside the region and did not have the sympathy of the ruling elite or the nobility, with the result that unlike 1487, 1491 and 1553 it lacked credible leadership.

Although the rebellion was a long way from London, which unlike Essex and Wyatt made it less of a direct threat to the capital, it did mean that it took longer for royal forces to reach the area and gave the rebels the opportunity to build up their forces. However, the rebellion was less threatening as not only did it fail to march towards London and threaten the capital as the Cornish rebels had in 1497 until they were defeated at Blackheath, but the rebels were unable to take the county town and regional capital of Exeter. In comparison The Pilgrimage of Grace was a far greater threat as it took the regional capital in the north, York, and this was repeated in 1569 when the Northern Earls took Durham and in 1549 when Kett was able to seize Norwich. Exeter remained loyal to the government throughout the siege to which it was subjected by the rebels, suggesting that they lacked both the numerical strength and support that had enabled the other rebels to take regional capitals. In comparison to both Wyatt and Essex it was also far less of a threat to the capital and therefore the government, remaining as it did in the West Country. Wyatt was able to reach Ludgate within the city and only Mary's speech at Guildhall saved the monarchy from a more serious fate, whilst Essex's rebellion actually took place within the capital.

However, it might be argued that the tradition of unrest in the region made it a serious threat. The area had risen in 1497 in protest against taxation to fund a war against Scotland, asserting its independent nature and how little integration there was with the rest of England. This tradition can be seen in 1549 as the Cornish rebels argued that they did not want the Prayer Book in English as they did not understand it. Despite this apparent divide from the rest of the country, the rebellion was no different from other peripheral regions, such as the north which felt excluded from the growing centralization and therefore in the Pilgrimage demanded a parliament in the north.

The Western Rebellion, although it proved difficult to suppress was not the most serious threat to the government. In terms of direct challenges to the Tudors the dynastic rebellions were a greater threat, particularly those during the reign of Henry VII when the regime was very insecure, there was still much sympathy for the Yorkist cause and there was recent evidence from Bosworth that the monarchy could be changed by force.

Examiner commentary

The answer is consistently focused on the question, a range of themes are considered and there is direct comparison across the period. The opening paragraph offers a view and this is sustained through the essay with the conclusion coming back to the argument that the dynastic rebellions were a greater threat. Synthesis is present throughout and comparisons with the Western rebellion are constantly made.

Y307 - Tudor Foreign Policy 1485-1603

Section A

Evaluate the interpretations in both of the two passages and explain which you think is more convincing in explaining the failure of the Armada of 1588.

Medium level response

The two Passages offer different interpretations as to why the Armada of 1588 was defeated. Interpretation A argues that its failure was the result of English naval advantages and Spanish weaknesses, whilst Interpretation B claims that credit should not be given to the English navy but to the weather, arguing that more Spanish ships were destroyed by bad weather than English fire-power.

Interpretation A gives a number of reasons as to why English naval advantages and Spanish weaknesses were crucial in the outcome. Interpretation A argues that the Spanish ships were slower and less manoeuvrable than the English. The Spanish fleet, it is claimed, used many old ships that were not designed for fighting, but were more like transport ships. The Passage also suggests that the English sailors were better than the Spaniards, who it is claimed were hampered by the fact they struggled to communicate given their different nationalities and therefore languages. The Passage also argues that it was not the fact the Spaniards ran out of powder that was important, but rather that they did not fire their canons as frequently as the English. All of this, according to the Interpretation, meant that when the Spanish anchored off Calais to await the troops from the Netherlands, which they were to transport to England, the English fleet was largely undamaged and would make the Spanish task that much more difficult.

However, Interpretation B suggests that it was not the strength of the English navy that was the most important factor, instead it was the nature of the English weather. The English guns and cannon, according to Interpretation B, had inflicted relatively little damage on the Armada. Instead it was events at Gravelines and afterwards that destroyed it. The 'floating bombs' or Hellburners that the English sent in forced the Spanish to cut their anchors and head north up the North Sea. Unfortunately for the Spanish they encountered bad weather which destroyed many more of their ships than English gunfire. The Interpretation mentions that the geography of the English Channel meant that it was difficult for them to turn back and instead they were forced round the top of Scotland and into the Irish Sea. It was in this part of the journey that they encountered bad weather and the number of wrecks found in the area suggests that bad weather, rather than the English navy was crucial in ending the threat of the Armada.

The Interpretations do offer very different views. However, in part Interpretation A is accurate as the English navy was able to prevent the Spanish from collecting the Spanish troops from the Netherlands and did force the Spanish to cut their anchors and flee up the North Sea. Despite this, Interpretation B is also accurate as little damage had been done to the actual Spanish ships by the English cannon and it was the weather in the North Sea, round the top of Scotland and in the Irish Sea that ensured very few Spanish ships made it back to Spain. Therefore there are elements of both Interpretations that are correct and neither gives the complete picture.

Examiner commentary

The views of both Interpretations are clearly and fully explained and the contrast between them is made. There is some own knowledge used, but it is not clearly used to evaluate the Interpretations, but instead is part of the explanations. There is little evidence of evaluative words in the response, a clear indication that the focus is on explanation rather than evaluation.

The judgement is well explained and is based on a sound understanding of events, but again some own knowledge which was precisely linked to it would help to make it more convincing. As a result of, at best, limited or even implied evaluation, the response would reach Level 4.

High level response

Passages A and B offer very different interpretations as to the reasons for the failure of the Armada in 1588. Whilst Interpretation A focuses on the strengths of the English navy and the weaknesses of the Spanish fleet, Interpretation B argues that the most important reason was the weather that the Spanish fleet encountered as that destroyed more ships than English fire power.

Interpretation A stresses the role played by the English navy, arguing that it possessed a new type of ship that was much more manoeuvrable than the Spanish ships, which were often old and consisted more of merchant ships used to transport grain or were not suited to the stormier waters of the Channel. Not only this, but the nature of the ships meant that the Armada was slow and therefore it was easy for the English ships to follow the Spanish up the Channel and wait to attack. The Interpretation also suggests that the Spanish sailors were not accustomed to the conditions in the Channel and there is some validity in this view as many had experienced only the calmer waters of the Mediterranean. The Interpretation is correct to suggest that the navy played a crucial role in defeating the Armada as it was the actions of the English navy, by sending in 'hellburners' at Gravelines which prevented the Spanish from picking up Parma's troops to transport to England. It was this action that forced many of the Spanish ships to cut anchor and flee northwards, further supporting the view that the English navy was important in the defeat of the Armada. However, the passage over-emphasises the damage that English fire power did to the Spanish fleet as little damage was inflicted by English cannons, despite their ability to fire more shots than the Spanish as they were able to reload their canon more quickly. It could also be argued that it was less the English navy that disrupted the Armada than the 'hellburners' as it was the sending in of them that ultimately forced the disruption of the crescent formation of the Spanish fleet.

Interpretation B argues that the most important factor in the defeat of the Armada was the weather. There is certainly a great deal of merit in this view as more Spanish ships were destroyed by the weather than by the English navy and therefore the Passage is correct to suggest that 'the Lord blew and they were scattered' is the best explanation for the defeat. The Interpretation is also correct to stress that it was the sending in of fire ships by the English that was crucial as this forced the Spanish to cut anchor and head northwards. The passage rightly suggests that the geography of the channel meant it would have been virtually impossible for the Spanish fleet to have headed back down the Channel, where they would also have encountered the English, and therefore they were forced to head north. This, as the Interpretation argues, was also made the most likely route because of the nature of the prevailing winds which would have pushed them north round the top of Scotland and then into the Irish sea. Certainly the number of wrecks found round that western coast suggests that the weather was crucial in destroying the fleet. Moreover, the narrowness of the Channel and his knowledge of the tides around the Isle of Wight made it much easier for Drake to follow the Armada after it passed Plymouth and ensure that they could not return that way. This also meant that the Armada could not turn and give battle to the English, which may also partly explain why A mentions the issue of shot and powder. In part A is correct to suggest that the Spanish were slower to fire, hence why they still had powder and shot left, but because of Drake's tactics and use of the geography and weather they also had little opportunity to deploy their canon once they were ahead of the English fleet. The argument that they were unable to turn back once things started to go wrong is therefore valid. The Interpretation is also correct to stress the role of the weather in another element of the enterprise. The Armada had to wait for troops from the Netherlands to embark from barges and this would take time and therefore depended upon good weather, which was not present.

The view of Interpretation B is certainly much stronger than that of A and was even acknowledged by contemporaries when they had the commemorative medal struck, which focused on the 'Protestant wind'. However, Interpretation A does have some merit as Drake was able to use his skill and knowledge of the Channel to his advantage and track the Spanish fleet, knowing they would be unable to return the same way or give battle. He also used the tactic of ending in 'fire ships' to disrupt the Spanish so the skill of the English navy should not be ignored. However, B is correct in arguing that it was ultimately the weather that destroyed the Spanish fleet, driving ships onto the sandbanks near Gravelines or onto the rocky coastline around Scotland and Ireland.

Examiner commentary

The answer is fully focused on the views of the two Passages. The views of both are fully explained and own knowledge is used to test the views offered. The knowledge is relevant and accurate and is directly linked to the Interpretations and there is evidence of the regular use of evaluative words. The judgement is balanced and knowledge is applied to support the view that is taken. The response is able to synthesise the two views and show that parts of each Interpretation may be considered to be valid, whilst overall one is stronger than the other. As a result the response would reach the top level.

Y307 - Tudor Foreign Policy 1485-1603

Section B

How far were dynastic and personal aims the main influences in shaping Tudor foreign policy?

Medium level response

All Tudor rulers' foreign policy was influenced to some extent by dynastic and personal aims, whether it was Henry VII at the start of the period or Elizabeth I at the end. However, there were also other factors that influenced foreign policy, particularly the fact that England was not a major power and was often simply forced to react to events. During the period issues such as a lack of money influenced policy, particularly under Henry VIII and Edward VI, or providing support for co-religionists under Elizabeth I.

Henry VII's foreign policy was heavily influenced by dynastic and personal aims. As a usurper he needed to secure the throne from both domestic and overseas challenges and gain foreign recognition. This was seen in both his policy towards Spain and France, where in the Treaty of Medina del Campo he secured recognition for his regime and gained support of a major power against pretenders to his throne. This was similar to his policy towards France, where through the Treaty of Etaples he gained recognition and the assurance that France would not support pretenders to the throne. In order to further secure the dynasty he signed the Treaty of Ayton with Scotland, which ended James' support for Warbeck and also married Henry's daughter to the Scottish king, further securing Henry's position. However, they were not the only factors shaping foreign policy. Henry lacked financial resources and therefore largely avoided war, even the invasion of France in 1492 was at the end of the campaigning season so that little fighting took place and instead Henry was more concerned to secure continued payment of the French pension. Tudor foreign policy under Henry was also influenced by the desire to improve trade as it would increase his revenue, and agreements were reached with Portugal, and Florence, but the suspension of trade with Burgundy because of its support for Yorkist pretenders shows that dynastic security was more important.

Henry VIII's foreign policy was also shaped by his desire to secure the dynasty and his personal aims. In particular it was his personal aim to show himself as powerful and a major player on the European stage, as well as claim the French throne, that led to the invasions of France in the 1510s and 1520s and even in the 1540s, when Boulogne was captured. Henry was also concerned about security, hence his alliance with the Protestant princes and the Cleves marriage in 1540 when he feared a Catholic crusade after his divorce from Catherine of Aragon. It might also be argued that Henry had the personal aim of uniting England and Scotland and that this influenced English policy in the 1540s and led to the invasion of Scotland and victory at Solway Moss. If Henry's desire for personal glory was the main influence on foreign policy, this was limited by financial constraints, particularly in the 1520s. Although one of Henry's main aims had been to assert his claim to the French throne, this was limited by the lack of financial resources available to him and the failure to raise the Amicable Grant in 1525 led to an invasion of France, after Francis I defeat at Pavia, having to be called off.

Although Edward VI was only a minor when he was on the throne, the direction of foreign policy was still heavily influenced by dynastic concerns, particularly under protector Somerset. War against Scotland continued in order to try and secure the marriage of Edward to Mary. However, during Northumberland's period in power it was finance that was more important and the aggressive policy pursued by Somerset had to be abandoned because of England's precarious financial position. Even under Mary Tudor dynastic and personal concerns dominated the direction of foreign policy. It was her desire to establish a Catholic dynasty that led to her marriage to Philip II and an alliance with Spain, which would take England to war against France. This policy was also influenced by Mary's personal desire to secure the re-establishment of Catholicism in England by gaining the support of the leading Catholic power.

Elizabeth's reign was little different to the earlier Tudors as dynastic security was the main factor influencing her foreign policy. Much of Elizabethan foreign policy was dominated by the fear of Spain and a Spanish invasion. It was fear of the Channel coast falling under Spanish influence, which made invasion a possibility, that encouraged Elizabeth to support the Dutch rebels in the 1570s.

Similarly Elizabeth supported the French in the later part of the period because she feared Spanish in France influence through the Catholic League and the threat that could pose to England. Security was Elizabeth's major concern as Elizabeth's claim to the throne could be challenged by Catholic powers, who until 1587, claimed that Mary Queen of Scots was the rightful ruler and therefore Elizabeth, until she was secure attempted to appease Philip of Spain and also avoid entanglements with France. It was this concern that led to the Treaty of Edinburgh in 1560 and later the Treaty of Blois with the French in 1572. However, Elizabeth's foreign policy may also have been influenced by religious factors as she did provide support for fellow Protestants in Scotland and the Netherlands, providing both financial and military aid for the latter, although it could also be argued that this was because these rebels prevented the Spanish from attacking England and therefore helped preserve England's dynastic security. She also sent forces to France, again it appeared to help the Huguenots, but also to divert Catholic attention from England. Therefore, even when religious factors appear to influence the direction of foreign policy, much of it was still influenced by dynastic and security concerns. Like Henry VII, Elizabeth did try and help trade, supporting ventures to the Americas and attacks on Spanish New World possessions, but with the latter this may also have been for security reasons.

All English monarchs were primarily influenced by dynastic concerns. Henry VIII and to some extent Mary were also influenced by their personal aims, but this was less important for Edward and Elizabeth. Finances also played a significant role in shaping foreign policy as the lack of money influenced decisions over war, but when security was threatened, as under Elizabeth, it was dynastic security that came first as was seen in the war against Spain in the latter years of her reign. Securing and protecting the Tudor dynasty was the main factor and although other influences were present they were always subordinate.

Examiner commentary

The essay adopts a chronological approach, with a paragraph on each monarch. Although the answer is analytical, this type of approach makes comparisons across the period very difficult and the answer shows no real evidence of synthesis, which is needed if it is to reach the higher levels. The response does have a good understanding of developments in foreign policy and the factors that influenced the direction. Given that there are only 45 minutes in which to cover the period the depth of knowledge is good and the answer avoids large amounts of description. Despite the focus and analysis, the lack of synthesis means that the response would be a mid-level response.

High level response

Throughout the Tudor period dynastic aims were a considerable influence in shaping foreign policy and, although personal aims were important to some monarchs, particularly Henry VIII and Mary I, they were less important. Other factors, such as religion and finance also played a role in influencing foreign policy at various stages, but throughout the period the most important concern was national security.

All the Tudor monarchs were concerned by dynastic aims, with Henry VII, Henry VIII and Mary Tudor anxious to secure the throne. Henry VII as a usurper was concerned to secure the dynasty by gaining foreign recognition and this led him to seek marriage alliances with both Spain, through the Treaty of Medina del Campo and Scotland through the Treaty of Ayton. Not only did these agreements give him security against pretenders but Medina del Campo gave him recognition and friendship with a powerful nation. Similarly Henry VIII looked to strengthen the Tudor dynasty by firstly marrying Catherine of Aragon, continuing his father's policy of allying with Spain. However, later, although by divorcing Catherine and pursuing a series of marriages he abandoned the Spanish alliance, he still looked to secure the dynasty by allying with the German protestant princes and marrying Anne of Cleves. Mary Tudor also pursued a similar policy, using marriage to secure her dynastic aims by marrying Philip of Spain and re forging the alliance with Spain. It could also be argued that Henry VIII, through the policy of rough wooing, and then Protector Somerset sought to pursue a similar dynastic policy for Edward by trying to arrange his marriage to Mary Queen of Scots so creating a union between England and Scotland. Even Elizabeth's policy was influenced by dynastic aims as she sought to preserve her throne from invasion by a series of marriage negotiations with Philip of Spain and the French dukes of Anjou and Alencon. Dynastic aims were also seen as a major concern for both Henry VII and Elizabeth in that both were concerned to prevent the Channel coast falling under the control of one power. During Henry VII's reign he went to war with France to try and prevent Brittany being taken by the French, whilst Elizabeth allied with France in 1572 and Dutch rebels to prevent Spanish control of the Channel coast. This was obviously of vital concern to both monarchs as Henry VII lacked the financial resources for such an undertaking, but recognized that security was more important, and similarly for Elizabeth, despite war costing millions of pounds she maintained the conflict with Spain until the end of her reign because of the threat to security, showing just how important a concern it was.

Personal aims were also important, but this was more apparent during the reigns of Henry VIII and Mary, rather than other Tudor monarchs. Henry VIII's policy was influenced by his desire to claim the French throne and display his warlike qualities, hence the invasions of France in 1512, 1513, 1523-5 and again in the 1540s. Henry wanted to be seen as the equivalent of his hero, Henry V, even if it drained England financially as it would also make him appear powerful and chivalrous. Although Mary was also influenced by personal aims they were very different from her fathers as she wanted to re-establish Catholicism and a Catholic dynasty, hence her marriage in 1554 to Philip of Spain. Such was this influence on her policy that she was willing for England to be dragged into the Habsburg-Valois wars, which led to the loss of England's last French possession of Calais. However, personal aims were not as important as other factors. Henry abandoned his French campaign in 1525 due to a lack of financial resources, showing how they could influence foreign policy, whilst Mary became involved in the Habsburg Valois struggle only because English security was threatened by French support for Stafford.

Securing the border with Scotland was a major influence on policy, particularly because of the Scottish alliance with France. All monarchs until 1560, when the Treaty of Edinburgh lessened the threat, were concerned to secure their northern border. Henry VII through marriage and the Treaty of Ayton was able to secure peace, whilst Henry VIII through more belligerent methods attempted to prevent Scottish incursions, defeating the Scots at Flodden and Solway Moss, then embarking on a policy of rough wooing to try and secure the marriage of his son to Mary Queen of Scots. This concern was also seen under Somerset, who continued Henry's war, defeating the Scots at Pinkie. However, under Elizabeth, although the goals remained the same – securing the border – the methods changed once the French left and Elizabeth pursued a more friendly policy. Scotland was an important element in English foreign policy, but this was largely because of the threat it posed to security, by offering the French a back-gate to attack England.

Support for co-religionist was also a factor in shaping foreign policy, but this was really only apparent during Elizabeth's reign. Support was given to Protestants in Scotland, but more importantly to the Dutch Calvinists and French Huguenots in the period from the 1560s onwards. Both money and troops were sent to aid the rebels, further adding to the decline in relations with Spain. However, support for these rebels was less because of religious reasons, but because of the threat to the Tudor dynasty should Spain triumph and therefore control the Channel coast. It was therefore national security that encouraged Elizabeth to support the rebels.

Finally English policy was shaped by her relatively weak position both politically and financially. English policy had to be reactive and a lack of finances forced aggressive policies, such as Henry VIII's 1525 campaign to be abandoned with the failure of the Amicable Grant.

However, even though England was often weak financially, it did not mean that when security was threatened the latter was sacrificed as was seen with Elizabeth's involvement in the long war with Spain at the end of her reign. This, and a willingness by Henry VII to sacrifice the financial gains of trade with Burgundy by his embargo in the late fifteenth century, are clear evidence that security was the most important factor shaping foreign policy throughout the period.

All monarchs were concerned by security, and even if other factors did influence policy at various stages, they were abandoned if security was threatened. In many instances marriage agreements were the most common way of securing the dynasty, but under Elizabeth it was war against Spain that was required. No monarch risked sacrificing security, whether it was the usurper Henry VII or Elizabeth I.

Examiner commentary

The answer is constantly focused on the question. It approaches the question thematically and throughout the essay makes comparisons across the period. It does not simply assert that there are similarities or differences between the monarchs, but explains them clearly and with accurate and relevant support. Given that the candidate has only 45 minutes to answer the question it covers a good range of issues and avoids being drawn into long narrative accounts. There is a clear and consistent argument and the response does compare the importance of the named factor with other factors in order to reach a judgement. The answer would reach the top level.

Y311 - The Origins and Growth of the British Empire 1558–1783

Section A

Evaluate the interpretations in both of the two passages and explain which you think is more convincing in its view of Francis Drake.

Medium level response

Interpretation A, written by Cummin, gives a very positive view of Drake, which is in contrast to the view of Interpretation B, written by Hamshire. Interpretation A argues that Drake's achievements and successes were very notable and that he promoted English interest overseas, bringing benefits to the country and the economy. In contrast, Interpretation B argues that Drake's reputation has been exaggerated as there were many unsuccessful trips and that his reputation should not be that of a hero.

Interpretation A focuses on Drake's circumnavigation of the world, which it sees as a great achievement and deservedly made him 'the hero of the hour'. The Interpretation focuses on the support there was for Drake's knighthood following his circumnavigation. The trip did bring both Drake and the investors considerable profits and helped to make Drake one of the wealthiest men in England. It also went a long way to building up his reputation as one of the greatest sailors as he was the first captain to take his ship all round the world and this helped to create his reputation as El Draque, who terrified the Spanish. Drake's success against the Spanish was crucial and it helped to inspire courage among other English sailors and privateers, as is stated in the Interpretation. Drake had certainly built up a great reputation following this and therefore the Interpretation is largely correct, although some of the language used might be seen as exaggerated, limiting the validity of the interpretation.

Interpretation B is in complete contrast to Interpretation A and offers a much more negative view of Drake. Not only does Interpretation B question his reputation, but it also questions how some of his contemporaries viewed him and according to this Interpretation he was not the 'national hero' that A suggests. The Interpretation focuses on his unsuccessful voyages in the latter part of his career and it is true that there were some, but it largely ignores his successful circumnavigation of the world and the fear he created among the Spanish and therefore, as with A, gives only part of the story. Instead the Interpretation considers the numbers who were killed on the Panama voyage and the failures of the 1589 and 1595 voyages, which as the details show did not achieve their aims. It also mentions the Cadiz expedition, which has been seen as a success in delaying a further Spanish Armada, but instead B argues that it served only to anger the Spanish and encourage another attack. The sheer number of events that are listed suggests that Drake was a failure and the greater breadth of coverage than Interpretation A does suggest that this is more convincing. Interpretation B is also made convincing by its reference to contemporary opinion about Drake, which is absent from Interpretation A. The fact that some contemporaries had such a view does force one to question his reputation.

Interpretation B is more convincing in its view of Drake as, unlike Interpretation A, it does cover most of his career, whereas Interpretation A is largely focused on the circumnavigation of 1577-80. The validity of Interpretation A is also brought into question as it ignores the fact that there were contemporaries who were critical of Drake and did not hold him in such high reputation. Moreover, A also contains some exaggerated language which makes one question its validity. Interpretation B does have its weaknesses as it scarcely mentions the circumnavigation, which was a great achievement. Despite this the breadth of coverage makes it more convincing.

Examiner commentary

The views of the two Passages are fully explained and comparisons between them are made. The response also notes the limitations, as well as the strength of both Interpretations. However, despite the cross-referencing between the two Interpretations, there is no real own knowledge used to either

support or challenge the views offered. Critical evaluation, using own knowledge is vital if the higher levels are to be reached and it is absent from this answer, whose focus is solely on explaining the passages in terms of Drake's reputation.

High level response

The two Interpretations offer contrasting views of Drake. Passage A praises Sir Francis Drake, labelling him as a 'hero' and the 'greatest sailor'. It argues that Drake could do no wrong and represented everything that was good about English sixteenth century privateering. However, the interpretation is limited as its focus is almost exclusively on his circumnavigation and does not consider other aspects of his career. On the other hand, Interpretation B scarcely mentions the circumnavigation and focuses on the latter part of his career, which in contrast to Interpretation A, it considers to have been a failure and offers a very negative view of Drake in contrast to the positive view given in A. Interpretation B ignores the positive financial contribution Drake made with the injection of money into the English economy that was very beneficial.

Interpretation A portrays Drake as hero-like figure, suggesting that there are 'few stories that could rival' the adventures of Drake. Cummins expands on this by stating that Drake 'inspired courage among his fellow countrymen'. Cummins does this to suggest that he was pivotal in inspiring England's next generation of privateers. There is evidence to suggest that this is true, as particularly after his circumnavigation of the globe he proved the potential of maritime activity, which gave confidence and encouraged the ambition of other privateers. This would result in the English eventually having the confidence to expand into new markets, such as missions to Roanoke Island in 1584. Interpretation A focuses on the financial impact of Drake's privateering, arguing that Drake 'made a stupendous profit and stating that 'Drake himself became one of the richest men in England'. These statements hold significant weight as Drake's circumnavigation of the globe is reported to have returned 4700% on investment to backers such as the Queen. It is also correct to argue that privateering was a very lucrative business for the privateers themselves, which encouraged others, such as Martin Frobisher to follow. It is therefore not surprising that Drake became one of the wealthiest men in England. Drake's contribution to the economy was, as the Interpretation suggests, outstanding. The annual prize from privateering was £200,000, which allowed the crown to fund many ventures, due to 20% of the plunder being claimed by the crown. The money was used in part to transform the navy, which was vital in repelling the Spanish Armada in 1588. The improvements to the navy would have been impossible without the work of Francis Drake, making the view of A more convincing. However, there are some limitations to a, the main one being that it never entertains the notion that Drake was unsuccessful, ignoring the fact that there were a number of failed expeditions, such as his last where Drake sailed to the West Indies with John Hawkins in 1596 and it ultimately ended in disaster as Drake died of dysentery off the coast of Panama.

Interpretation B is largely negative in its view of Drake and starts by stating that 'Drake's knighthood was not universally approved of'. The argument is supported by Richard Maddox's account which shows that Drake did have opponents. The Interpretation is correct as Drake was involved in a series of controversial situations, such as the Rathlin Massacre, where 600 were massacred despite surrendering. This incident supports the view in B that he was not always a hero. The Interpretation is also correct that Drake did have a number of disastrous expeditions, it mentions the voyage to Panama, where 750 men died. There is other evidence to support the view that Drake failed on a number of occasions, for example in 1568 Drake was attacked by Spanish ships when unprepared and lost all but two of his ships and Drake only just managed to escape with his own life. Interpretation B refers to the attack on Cadiz and there is some justification for seeing it as a failure as the attack did not repel the Spanish but made them more determined to attack England. Throughout her reign Elizabeth I had to deal with attacks by privateers such as Drake on the Spanish which disrupted relations further, further supporting the negative view in the Interpretation. However, the Interpretation is less convincing as it ignores Drake's achievements, ignoring his role in the defeat of the Armada or the pride England gained from the circumnavigation. Drake was crucial as Vice-Admiral in the defeat of the Armada. The Interpretation also ignores the benefits that his seizure of bullion might have brought the economy.

Although both Interpretations have weaknesses as they are both one-sided, with one claiming that 'Drake's knighthood was not universally approved of', whilst the other argues Drake was 'the hero of the hour'. Although Interpretation B contains more facts and dates to support its claim, it ignores the successes and benefits he brought England. A is more convincing as his capture of a Spanish ship containing 25,000 pesos of gold, worth about £7 million in today's currency cannot be ignored and added to that the 4700 per cent return on investment, and the 20 per cent gain the Crown made from plunder meant that the voyages were a success and encouraged further English expansion. Therefore, although B is correct to highlight some of the limitations, his impact was much more positive than the Interpretation suggests.

Examiner commentary

The response explains the contrasting views of the two Interpretations. Knowledge is used to test the views, although in places the links to the actual interpretations could be stronger and more sustained. However, there is some detail, which again in places could be developed. The response does consider

both the strengths and limitations of both Interpretations. The response could have commented on some of the language used and whether that impacts on the validity of the two views. A judgement is reached and there is some justification for why it is given. As a result the answer would just reach the top level.

Y311 - The Origins and Growth of the British Empire 1558–1783

Section B

‘North America was the main cause of imperial rivalry between Britain and the European powers of Spain and France.’ To what extent do you agree with this view of the period 1558-1783?

Medium level response

There were a number of reasons why there was imperial rivalry between Britain and France and Spain in the period from 1558 to 1783, however they were not confined to North America, or as the period progressed to the Americas, but widened to include Asia, particularly India. Factors such as competition for land in North America had been an initial cause of rivalry, but alongside that there were also issues such as privateering and plunder, which helped to bring England and Spain into conflict. The rivalry was also included control of the Caribbean and would later include India and even access to South East Asia. Not all of the conflict was over controlling land, but also control of the seas created rivalry, as it was vital for control of trade. Initially as well there was the issue of mercantilism, which to succeed required the exclusion of other nations, not just France and Spain and encouraged further rivalry and costly naval wars and diplomatic feuds.

Imperial rivalry, particularly between England and Spain, at the start of the period was due to the Spanish seizure of land in the Americas, particularly the South, taking lands such as Peru, Mexico and Chile, as well as the Caribbean. These lands were producing large quantities of silver, which privateers, such as Drake and Hawkins, were determined to seize. The attempted seizure of such ships and the determination of the English to break into the trade with the New World caused conflict and resulted in the Spanish attack on Hawkins' fleet in 1568 at San Juan de Ulua in the Gulf of Mexico and this resulted in hostilities breaking out between the two nations. It was Spanish determination to keep England out of the New World that had caused the conflict. Hawkins had already sailed to West Africa and bought slaves which he had sold to colonists in the New World which had further angered the Spanish.

The profits to be made from the slave trade were also a cause of rivalry. Hawkins voyage in 1562 angered the Spanish. There was a great deal of money to be made from the trade and in 1564 Hawkins had repeated his voyage, financed by Elizabeth, Leicester and Cecil, each of whom made a 60 per cent return on their investment. Therefore the profits that could be made from such a trade encouraged the English to continue their involvement, despite Spain's determination to exclude them from the lucrative trade.

Such developments suggest that far from land being the major concern, at least initially, one of the major concerns was to control the seas in order to control trade. This was particularly true given the belief in mercantilism, whereby the aim was to export more goods than were being imported. This required the acquisition of prized commodities, such as spices, sugar, coffee and tea and the exclusion of other states from the trade. This meant that Britain, France and Spain all looked to build up the power of their navies and to defend the trade routes between the mother country and the area of trade from rival nations. Therefore, the system depended upon limiting the free flow of goods and further encouraged England and the other powers to engage in naval wars as they strove to increase their profits, with Britain and France engaged in trade rivalry for much of the eighteenth century.

Rivalry was not confined to North America, but also included the Caribbean and Asia. Control of the plantation economies of the Caribbean was a major cause of conflict, initially between England and Spain, but later France as the sugar and tobacco plantations offered large profits. Control of these was more important than North America as it was the most profitable part of the old empire and explains why Britain spent enormous sums of money defending the West Indies from both the French and Spanish in the eighteenth century. It also required the transportation of slaves from West Africa to man the plantations and therefore encouraged participation in the slave trade and development of links with the area around Benin.

However, in terms of trade there was also rivalry with Spain over access to the spice areas of the Far East which had come under their control following Spain's acquisition of Portuguese colonies in the late sixteenth century. Similarly, the creation of the East India Company in 1600 and the establishment of trading areas, such as Surat, Madras, Bombay and Calcutta, to which British goods, such as woollen goods and iron were exported eventually brought the British into conflict with the French, who had also established trading posts in the seventeenth century and this would eventually cause conflict that culminated in the Battle of Plessey, where the Nawab of Bengal and his French allies were defeated. Not only did it lead to the East India Company gaining important trade agreements, but it pushed the French out of India.

However, it would be wrong to ignore the role of North America in the rivalry. From the sixteenth century onwards there was competition to establish colonies in North America with both England and France involved in failures in the sixteenth century, but with greater success in the seventeenth. This did lead to rivalry between the nations as they and the settlers became involved in conflicts not only with the natives but each other. Competition for land brought French and British settlers into conflict, there were clashes over the border with Canada (New France) and Louisiana, at the mouth of the Mississippi River, but most notably after the British established the Ohio Company and the French built a series of forts between Lake Erie and the Allegheny River in the mid-1750s. Conflict was further encouraged as the areas were rich in resources and it was not surprising that it led to conflict as by 1760 one third of British imports and exports crossed the Atlantic and was continuing to grow. Such resources, with the mercantilist system generated large amounts of money for the monarchs and encouraged further attempts at expansion to control land, trade routes or simply protect existing colonies. This became even more evident in the eighteenth century when numerous wars between England and France, but also Spain were fought in North America, with the War of the League of Augsburg, the War of the Spanish Succession, the War of Austrian Succession and the Seven Years' War. However, in most instances it was not imperial rivalry that started the wars, but conflict in Europe, which then spread to North America and other parts of the globe, such as India. Although, therefore imperial rivalry in North America might be seen as a cause of conflict they were more about the balance of power in Europe and even the colonists saw most of the conflicts as such given the labels they gave them – King William's War, Queen Anne's War and King George's War. But despite this, the colonists were still determined to defeat the French. Moreover, imperial rivalry in North America was less important as on most occasions Britain did not send help to the colonists. It would therefore be more accurate to conclude that North America was more the theatre in which the rivalries were played out, rather than the cause.

North America was therefore not the main cause of imperial rivalry, but simply the region in the world where tensions, initially between England and Spain, but later England and France were played out. The causes of those tensions were largely economic be it for access to the markets of the New World in the sixteenth century to the plantations and wealth from the considerable trade that the area offered. However, as the period progressed India was also becoming just as important, if not more so for Britain and considerable money and energy went into driving the French from there.

Examiner commentary

The response is aware of a number of reasons why imperial rivalry developed between Britain, Spain and France. The answer covers the whole period and provides supporting details from across both the time span but also a range of areas. The role of the factors is explained and there is some argument and analysis, particularly at the end as to the role of North America in Imperial rivalry. However, the answer is little more than a list of reasons and there is no clear evidence of synthesis or comparison of factors to take the response into the higher levels.

High level response

The causes of imperial rivalry between Britain, France and Spain in the period from 1558 to 1783 were not simply due to North America, which was often just the place for clashes, instead it was concern over trade and power within Europe. Issues such as protecting areas from rival trading nations, not just in North America but also India and other parts of Asia were crucial in this rivalry. However, the wealth and goods this brought to the major powers was important as it allowed the countries to try and dominate Europe and assert their influence nearer home. North America therefore, although the site of much rivalry and even warfare throughout much of the period, was not the main cause of imperial rivalry.

Although initially it does appear that North America was the main cause of rivalry, at least from the establishment by England of the colony in Virginia in 1603, as the three nations all competed for the ownership and control of new lands in North America. The English settlers, later British, were drawn into conflict with settlers from France, who established bases in Louisiana and at the mouth of the Mississippi and also in New France (Canada), all of which bordered British settlements. Similarly the English were drawn into disputes with the Spanish in areas such as Florida. Warfare and rivalry was therefore a fact of colonial life throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as the nations sought to secure a foothold in the region. This rivalry was also seen in the numerous wars that were fought on American soil throughout the period between the three nations. From the end of the seventeenth century, with the War of the League of Augsburg 1689-1697 through to the Seven Years War 1756-63 colonists were involved in four conflicts in America, which would eventually leave Britain as the dominant power. North America was important in the development of imperial rivalry because of its trading importance and the resources that it provided for the European powers. It was trade and the availability of raw materials that had drawn the French into North America, with the availability of commodities such as furs and it was trade and the associated wealth that attracted Spain and England. This trade, and the desire to exclude the other nations from it, not only generated wealth for European monarchs, but also created rivalries as they fought to exclude the other nations. Moreover, North America was also important strategically in protecting and opening up other trade routes, initially in the search for a north-west passage, but also in providing security for other colonies that had been acquired, particularly in Central America and the Caribbean.

However, such a view fails to place the rivalry in North America in a wider context. The rivalries in North America were also seen in Asia, particularly in India, where the British and French struggled for influence particularly in the eighteenth century, until Clive defeated the Nawab of Bengal and his French allies at Plassey and drove the French out. Yet this military conflict, and rivalry in the Far East with the Spanish who had acquired the former Portuguese colonies after its Union with Spain in the sixteenth century were more about trade and wealth as had also been the case in North America. It was Trading Companies that were largely the cause of the rivalry between the powers, with the East India Company looking to increase its influence and wealth in India, whilst it was the formation of the Ohio Company in North America that helped bring rivalry with France to a climax at the same time.

Trade and economic wealth was the main cause of rivalry. At the start of the period it had been English desire for access to the Spanish New World in south and Central America that had led to attacks by privateers such as Hawkins and Drake and brought England and Spain into conflict following the incident at San Juan de Ulua in 1568. English realization of the profits that could be made from the slave trade had become clear following Hawkins' voyage to Africa in 1564 and subsequent sale to Spanish settlers that provoked conflict. The desire to keep other powers out of lucrative trades became even more apparent in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as mercantilist principles developed, which could be maintained only by enforcing strict limitations on the free flow of goods, which therefore necessitated using naval power to defend the trade routes between the mother country and its colonies from its rivals, whether it was in North America, the Caribbean or Asia. Concern over trade and wealth as a cause of the rivalry is even more apparent where the Caribbean is concerned. Control and protection of the lucrative plantation colonies in the Caribbean was even more important, particularly as it provided Britain with a far greater source of wealth than North America. However, as areas of the Caribbean had initially been taken by the Spanish and French, British involvement inevitably led to rivalry and conflict in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. This was also seen in South East Asia as Britain came into conflict with Spain over access to the very lucrative spice trade and in Africa with access to the developing West African slave trade. It was therefore trade and the wealth that it generated throughout the period that was the main cause of imperial rivalry. It was the desire to protect both markets, where home produced goods, such as iron could be sold, as well as acquiring luxury items such as sugar, tobacco and spices that caused the rivalry which was seen not just in North America, but other parts of the world and also on the seas in order to control the trade routes.

Even the wars fought in North America were not evidence that it was the main cause of imperial rivalry. Although four wars in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were fought in North America between the imperial powers, the first three chronologically – the War of the League of Augsburg, the War of Spanish Succession and the War of Austrian Succession – all began in Europe and then spread across the Atlantic. These wars, along with the Seven Years War were more about the balance of power in Europe, of which imperial possessions played a part. Even the Seven Years War, which began in North America, was also fought in India, suggesting that warfare, the clearest sign of rivalry was not due to North America alone.

Moreover, as the colonists were often left to the fight conflicts alone and viewed them as foreign wars, hence their names of King William's War, Queen Anne's War and King George's War. It would suggest that imperial rivalry was due more to conflict and struggles over Europe's balance of power in which imperial rivalry in America was just a side-show.

North America was the site of much rivalry between the powers, but it was no more the main cause than India or the Far East. Conflicts that were fought in North America were part of a wider struggle for influence in Europe and to develop and protect the trade that provided the powers with wealth. It was access to wealth that was the most important cause of rivalry throughout the period, from attacks by English privateers to trading companies securing exclusive rights.

Examiner commentary

The response is focused on the question throughout. There is a clear line of argument pursued and this is reflected in the final judgement, which is based on the main body of the essay. The argument is well supported with examples drawn from across the whole period and a range of geographical areas. Reasons for rivalry are explored and the relative importance of the factors is evaluated. The argument for the continuity of trade and the associated wealth is made and the awareness of continuity helps to take the response to the higher levels as it allows the answer to display synthesis as comparisons across the period and between regions are made. The essay would be placed in the lower end of the higher levels.

Y312 - Popular Culture and the Witchcraze of the 16th and 17th Centuries

Section A

Evaluate the interpretations in both of the two passages and explain which you think is more convincing as an explanation of the reasons for the persecutions in Salem.

Medium level response

The two interpretations by Thurston (A) and Latner (B) offer different reasons for the persecutions in Salem in the 1690s. Thurston suggests that long term developments were the main reason for the persecutions. He mentions issues such as the political situation and the problems caused by the arrival of a new governor and the tensions caused by Indian raids. Latner's view is that the persecutions were the result of social and economic tensions within Salem Village. He says that there was a deep rift within the community between those who supported the ministry of Parris and those who opposed him and that this led to the persecutions.

Interpretation A by Thurston puts forward the view that it was a unique set of political events that allowed the trials to develop on the scale that they did. The Passage notes that such trials were unusual in New England. According to this account there were a number of reasons why the trials occurred. He describes the tensions that were building up in the colony because of the new charter, which according to this account, had caused a constitutional crisis, wars and epidemics. As a result, many people were worried by the developments and, as A suggests, thought that the situation was perilous and this may explain their reaction. It is true that there were attacks from Native Americans and this is likely to have caused panic, whilst the Anglo-French war did little to calm fears. It appears, according to Thurston, that attacks from the Native Americans had been witnessed by a number of girls who had seen their families slaughtered and that this created hysteria and that given the epidemics and diseases that were prevalent their tales were willingly listened to. This certainly appears to be the case as evidence from children as young as four was taken down, whereas, as the Source says, such evidence would not normally have been listened to in calmer times. This all suggests that the trials were the result of a series of events that had created hysteria and fear in Salem and for which the inhabitants wanted some answers and believed they had found them in witchcraft.

Interpretation B offers a different explanation for the persecutions in Salem. Latner explains the number of persecutions by examining the tensions within Salem Village itself and not the long-term problems that the settlement faced. He sees the reason for the persecutions as being part of the struggle between those who supported the minister, Samuel Parris, and those who opposed him. The Interpretation argues that religious tensions and factional strains within the village were the main factor behind the persecutions. Latner argues that the religious tensions contributed to the 'initial afflictions in Parris' own household and to the conclusion they were caused by agents of the Devil'. The concern then spread that this was not confined to his household and led to the widespread persecutions. According to this interpretation it was the tensions within Salem Village, particularly social tensions that caused the witchcraze, but this view ignores the fact that the trials went beyond the village and included other towns in the province of Massachusetts Bay. However, it is true that the first accusations of witchcraft did come from Parris' daughter and niece so that suggests at least some of Interpretation B is true.

Both Interpretations A and B have some elements that can be supported by my own knowledge. As I have said there were long term tensions and concerns in the colony and they had been growing with the arrival of a new governor with a new charter. There were also short term problems within Salem Village over the appointment of the new minister, Parris. It might therefore be suggested that it was the coming together of these two sets of problems that best explains why there was large scale persecution at the end of the seventeenth century as both Interpretations have some points that can be supported. However, both Interpretations also have points that are missing as A does not look at the short term causes, whilst B ignores the long term tensions in the colony that provided the background to this incredible event.

Examiner commentary

The answer is focused on the issue of the reasons for the persecutions. Some knowledge is applied to the two Interpretations to test the validity of the view they offer, but the knowledge is quite limited, but there is some evaluation of the two views. However, much of the answer focuses on explaining the views of the two passages. Although this is done clearly and the response shows a good understanding of the two passages this is not enough to take the response to the highest levels, more precise own knowledge is required to test the views offered. The answer attempts to reach a judgement, which again shows some validity and attempts to synthesise the two views.

High level response

The two passages offer differing interpretations as to the causes of the Salem Witchcraze of 1692. Interpretation A suggests that it was the result of long term political problems, whilst Interpretation B suggests that the causes were more short term and due to the social and economic situation in Salem village. However Passage B also suggests that there were long term religious tensions and turmoil within the Church that played a role in events in the village, but did not contribute to events in other areas, which are not explained in Passage B. Passage A, on the other hand does offer an explanation for the persecutions in Massachusetts, which is not offered by Passage B, which focuses solely on the immediate outbreak in Salem Village.

Interpretation A stresses the importance of the challenges facing the settlers in New England and the particular pressures that they were under given the wars and epidemics they faced. According to Interpretation A it was these developments, along with the political situation caused by the arrival of both a new governor and a new charter that created the tension that led to a sympathetic response to the girls' claims. There is certainly some truth in the view that the settlers were under pressure; the Interpretation specifically mentions attacks from Native Indians, but there were also challenges from the French with the Second Indian War or King William's War. The Interpretation also suggests that the settlers were concerned by their perilous situation and that would certainly appear to be true as Indians did suddenly appear, attack villages and burn houses or as the Interpretation suggests massacre inhabitants, which may well have added to the tensions and made stories of witchcraft credible and further supporting the events that had occurred in Maine. The Native American tribes were also used by both the French and English to terrorise their opponents, with the English making a deal with the Iroquois Indians. Therefore, Interpretation A is probably correct to suggest that there was a sense of panic among the settlers who feared for their own lives. Certainly the Interpretation's view that the inhabitants were willing to listen to stories from very young children is true as some as young as four were listened to, which would not have happened if the situation had been less fraught. Therefore Interpretation A is useful in explaining the long term causes and the context in which the accusations of witchcraft took place, but it is less convincing in explaining the trigger for the events.

In explaining the trigger for the events, Interpretation B is much stronger than Interpretation A. Interpretation B focuses on the short term causes of the witchcraze and suggests that it was due to social and economic causes. It is certainly true that there were long standing tensions between the Puritans and Church of England in Salem and this was one reason that delayed Parris' acceptance of the job as minister. There were also quarrels over property lines, grazing rights and church privileges and these were issues that Parris was unable to resolve. Moreover, there was also economic rivalry between Salem Town, which was more prosperous than the village and these two issues may explain the outbreak of the witchcraze. The importance of Parris in the outbreak of the craze is further supported by the fact that the first accusations came from Parris' daughter and niece, Abigail Williams. However, although this may explain why there were accusations in Salem Village, the Interpretation does not explain why the trials went beyond the settlement and took in several towns in Massachusetts Bay. The divisions within Salem Village may explain why there were accusations within the village and this encouraged others to look elsewhere for further evidence as the colony was fearful given the wider context mentioned in Interpretation A.

The two Interpretations, although they offer different explanations for the persecutions are both accurate in explaining the witchcraze outbreak. Interpretation A provides an accurate explanation of the context within which it was easy for the inhabitants to feel threatened and be willing to believe the stories, whilst Interpretation B gives a valid explanation for the development of events in Salem Village, even if it does not explain events outside the neighbourhood.

Examiner commentary

This is well focused on the question and is consistently analytical. Own knowledge is used to both support and challenge the interpretations. The knowledge is used to evaluate the strengths and limitations of the Interpretations and is clearly linked to the Passages. The response is able to draw the views offered in the two Passages together to provide a supported judgement about the reasons for the witchcraze and show how, although the two interpretations differ, they also offer a long and short term explanation for the events.

Y312 - Popular Culture and the Witchcraze of the 16th and 17th Centuries

Section B

'Throughout the period the main reason for the persecution of women was their economic position.' How far do you agree with this view?

Medium level response

Although the economic position of women made them more likely to be scapegoated and put them in situations where they were more at risk of being accused, it was not the main reason for their persecution across the period. This is demonstrated by the fact that there were some areas where more men were accused than women and the rate of persecution varied across the period and in different places, but in almost all places in Europe throughout the period the economic position of women remained the same. Instead, attitudes towards women and stereotypes of witchcraft were a more important reason, because they made people more suspicious of women as witches and meant that women who did not fit conventional roles were likely to be accused.

Women's economic position could contribute to their prosecution because they were in roles which made them susceptible and were often more vulnerable in society. Women's roles such as cooks and midwives put them in situations where if things went wrong, they could be blamed, and also gave them more means to practise magic. Cases such as Elizabeth Matlock (prosecuted for witchcraft in Cambridgeshire in 1566), Appoline Behr (prosecuted in 1580 and from Lorraine), or Gilly Duncan (arrested in East Lothian in 1650) who were untrained and unlicensed healers, demonstrate that there was continuity across different places and times in terms of women in these occupations being particularly vulnerable to accusation. In addition, some women acted as healers and even actively cultivated a reputation for witchcraft in order to earn money, for example in Lancashire in 1612, which clearly made them vulnerable to persecution if anything went wrong. Women were often more likely to be poor or on the margins of society, particularly if they didn't have a husband, and this meant that it was seen that they were more likely to need to make a pact with the Devil in order to get by. For example, those initially accused of witchcraft in Salem in 1692 were a slave, beggar and old woman, all on the edges of society. It was often older women who were accused, demonstrating the factor of vulnerability in increasing accusations. The stereotype of a witch as standing over a cauldron or sacrificing babies was more easily applied to women, explaining the trend in female prosecutions. However, it was not in itself sufficient because women's roles remained the same throughout the period whereas the rate of persecution fluctuated across time and between different regions.

The main explanation for this fluctuation in persecution was the spread of the 'cumulative' stereotype of witchcraft, which included women as the main group who would make a pact with the Devil, and therefore this was a more important reason than their economic position. With foundations in the Bible (particularly the story of Adam and Eve) and in classical teachings, women were seen as the weaker less rational sex, more carnal, and more susceptible to diabolical temptation. This meant that they were perceived as more likely to be witches. This view of women was spread by demonological texts such as the *Malleus Maleficarum* (1484) but also through images and woodcuts which were more accessible to illiterate peasants such as those by Hans Baldung Grien. The influence of demonological literature can be seen by the fact that during the period 1520-1560 where there was a lull in witchcraft prosecution, there was also a lull in demonological literature. Women were seen as central to the threatening diabolical conspiracy which was overwhelming Europe. The importance of these ideas is demonstrated by the fact that the spread of witchcraft prosecution mirrored the extent of infiltration of the ideas – in Eastern Europe, for example, where ideas spread later, witchcraft prosecutions came later, and in England, where the idea of the Sabbath in particular never gained full acceptance, witchcraft accusations were lower. Similarly, in Normandy, 75% of those tried for witchcraft were actually men, and this was due to a different stereotype of witchcraft which painted witches as usually male shepherds.

These ideas set the backdrop of suspicion between neighbours (women were more likely to accuse other women) but also meant that judges and magistrates were more likely to believe accusations against women and likely to lead women to implicate other women in their confessions. Therefore, the intellectual backdrop was more important than economic position in explaining why women were disproportionately persecuted.

In conclusion, although their economic position made them vulnerable to accusations and helped determine which precise women were targeted, it is not in itself sufficient to explain the high levels of persecution. Instead, the spread of intellectual ideas, based in the general misogyny of the time, which painted the witch as stereotypically women, was more important. This is demonstrated by the uneven level of persecution which broadly correlates to the spread of the ideas of witchcraft.

Examiner commentary

There is some synthesis across the period. However, the response discusses only a few reasons why women were persecuted for witchcraft and with little comparison or synthesis this would prevent the answer from reaching the higher levels. There is some explanation as to why women were persecuted and why economic factors were not the main reason. The answer would benefit from more regional examples so that more comparisons could be made and this would take the answer into the top grade band.

High level response

Throughout the period it was the persecution of women that dominated witchcraft accusations and trials. Despite the fact witches could be either men or women it was in only seventeenth century Iceland that over 90% of the accused were men or similarly in Russia where it reached nearly 70%, but in most regions, be it the Holy Roman Empire, which saw the greatest number of accusations, or the bishopric of Basel or Essex, it was women who dominated the accusations. There were a number of reasons for this and the economic position of women was certainly one of the most important reasons. However, it is also important to consider the position of women in society and the attitude of society towards women in this period.

The economic position of women did make them more vulnerable to accusations of witchcraft. Throughout the period women were involved in numerous jobs in which people could die, be it as a cook or midwife. As midwives they were frequently blamed for the death of children by grieving parents, with Walpurga Hausmannin of Dillingen in Germany found guilty of killing some 40 babies over a twelve year period, whilst similarly in Augsburg a lying-in-maids were frequently accused of killing children. Preparation of food also led easily to accusations of witchcraft when people became ill, as was seen in Baden Baden in Germany where half of those accused of witchcraft were involved in the preparation of food, either as bakers, butchers or innkeepers. The very nature of women's employment throughout the period and their dominant role in the home meant that they could easily be blamed for 'inexplicable' domestic catastrophes. The same was true of women's roles as healers, many women had developed the reputation as 'wise' or 'cunning folk' and had reputations for healing disease, but when disease struck or people died unexpectedly, they could be blamed. Elizabeth Matlock was prosecuted for witchcraft in Cambridgeshire in 1566 similarly, Appoline Behr from Lorraine in France was prosecuted in 1580 and Gilly Duncan, who was arrested in East Lothian in 1650 were untrained and unlicensed healers, demonstrate that this was a continuous problem throughout the period and across Europe. In addition, some women acted as healers and even actively cultivated a reputation for witchcraft in order to earn money, for example in Lancashire in 1612, which clearly made them vulnerable to persecution if anything went wrong.

At the same time, many of those women accused of witchcraft were poor and struggled to survive, therefore resorted to begging which put pressure on local communities, particularly during times of economic depression or crisis. Many of those prosecuted were elderly, often over 50, which may have meant that they were widowed and therefore less able to look after themselves and again resorted to begging, whilst high mortality rates and barren marriages also meant that a third of elderly widows had no surviving family to care for them. Competition between these women for what could be earned from begging led to quarrels and accusations. Poverty and accusations of witchcraft was not just a problem in Europe, but was also seen in the witch trials in Salem at the end of the seventeenth century, where those initially accused were a slave, beggar and an old woman. This problem was further increased by the number of widows or unmarried women resulting from warfare, which was an issue throughout the period with the Habsburg Valois Wars, Wars of Religion and the Thirty Years War, and because of plagues which again were a constant issue throughout the period. In the past this problem would, on many occasions have been managed nunneries, which took in many single women, but were in decline or in areas impacted by the Protestant reformation had been closed. These developments meant that as these women lived on their own they were more vulnerable to persecution and less able to defend themselves from accusations.

However, it was not just that they were poor that was a problem. They often lived on the margins of society and with their begging were also seen as a threat to order and the hierarchy. Many of those accused, be it in England, the Holy Roman Empire or France were seen as behaving in way that was outside accepted social norms, for example they did not attend church, were heard cursing or there were rumours of immoral behaviour. These women were seen as the disturbers of the social order, either unwilling or unable to co-operate with others. In some instances it was the actual behaviour of the women themselves that brought on the accusations with quarrelsome and selfish behaviour, which when challenged led to an angry reaction and caused others to see them as possible agents of the Devil.

Attitudes towards women throughout the period have also been seen as a reason for their persecution. Although the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were very misogynistic society in their outlook, with women viewed as more likely to sin and have more carnal desires, this interpretation for their persecution seems less valid than their economic position. In many instances it was women themselves who made the accusations and acted as witnesses in trials. This suggests that although 80 per cent of those on trial for witchcraft in Germany, France, Switzerland and Scotland were women, and in England and Russia it was nearer 95 per cent, judges were responding to pressure from below, pressure which came from women, not men.

More important than their economic position was stereotype of witchcraft, which suggested that women were more likely to make a pact with the devil than men. This development was encouraged by a number of treatises from across the period, such that a female witch stereotype had been established by 1500. Such accounts saw women as the weaker sex and more likely to succumb to temptation, building on the picture of Eve in the Bible, whilst the *Malleus Maleficarum*, written by Kramer argued that 'When a woman thinks alone she think evil thoughts' and this image was carried forward in many visual representations, such as Albrecht Durer's engraving 'Witch Riding Backwards on a Goat' and also in

the works of his apprentice, Hans Baldung Grien, who portrayed women as the embodiment of female sexual power. However, although these images may have influenced the elite and influenced judges, it still must be remembered that the majority of witches were brought to trial not by accusations from members of the elite, but by their neighbours who were often women. Yet, the influence of such work should not be ignored as the decline in persecutions in the period 1520-60 corresponds to a decline in such work, suggesting that it did play a role in the level of persecutions.

The economic status of women played a crucial role in their persecution throughout the period, however this was at least in part because it was linked closely to their social status and made them more vulnerable to accusations in a society that was struggling with changes that it often did not understand. Not only did their economic position, but also their social meant that they were seen as less valuable to society and therefore provided the ideal scapegoat as they were too weak to fight back. It was therefore a combination of reasons that resulted in the large number of women who were prosecuted, with their social and economic position making them vulnerable to the stereotype that had emerged by 1500.

Examiner commentary

The answer considers a range of reasons and does attempt to weigh up their relative importance and sees links between them. A range of regional examples are used so that the answer is not based solely on generalisations. Other factors could be discussed and ideas developed, but in the time allowed responses cannot be expected to cover all issues and develop all points. There is evidence of synthesis and awareness of both continuity and change across the period. The answer would reach the highest level, although the conclusion could be stronger.

Y314 – The Challenge of German Nationalism 1789-1919

Section A

Evaluate the interpretations in both of the two passages and explain which you think is a more convincing explanation of the role of nationalism in the Unification of Germany.

Medium level response

The two interpretations offer very different views about the role of nationalism in the Unification of Germany. Passage A, written by A.J.P. Taylor puts forward the view nationalist ideals had little role to play in the Unification. However, Passage B, written by G. Craig argues that it was influenced by popular support.

Interpretation A argues that militarism was more important than nationalist ideals in the unification process, it goes on to explain that nationalist feeling was actually anti-Prussian. Taylor puts forward the view that the victories in the two major wars of unification in 1866 and 1870 had little to do with nationalism and were due more to militarism and that Bismarck himself was not a nationalist. There is certainly some truth in this view as Bismarck was more concerned with Prussia and its expansion, rather than nationalism. When Germany was united in 1871 Bismarck did much to protect the position of Prussia in the German constitution and in the nature of the empire that was created, which was very similar to that of the North German Confederation. Although the passage initially appears to suggest that Bismarck was a nationalist with the quote that he was 'decked out as national enthusiast', it goes on to argue that this was not the case. The passage goes further and even argues that nationalism was repugnant to the Prussian Officer class. According to Taylor the wars were simply wars of conquest and were therefore similar in nature to those of Napoleon earlier in the century. It also argues that even where there was national feeling in 1866, during the war against Austria it was aligned against Prussia. Prussia was Protestant, whilst South Germany was Catholic and therefore the two regions were divided both religiously and culturally. Yet, there was also much evidence of growing cultural nationalism in Germany from after the Napoleonic Wars so perhaps the idea of growing nationalism should not be ignored.

Interpretation B, in contrast, suggests that the 'particularism and distrust of Prussia' were swept aside, instead it puts forward the view that there were demonstrations of support for the national cause. According to Craig, much of the nationalism was generated by anti-French feeling, which was stirred up by the fear that there was going to be a French attack. It also suggests that the popular clamour from the people could not be ignored by Bismarck, however it also states that his policy had been annexation. As a result, Craig argues, the Empire created in 1871 was due to the German people. He suggests that the rapid implementation of the treaty obligations by the South German people are clear evidence of their support for unification and that this desire for unification continued. The south German states distrusted Napoleon as they believed that he had designs on parts of their territory as a reward for remaining neutral during the Prussian war with Austria in 1866. In 1866 the French ambassador had given detailed plans to Bismarck for France to acquire part of the Rhineland, but instead he had suggested that they should look for compensation in the French speaking areas of Belgium and Luxemburg. This encouraged Napoleon III and damaged relations between France and Prussia, whilst it also helped to create nationalist feeling in German states, which might speed up unification. The decline in relations between France and Prussia increased because of the Hohenzollern candidature and the Ems telegram. The Ems telegram appeared to threaten French honour, which pushed France to war. It was the war that brought the South German states onto Prussia's side. Bismarck was able to call on the states to support Prussia as had been agreed by their military alliances of 1866, which they agreed to do. This appears to support the Interpretation, but such a view ignores the differences between the north and southern states and the distrust between them, which is hinted at in Passage A. However, victory in the war created a sense of national feeling and encouraged a permanent union between the north and south states.

Examiner commentary

There is a clear understanding of the different views offered by the two Interpretations and these are well explained and developed, using material from the two Interpretations. There is also some limited evaluation, particularly of Interpretation A, where own knowledge is directly applied and linked to the Interpretation to judge the validity of the view offered. However, for much of the response the knowledge that is present is largely deployed rather than being used to evaluate the views of the two Interpretations about the role of nationalism. Much of that knowledge is relevant, but the evaluation is only implied and the examiner would have to make the link between the knowledge and the Interpretation. With clearer links the answer would reach a higher level.

High level response

The two Interpretations offer contrasting views about the role of nationalism in the Unification of Germany. Interpretation A puts forward the view that nationalist ideals and nationalism had little to do with Unification even in the victories of 1866 and 1870, whereas Interpretation B argues that Unification was influenced by popular support, even in the south of Germany. Interpretation A argues that Unification was nothing more than militarism and conquest, whilst Interpretation B argues that there were high levels of support for unification among the south German people and that the South German states responded by rapidly invoking its treaty obligations. Moreover, B concludes by arguing that the Empire would not have come into being had it not been for 'the persistent and growing popular desire for unification.'

Interpretation A rather than arguing that nationalist feeling was important in unification, suggests that what nationalist feeling there actually was in Germany was anti-Prussian. There certainly appears some validity to Taylor's claim as many states were concerned that if unification took place Germany would be dominated by Prussia and were fearful of that. Moreover, there was anti-Prussian feeling among some of the South German states as they were culturally and religiously divided from Prussia, with the southern states being Catholic and Prussia being German. Therefore, even though they turned to Prussia for support during the Luxemburg crisis and soon invoked their military obligations, as mentioned in Interpretation B, it was more the result of fear than national feeling, supporting the view of Interpretation A that nationalism played little part. Interpretation A also suggest that Bismarck, although he was 'decked out as a national enthusiast' was not. This is evident throughout his career, if he wanted any expansion and enlargement it was of Prussian power and this became evident in the constitution that was drawn up in 1871 which gave Prussia the dominant voice and was modelled on the North German Confederation that had been dominated by Prussia. However, although it may be correct to suggest that national feeling played little role, the Interpretation is wrong to completely dismiss the idea of nationalism as there had been evidence of a growing nationalist feeling in the German states, with the emergence of organisations such as the National Society and was seen in some of the cultural festivals and in the growth of literature and patriotic songs, such as Deutschland uber alles.

Interpretation B emphasises the role of nationalism in the unification process. It admits, as stresses that there had been distrust of Prussia in the past, but argues that this was now swept aside on 'the flood of patriotic exaltation'. There were certainly concerns among the South German states about French intentions after 1866, when Bismarck had persuaded them to remain neutral and encouraged them to hope for territorial reward. The Interpretation correctly acknowledges that the southern states had entered into military treaties after 1866, however whether they put them into action in 1870 because of national feeling is a matter of debate. It could even be suggested that such was the anti-Prussian feeling in the southern states, which A mentions, that Bismarck was aware that war was the only way that they would be brought under Prussian dominance and united, therefore Bismarck was able to exploit not popular nationalism, as B suggests, but fear of annexation among the south, who threw their lot in with Prussia, rather than France. Therefore, although B argues that 'the German Empire was the creation of the German people' evidence suggests that Bismarck helped to create and exploit a situation in which animosity to Prussia and fear of its domination would be put aside.

Interpretation A is correct to argue that there was a strong anti-Prussian feeling in the south and although it exaggerates the idea that it was conquest for the sake of conquest, it offers a more convincing view about nationalism, both of the southern states, but also in Prussia and of Bismarck. However, B is correct to stress that anti-Prussian feeling was put to one-side, but it was not, as B argues due to nationalism but rather self-preservation. It was a blind hatred of France that brought the north and south together, not nationalism.

Examiner commentary

The response is consistently focused on the two interpretations. It shows a clear understanding of the views offered by the two interpretations about the role of nationalism in German Unification. The views are thoroughly explained and then relevant, detailed and accurate, own knowledge is applied to both interpretations in order to assess both their strengths and limitations about the role of nationalism. The knowledge is directly and clearly linked to the interpretations and the evaluative words help to make the argument being pursued clear. It is particularly impressive that the evaluation is balanced, with the response seeing both the strength and limitation of both interpretations, rather than seeing one as correct and the other as invalid. This is reflected in the judgment which synthesizes the two to reach a conclusion, which has been supported in the main body of the answer.

Y314 – The Challenge of German Nationalism 1789-1919

Section B

'Bismarck's appointment as minister president of Prussia in 1862 was the most important turning point in the course of German nationalism.' How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1789 to 1919?

Medium level response

Bismarck's appointment as minister president of Prussia in 1862 was an important turning point in the course of German nationalism as he had a fundamental impact on events until his removal from power by Wilhelm II in 1890. However, the removal of Bismarck was also important as it resulted in Wilhelm dominating German policy and embarking on an aggressive form of nationalism that took Germany to war in 1914 with calamitous results. It might also be argued that events before Bismarck came to power, such as the French Revolution and Napoleonic Wars had a considerable impact on the course of German nationalism as they helped to create a sense of Germany and helped in the growth of cultural nationalism. On the other hand, it could be argued that the creation of the Zollverein was crucial as it allowed Prussia's economic strength to grow which would enable it to defeat Austria and exclude it from the development of Germany.

Bismarck's appointment in 1862 was a crucial turning point in the course of German nationalism for a number of reasons. Not only did Bismarck solve the Prussian constitutional crisis of 1860-2 by ignoring parliament but he created an efficient army through his military reforms which by 1870-1 had brought about the Unification of Germany through driving out Austria in the Seven Weeks War of 1866 and then uniting the southern states with the North German Confederation to defeat France in 1870-1. Bismarck's appointment was important as his diplomatic skills ensured that he isolated both Austria and France so that when war did break out Prussia was not faced by a range of opponents. Through his meeting with Napoleon at Biarritz he isolated Austria and then through the lenience of the Treaty of Prague, after the defeat of Austria, he ensured that they would not support France. It could also be argued that it was Bismarck therefore who ensured that Austria was excluded from the new state and that it was a Kleindeutsch, as opposed to a Grossdeutsch that emerged. His appointment also ensured that the Germany that emerged was dominated by Prussia as he was a Prussian patriot rather than a German nationalist and manipulated the growing nationalist feeling within Germany in the interests of Prussia. When the new Reich government was established Bismarck ensured that Prussia had the power to veto legislative proposals and that the Emperor was always the King of Prussia and the office of Chancellor was combined with the Minister-Presidency of Prussia. It is therefore valid to argue that Bismarck's appointment determined the course of German nationalism and the nature of the German state that ultimately emerged in 1871 as without his diplomacy and actions in the wars of the 1860s a German state may not have emerged.

Although Bismarck played a crucial role in the emergence of the German state, the course of German nationalism was also influenced by Kaiser Wilhelm II. It was Wilhelm who set Germany on a new course and brought in a new, more aggressive form of popular nationalism. It was this nationalism that ended the more peaceful nationalism that Bismarck had ushered in after the victory in 1870. The Kaiser wanted Germany to assert itself and gain 'its place in the sun', by acquiring colonies and developing a navy. His 'Weltpolitik' policy brought Germany into conflict with other powers, most notably Britain, France and Russia, ending French isolation. The Kaiser encouraged the development of nationalist pressure groups such as the Navy League and the Pan-German League, which gave further support to his expansionist policy and would eventually lead to Germany going to war in 1914 in order to dominate middle Europe. It can therefore be argued that it was Wilhelm's accession and support for a more aggressive nationalist policy that was the most important event in determining the course of German nationalism as it united the country behind the idea of war and expansion.

In the earlier period it was the French and Napoleonic wars that were an important turning point in the development of German nationalism. French rule alienated many Germans, particularly given the suffering of heavy taxes and French controls.

However, for some Germans, French rule had a positive impact and provided a model to be copied, whilst some liberals approved of the reforms the French introduced and wanted to emulate and continue them after the French defeat. Meanwhile, some have argued that the 1813 War of Liberation against the French was a turning point as it was the first time the German people had come together and was seen by some Prussians as the beginning of a struggle of the German people against a foreign tyrant. Others have argued that the period was a turning point because it resulted in the development of cultural nationalism with the work of philosophers such as Herder, Fichte and Hegel gaining a popular following among the educated middle class, which would lead to the 1848 revolutions.

However, some have argued that it the creation of the Zollverein in the 1830s that was the most important turning point as not only did it encompass some twenty five states by 1836 but it led to a unification of currency and system of weights and measures. Just as importantly, it excluded Austria and allowed Prussia to emerge as the dominant economic power, which later could be translated into military power. This development was important as it ensured that Prussia would be the leading economic state, which as Bismarck later pointed out in his famous 1862 speech would be crucial. It also ensured that Austria would be excluded from any future development of Germany.

It could also be argued that the Treaty of Versailles was the most important event in the course of German nationalism. Outrage at the terms imposed on Germany in 1919 united Germans in a way no other event in the nineteenth century had been able to do. It brought people together as they were opposed to the ending of Germany's great power status with its loss of military and economic power and united people behind the call for revenge.

There were a number of events that were important in the development of German nationalism. Bismarck's appointment was important as he brought about the actual unification. However, the Zollverein ensured that Austria would not be part of the development, whilst the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars helped to create a sense of nationalism that could be built upon. Wilhelm took the nationalism further and inspired a more aggressive approach, which despite defeat in 1918 left Germany even more united than in the past. Therefore although Bismarck was important in its development so were other events.

Examiner commentary

The answer explains and analyses the significance of a number of events as possible turning points. The structure of the response makes it difficult for a comparison between the differing events and therefore there is no evidence of synthesis across the period. Therefore, regardless of the quality of analysis or explanation the response will not reach the highest levels. A thematic or comparative approach using much of the same material would allow the key skill to be demonstrated and allow a supported judgement to be reached.

High level response

It would be difficult to dispute the importance of Bismarck's appointment as minister president of Prussia in 1862. In less than ten years Germany had been unified and there is little doubt that he had a profound impact on the events of 1862-70. However, although he had a considerable impact on the political and military development of Germany, he had far less impact on either its cultural or economic development and therefore, although his appointment was a significant turning point it was not the most important in all areas of German development.

Bismarck's appointment as minister president in 1862 was the most important turning point in terms of the military development of Germany. It was his military reforms of the 1860s that created the army that would be victorious in the Wars of unification later in the decade. Wilhelm II created the German navy, with the Navy Laws of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, but it was Bismarck who created the army that defeated Austria and France and resulted in the declaration of the German Empire in 1871. Without his decision to ignore Parliament's claim that his actions over the army bill were illegal the army would not have been reorganized. Moreover, Bismarck's actions were also more important in creating a diplomatic situation in which Prussia could outmanoeuvre its enemies; he was able to ensure the isolation of Austria in 1866, by gaining Russian friendship, and in 1870 his earlier lenient treatment of Austria after their defeat ensured that they would not aid France. Bismarck was also able to exploit a fear of France among some of the south German states, which encouraged them to abandon their dislike and fear of Prussia to join the new state. In contrast, Wilhelm mismanaged Germany's diplomatic position and allowed France and Russia to ally, whilst Germany relied for support on a weakening Austria and an unreliable Italy. In terms of securing military victory, which after all was the key to German unification, it was Bismarck's actions, both in terms of creating the army and securing the neutrality of potential enemies that was most important.

Politically it was also Bismarck's appointment in 1862 that was the most important turning point. As a Prussian Junker it was his vision of Germany that would triumph. Not only was it his vision of a *Kleindeutsch* that was pursued as a result of military conflict with Austria, but when the new Empire and its constitution was proclaimed he ensured that it was a Prussian dominated Germany that emerged. The nature of the constitution gave Prussia a veto over legislation and also ensured that the Emperor would always be the king of Prussia, whilst the office of Chancellor was combined with the minister-presidency of Prussia. In contrast the revolutions of 1848-9 and attempts to establish the Frankfurt parliament were less important in the course of German nationalism as they failed. The achievements of 1870-1 were long lasting, whereas the German Confederation undid most of the achievements of 1848 and attempts at reform and new constitutions were often less liberal than had been the situation before 1848. However, although the revolutions were a setback for liberal and national feeling they had influenced many to continue the fight for a nation-state and had stirred national consciousness on which Bismarck would be able to build. The events of 1848-9 were less important than Bismarck's appointment as earlier events revealed that Germany was still divided, whereas Bismarck was able to unite Germans around the fear of a common enemy and unite the country politically. Although the accession of Wilhelm II was an important turning point politically as it resulted in the downfall of Bismarck and a far greater role in politics being played by the Emperor. The Chancellors he appointed were much more under his control, leading to a more authoritarian monarchy, but the authoritarian nature had been established, at least in part by Bismarck in 1862 when he ignored the Prussian parliament over the army bill and in the nature of the Empire he established in 1871. Bismarck's appointment was the most important turning point politically as it established the nature of both the German state and the direction politics would take.

However, economically Bismarck's appointment was far less significant than the establishment of the Zollverein. Bismarck would be able to take advantage of the economic dominance and power that the Zollverein gave Prussia and use it to develop the armed forces that would be crucial in 1860s, but its establishment in 1834 was the most important economic turning point. Not only was it important because it unified both the currency and a system of weights and measures, but the benefits members gained economically under Prussia encouraged a similar political outlook. The Zollverein was important as a force for unity and Prussian led unity as Austria refused to join. It certainly laid the foundations for the growth of the German economy which continued to expand throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth century and brought an end to each of the 39 German states established in 1815 managing their own economies.

Similarly, Bismarck's appointment was not the most important turning point culturally. Bismarck did little to unite Germany culturally, never rally reconciling the Catholic states of the south to the Protestant north and then further alienating them with the *Kulturkampf*. In comparison it was the events at the start of the period that were crucial in developing a sense of cultural identity. Whilst Bismarck was a Prussian nationalist, it was the writings of German intellectuals, such as Herder, Fichte and Hegel who developed the concept of a common language and cultural tradition, which would see its flowering at the Hambach and Wartburg festivals and help to create a sense of identity, which many middle class liberals would build on in 1848. Bismarck did little to encourage this when in office and therefore his appointment was far less significant.

Bismarck's appointment was certainly one of the most significant turning points in the course of German nationalism. In simple terms it was his policies that led to the Unification of Germany and the type of empire that emerged in 1871. Although Wilhelm would take the development further and on a new course, with his appeal to popular nationalism through his policies of Weltpolitik and expansionism, it built on the foundations laid by Bismarck. However, although Bismarck's appointment was crucial, he was only able to Unite Germany under Prussia because of its economic dominance and power and therefore the creation of the Zollverein was also a crucial turning point.

Examiner commentary

The response adopts a thematic approach and this makes it easier for comparisons as to the significance of a range of events to be made. Although the whole period is not covered in each paragraph that does not matter, it is covered during the course of the essay and although there is much more that could be said – for example about the outbreak of war or the Treaty of Versailles as turning points – it must be remembered that the candidate had only 45 minutes in which to write this and therefore it is not expected that everything can be considered. The argument is supported, but the candidate is careful not to go into too much detail. The answer is consistently focused and there are substantiated comparative judgements which would take the answer into the higher levels.

Y315 – The Changing Nature of Warfare 1792-1945

Section A

Evaluate the interpretations in both of the two passages and explain which you think is more convincing as an explanation of British generalship in the First World War.

Medium level response

Passage A, written by A. Clark in 1991, puts forward the view that the generals, but more specifically Haig, were brilliant in the First World War and that Haig played a leading role in defeating the German army. However, Passage B, written by G. Sheffield in 2011, puts forward the view that the British Generals were unimaginative and followed 'poorly executed plans' and 'achieved little at huge cost to their men and the nation.' Passage B offers the traditional view that the ordinary soldiers who fought in the major battles were Lions, but that they were led by Donkeys. There is much debate about the role of the leadership of the British army in the First World War and these two Passages offer differing interpretations, with Passage A being much more positive than Passage B in its view of their contribution.

Passage A suggests that Haig's army played a crucial role in the defeat of the Germany army in 1918 and that its role rates as 'the greatest series of victories in British history.' The Interpretation, which acknowledges that the Somme and Passchendaele were bloody encounters, also argues that they had a valuable strategic importance and were successful as they inflicted heavy damage on the enemy. The Interpretation does have some balance in its view of the Generals as it does admit that they made mistakes and there were some terrible consequences. This positive view of their contribution is surprising given the number of men who were lost, for example on the first day of the Somme, or in the mud of Passchendaele. The Interpretation does not provide any evidence to suggest that these battles weakened the Germans and therefore makes the view less convincing. However, in 1918 there were successes as the German advance in the Spring Offensive was halted and the British army was able to advance and convince the German command that they could not win and therefore force them into signing the armistice.

Passage B is much more negative in its view of the Generals and unlike Passage A it does not simply focus on Haig, but writes more generally about the leaders of the British army. The Passage puts forward the view that the leadership of the army did not learn from its mistakes and did not adjust to the demands of the new type of trench warfare. According to Sheffield the commanders wanted to return to the old style of warfare in which the cavalry played an important role in open, rather than trench battles, and that many lives were wasted in doing this. This certainly appeared to be the case at the Somme and Passchendaele, with so many men lost in taking so little ground. However, the account looks only at events up to the winter of 1917, whilst Passage A considers events up to the end of the war. Improvements, such as the use of the creeping barrage did take place and improvements were made in the later stages of the war which Passage B does not mention. Passage B also puts forward the view that the German army was most highly trained and therefore new skills, which the British commanders did not adopt, would be needed. This lack of new plans or poor plans had been seen at Passchendaele, when attempts at advancing were simply swallowed up in the mud or in the 60,000 casualties on the first day of the Somme.

The Interpretations offer different views, but A focuses more on Haig and the army he created, whilst B considers the leadership in more general terms. Passage A is also more valid as it does cover the whole period of the war and sees the ultimate British victory, whereas B largely stops in 1917 and does not see the victories of 1918 and defeat of the German forces after their Spring Offensive. Interpretation A is also better as it does acknowledge that some battles have been seen by some as disasters and this gives the passage more balance, however it does not provide evidence to show that they inflicted damage on the Germans which it claims. B is less strong as it does not cover the whole of the war.

Examiner commentary

The answer does have a sound understanding of the views offered by the two Passages and is able to see the differences between them. The views are explained and some contextual knowledge is used to test the views, but the knowledge is limited, and in places there needs to be a much closer link between the knowledge and the passages so that it is made clear that the knowledge is being used and not just imparted. There is some attempt to see the Passages in a wider context, and the response does note that B does not cover the whole period and suggests this makes it less convincing as a view of generalship in the war. There is some argument and evaluation, but in places the evaluation needs much more development and greater knowledge applied to test the views.

High level response

The two Interpretations offer different views about British generalship in the First World War. However, it should be noted that most of Passage A focuses on Haig, whilst Passage B is less focused on individual generals. Secondly, Passage A considers the whole of the First World War and therefore does acknowledge that ultimately victory over Germany was achieved, whilst Passage B ends with the events of the winter 1917, before British successes were really apparent and therefore offers a very different perspective.

Passage A is very positive in its view of the First World War generals, and in particular Haig, crediting him with playing a leading role in defeating the Germany army in 1918 and even arguing that the Somme and Passchendaele, despite the heavy casualties which are acknowledged, played a vital role in wearing down the German forces through the attritional damage they caused. There is much evidence to support such a view as Haig was prepared to learn and did use both new technology and tactics, such as gas and tanks and the keen interest he took in equipping his men with machine guns. The Passage is also correct when it argues that the battles of the Somme and Passchendaele were crucial in wearing down German morale. Certainly Haig was crucial in the victory of 1918, he had prepared with the necessary resources, including cavalry and by reorganising the transport system in France so that supplies were available. In the advances of 1918 the British and French had combined arms operations and used tanks and aircraft, avoiding heavily fortified points to ensure they broke through, hardly evidence of generals as 'incompetent buffoons'. It is therefore unfair to label Haig, or other commanders, as donkeys. He maintained the trust of his army and his subordinate leaders were just as committed.

Passage B disagrees with the view of Passage A and suggests that the commanders did not learn from their mistakes. Although there is some truth in the view that in the early years of the war similar tactics were adopted of accumulating large forces to advance, which was proceeded by a large-scale artillery bombardment, which not only warned the enemy of an attack but made the battlefield even harder to navigate. It does appear that the tactics used at Passchendaele in 1917 were very similar to those at the Somme or even earlier, but this view ignores the point that new tactics, such as the creeping barrage and night attacks were introduced. It might be argued as B does, that plans were poorly executed but it is wrong to argue that commanders did not understand the conditions, as careful reconstruction of the attack area were made so troops knew what to expect. The Passage also suggests that the generals squandered the lives of soldiers, and although there were large scale casualties, as on the first day of the Somme, the generals did not squander lives and many commanders were with their troops and died with them, and were not back in comfortable headquarters. Passage B is limited in its view as it does not consider the developments after the winter of 1917, particularly the giving of greater initiative to individual units, which would also help in the victory of 1918.

Although Passage B is correct in arguing that perhaps the army was slow to adjust and that battles in 1917 did still seem to take the same form as in 1915, it is less convincing than Passage A as an explanation of British generalship in the war. Passage A by seeing the wider context of the whole war and accepting that some of the early events, such as the BEF's experience, were less than glorious is more convincing as it does cover the whole war and correctly recognizes that the army did change its tactics and approach.

Examiner commentary

This is a well-focused answer. It is clearly aware of the different Interpretations and is able to explain them and then apply relevant, detailed and accurate knowledge to them in order to reach a balanced judgement. The response does not drift from the question and is analytical throughout, with knowledge being consistently used rather than just deployed. A convincing and balanced line of argument is pursued throughout and a supported judgement, which follows from the main body of the essay is reached.

Y315 – The Changing Nature of Warfare 1792-1945

Section B

How important were manpower and resources in determining the outcome of war in the period from 1792 to 1945?

Medium level response

Manpower and resources played an important role in determining the outcome of wars, but there were a range of other factors, such as alliances, leadership and weaponry that were also important. The number of soldiers available to a state and the resources it possessed, such as iron and steel would play an important role in many of the wars in this period. This essay will compare their role with that of other factors by looking at a series of wars between 1792 and 1945 in order to reach a balanced answer.

The outcome of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars were determined in part by manpower and resources, but also by leadership, alliances and strategy. At the start the ability of France to raise mass armies meant that it could sustain huge losses in its full frontal attacks, which its enemies were unable to sustain and this helped to make it victorious. However, in the Revolutionary Wars France was aided by the failure of the other European powers to maintain alliances for long periods and this enabled the French to pick up off opposition. However, when the Great Powers were able to sustain the Sixth Coalition that followed the Treaty of Chaumont they were able to defeat Napoleon, suggesting that the strength of alliances were crucial in determining the outcome of wars. It could also be argued that leadership was important in determining the outcome of these wars as when Napoleon was at the height of his powers he was able to lead the French army in Italy to victories and later secure a stunning victory at Austerlitz. It was only when his powers of generalship declined that France was defeated. Similarly his strategy of trying to defeat Britain through the Continental blockade, which ultimately led to the Peninsular War and the invasion of Russia were huge mistakes and suggests that strategy was a crucial factor in the outcome of wars.

In the Crimean war, despite the large number of forces available to Russia they were unable to defeat Britain and France, suggesting that manpower was not always the most important factor. Britain and France were victorious because of the resources they had and their ability to bring them in via ships and a purpose built railway line, whilst the weakness of Russian forces meant that the poor command of the British and French forces were overcome.

The result of the American Civil war was in part due to resources and manpower as the North outnumbered the South in both men and weapon production. This allowed them to sustain a war of attrition and the heavy losses at battles, such as Gettysburg, which the South could not sustain. Gettysburg saw some 97,000 casualties, with the South sustaining 50 per cent casualties on the third day during Pickett's Charge, which they were simply unable to sustain. The North with its much larger population was able to raise larger armies and better cope with the high casualty rates. This was an important factor as the South did possess competent generals in Lee, who despite smaller forces had been able to withstand the attacks from the North, defending Richmond and preventing a Northern invasion with his actions around Chancellorsville in 1863. Yet, his generalship was not enough, further supporting the argument that it was manpower and resources that were crucial. It could also be argued that the strategy of the North, with the Anaconda plan was important in securing victory as it allowed them to strangle the South's forces, bring about a collapse in its economy and with it a loss of both morale and confidence, leading to defeat.

The German Wars of Unification were in part decided by resources and manpower on the battlefield. It was Prussia's ability to get large numbers of men to the battlefield quickly, by using the rail network that played a crucial part in the defeat of both the Austrian and French forces. The dramatic growth in the Prussian economy in the period after 1830 was vital and this was allied to a trebling of the rail network. However, although Prussia possessed these advantages, it was the command structure and the development of the General Staff that ensured victory, with its strategic planning and ability to respond to the technological developments in both the railways and telegraph, with the railways being integrated into the planning. The increase in speed of movement meant control of armies moved from battlefield commanders to the general staff, who had been trained in mobilisation exercises.

The outcome of both the First and Second World Wars was at least in part due to the resources and manpower of the Allied forces compared to those of the Central and Axis powers. In the First World War it was the arrival of American forces and their numbers and resources that brought an end to the stalemate on the Western front and more than made up for the loss of Russian forces in the east, which had allowed Germany to move its forces west. Resources also became important as the war progressed, with the naval blockade of Germany having a significant impact. In the Second World War it was the sheer size of the Russian army that was able to sustain the heavy losses, such as Stalingrad, which eventually turned the tide. At the same time America and Britain was able to supply Russia with resources via the Arctic route to enable them to survive. Strategy had been important at the start of the war and brought Germany victory through Blitzkrieg, but this sort of warfare was not possible against Russia or Britain and therefore manpower and resources became more important as war progressed. In the Pacific war it was the same, Japan could not resist the American numbers or resources, given their smaller population and lack of raw materials. However, in the Pacific technological developments, with the Atom bomb, would ultimately prove crucial in ending the war.

It can therefore be seen that manpower and resources were important to some extent in most of the wars during the period, but there were also other factors. Towards the end of the period it might be argued that manpower and resources became more important as wars became longer, whereas in earlier wars strategy and leadership were more important.

Examiner commentary

Although the essay does deal with named factors of manpower and resources there is often little depth to the material. In places there are unsupported claims, whilst a number of points are not fully supported or developed. The approach is chronological and this makes it very difficult to make comparisons between factors and there is therefore no evidence of synthesis. The factors behind the outcome of most of the wars are explained, but only in the final part on the First and Second World War is there any attempt to show similarity or difference. The conclusion offers potential and it is a pity that the view offered there is not developed in the main body of the essay. The answer would be a mid-level response as there is an attempt to argue and analyse a range of issues.

High level response

Throughout the period from 1792 to 1945 large armies, be it at the start or end of the period have played a crucial role in determining the outcome of wars. In terms of resources they have become more important as war has become more sophisticated, but their importance depends heavily upon the ability of states and armies to utilize them. However, there are other factors that have played an important role in determining the outcome of wars, in particular alliances, which played a vital role in both the Napoleonic Wars and the Second World War. Similarly, strategy, leadership and weaponry have also been influential factors in some of the major conflicts, such as the Wars of German Unification or the war in the Pacific during the Second World War.

Manpower was an important factor in the outcome of wars throughout the period. At the start of the period it was the sheer size of the French Revolutionary armies which allowed them to sustain heavy losses in the early years of the wars, similar to the Russian army at battles such as Stalingrad in the Second World War, and with the *levee en masse* take the fight to other European powers. Lacking the training and experience of other European armies it was the size of the revolutionary armies that allowed them to launch offensive attacks that the smaller armies. This was also similar to the Napoleonic armies at the start of the Napoleonic Wars as he inherited the Revolutionary army which still outnumbered the armies of other European powers and enabled him to inflict defeats against Prussia and Austria. The importance of the size of the armies was also important in determining the outcome of both the First and Second World Wars. It was the arrival of large numbers of troops from the USA in 1918 which finally allowed the deadlock on the Western front to be broken, whilst in the Second World War it was the size of the Russian army which allowed it to sustain heavy casualties at the start of the conflict, before being able to go on the offensive and drive Germany out of Eastern Europe.

Similarly resources were important in determining the outcome of wars, particularly in longer conflicts, such as the American Civil War, but most notably in both the First and Second World Wars. Resources have become more important as warfare has become more sophisticated. In the Second World War Germany was successful in the initial stages with Blitzkrieg, but its inability to secure oil supplies in the Caucasus or the Middle East contributed to its defeat. In comparison Britain was able to survive the early years of the war because of supplies from the USA and when the USA joined the war their resources and Britain's were able to supply the USSR through the Arctic route and ensure victory. This was also similar in the Pacific where US control of oil supplies and the lack of raw materials possessed by Japan was crucial in the defeat of the latter. However, resources were less important in shorter wars, such as the Wars of unification, although even here Prussia's exploitation of its coal and iron were crucial in victories against France and Austria as it allowed it to develop a rail network to deliver men to the front more quickly than its opponents.

There were other factors that were also important in determining the outcome of wars and on a number of occasions played a more important role than either manpower or resources. Although manpower enabled Napoleon to deploy large armies, it was leadership in the Italian campaign, where his personal relationship with his troops helped secure victory and again at Austerlitz, where he defeated a much larger combined Austrian and Russian army. Even Wellington argued that Napoleon made the difference of forty thousand men. Similarly, it was the organisation of the Prussian General Staff rather than their ability to exploit resources and the manpower that was important in victories against Austria and France. Although they possessed a more developed rail network, it was the training of the General Staff and their ability to use both that and the telegraph that enabled them to deliver larger forces to Sadowa and Sedan.

It was not just leadership that was important in securing victory but also alliances. This was seen clearly in the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars. In the Revolutionary Wars and for much of the Napoleonic Wars the failure of Britain, Austria, Prussia and Russia to sustain an alliance made it much easier for Napoleon, who was easily able to divide the various coalitions, whereas with the establishment of the Sixth Coalition, after the Treaty of Chaumont, he was unable to achieve victory as the forces agreed to remain united until he was defeated. In both the First and Second World Wars alliances were just as important as resources and manpower as the support of America in the First World War and Britain, America and the USSR brought together far greater power than Germany and its allies could muster and resulted in Germany being unable to sustain its war effort. However, there were also occasions, particularly in the mid nineteenth century when the absence of alliances was important in determining the outcome. The Southern States in the American Civil War were prevented from obtaining an alliance which might have changed the outcome and in both the Austro-Prussian and Franco-Prussian Wars Bismarck's ability to keep the opposition isolated was an important factor in the Prussian victory.

The quality of troops and weapons was also a factor in the outcome of some wars. At the start of the period the Revolutionary Wars were determined less by the quality of troops than numbers. It can be argued that this was similar in the later periods when it was the number of conscript troops in the First World War that prolonged it after the professional armies had been largely destroyed in the early years, similarly in the Second World War it was the raw conscripts in Russia and from America that played a crucial role. However, the quality of weapons available did play an increasingly significant role in determining the outcome, with the quality of Russian tanks on the Eastern Front and ultimately the atom bomb determining the outcome.

Resources and manpower did play a role in determining the outcome of wars, particularly in the more recent conflicts. However, much depended on how the manpower and resources were deployed as large armies, such as the Russian in the First World War could be defeated. Moreover, developments in technology, such as the atom bomb also meant that victory could be secured without deploying large armies, although it should be remembered that without the island hopping policy that had preceded the dropping of the bombs it would not have been possible. Effective strategies and command of men was important and was seen throughout the period, as without that resources could be wasted. However, without resources, particularly in recent conflicts, defeat was more likely as Germany discovered in two world wars and Russia in the First World War.

Examiner commentary

The thematic approach allows comparisons to be made between a range of conflicts. The answer is aware of change and continuity across the period and effective comparisons are made to show the patterns and relative importance of a range of factors. Some factors, such as strategy and weaponry are not well developed, but in 45 minutes it is not possible to cover all issues in depth. The named factors are analysed and their importance is compared with a range of other factors so that there is evidence of comparative evaluation. The judgement at the end could be stronger, but given the length of the response it is likely that the candidate was running out of time. There is evidence of synthesis and the comparisons are well explained which helps to take the response to the highest level.

Y316 – Britain and Ireland 1791-1921

Section A

Evaluate the interpretations in both of the two passages and explain which you think is the more convincing explanation of Ulster's position during the Home Rule crisis of 1912–1914.

Medium level response

The two Passages offer different views about Ulster's position during the Home Rule crisis of 1912-1914. Passage A offers the view that Ulster's position was weak as it had been unable to stop the Home Rule Bill, which would come into effect at the end of the war. Passage B puts forward the view that Ulster was in a much stronger position. Instead Passage B argues that Ulster, far from failing, had been able to secure Partition, which would be permanent. Therefore the two interpretations are contrasting in their views about the position of Ulster, with A seeing it as weak and B as strong.

Passage A argues that Ulster had been unable to stop the passage of the Home Rule Bill. Not only that, but according to Passage A the government was willing to force Ulster to accept it as they were unwilling to accept excluding Ulster from its terms. The government had lost patience with Ulster and was, according to the passage willing to coerce it by 'swift and decisive military action'. The weakness of Ulster's position is emphasized by the comment that Carson was nervous and was aware that some in the government were willing to act decisively against Ulster. The Passage also suggests that the threat from Ulster was more apparent than real, that they lacked the ability to force the government to concede and that their threatening language was hollow and that there was little chance of civil war breaking out. Ulster's position, according to A, was also weakened because of the actions of Redmond, who was keen to support the British war effort and this would prevent the Unionists from being able to claim they were the only ones who supported the effort, which might also weaken Ulster's position by lessening the divide between nationalists and unionists.

In contrast, Passage B argues that Ireland was close to civil war. The Passage mentions the creation of an Ulster army to resist Home Rule, which further adds to the view that they were willing to resist Home Rule strongly. The Interpretation also suggests that the British army would not crush Ulster as they would be unwilling to act against them and neither would the Irish Volunteers, as they lacked the strength, which further strengthened Ulster's position. Not only that, but in contrast the Passage goes on to stress that the Ulster Volunteers had strengthened their position through gun-running activities, which had allowed them to arm a considerable force to resist. As a result of both the weakness of the British and Irish Volunteers and the strength of the Ulster Volunteers, Passage B stresses that Home Rule could not have been imposed on Ulster, which is in complete contrast to Passage A. The Passage also argues that exclusion had been reluctantly accepted by both Redmond and Carson, suggesting that in some ways Ulster had at least been able to avoid coming under nationalist rule. Given the strength of Ulster's position Passage B argues that there would be permanent partition, in part because there was no alternative, therefore Ulster would be able to resist a development which according to the Passage they viewed as 'catastrophic' and would lead to their destruction.

The Passages therefore offer contrasting interpretations about the position of Ulster during the crisis of 1912-14. Passage B offers the more convincing view as Ireland was partitioned and it was permanent; Ulster did not as A argues fail, although it did not preserve the Union intact, but nor was it forced to become part of the new Irish state which it feared. Passage A underestimates the strength of Ulster's position and its ability to resist, which is stressed in B through the Ulster volunteers and gun running, as well as the reluctance of the British army to act. Passage B therefore offers the more convincing view of Ulster's position.

Examiner commentary

The two interpretations are thoroughly explained and comparisons of the two interpretations are made. Although the explanation of the two views is very thorough, there is no own knowledge used to test the views of the interpretations and therefore no real evidence of the critical evaluation which is needed for the higher levels. The response could have suggested that the gun running at Larne, for example strengthened the view offered in B or that Ulster's position was weakened, as A suggests, by making reference to the rash comments of Bonar Law at Blenheim. However, a judgement is reached as to which Interpretation is more valid and some support for the view is given.

High level response

The passages offer contrasting interpretations about the position and strength of Ulster during the Home Rule crisis of 1912-14. Whilst Interpretation A argues that Ulster's position was weak and that the government had the strength to overawe its threats, Interpretation B argues, in complete contrast, that Ulster was in a strong position and that the British government would have been unable to force Home Rule on Ulster. Interpretation A argues that Ulster's position was weak and had been unable to prevent Home Rule, as seen by the majority in the Commons in January 1913, whilst B, in contrast, argues that Ulster's position was much stronger and that partition and separation was being considered.

Interpretation A argues that Ulster had been unable to halt the progress of the third Home Rule Bill. The passage supports this claim by saying that the government was unwilling to concede exclusion for Ulster, whilst at the same time it was willing to use force to coerce it. There is certainly some strength in such a view as the government was dependent upon Redmond's Irish Nationalists and could therefore not retract its position or make compromises and at the same time Ulster's position, it could be argued was weakened following the rash comments made by Bonar Law at Blenheim Palace when he claimed that 'I can imagine no length of resistance to which Ulster can go in which I would not be prepared to support them, and in which, in my belief, they would not be supported by the overwhelming majority of the British people'. The Interpretation is therefore correct to argue that the violent language used by Ulster and the Volunteer force was just an 'extreme form of the politics of theatre', whilst the threat of civil war was not real. However, Interpretation A ignores the forces that were available to Ulster and which put it in a stronger position than the Interpretation acknowledges. According to Interpretation A the government was in a strong position but this ignores the weak stance of the government over the Curragh mutiny or its inability to prevent gun-running, which is mentioned in Interpretation B.

In contrast, Interpretation B argues that Ulster's position was much stronger. According to the Interpretation the objections to Home Rule in Ulster were very strong and they saw it as 'catastrophic' for them and the measures that they took were not bluff, which is in contrast to the view offered in Interpretation A. This is supported by the interpretations reference to the creation of the Ulster Volunteers and the government's inability to prevent gun-running, which is given further credence by events at Larne. The view of the Interpretation is also strengthened by the effectiveness and success of the Solemn League and Covenant in mobilizing Protestant opinion in Ulster, which is further evidence of the strength of feeling noted in the Interpretation. The Interpretation also suggests that the British Army was not about to coerce Ulster and stop the protests and this is supported by events such as the Curragh Mutiny, which suggests the government did not have the force to impose Home Rule if it came to a struggle. However, the Interpretation argues that because of this 'Partition would be permanent', but in 1914 neither Carson or Redmond had publically accepted exclusion or partition along the lines of the six counties and there was no evidence to suggest that the British army would not impose Home Rule on Ulster, whilst Carson was also having doubts about armed resistance, suggesting that Ulster's position was not as strong as the Interpretation suggests.

Although the Interpretations offer contrasting views about Ulster, there is some validity in both. Interpretation A does acknowledge that, despite Ulster's weak position, it would have to take account of its feelings, which was valid and it does mention the agreement to bring in an amending bill before the implementation of Home Rule. Interpretation B, which stresses the strength of Ulster's position, is largely supported by later events, but some of the arguments put forward, such as 'the British army was not about to coerce the Ulster Volunteers' lacks support. Therefore, although B might be supported by later events, there are some weaknesses, whilst A also correctly notes some future developments and the need to acknowledge the position of Ulster.

Examiner commentary

The response not only explains the views of the two passages clearly and accurately but it also draws comparisons and contrasts between them. The Interpretations are thoroughly explained and the points made are developed, but the answer also applies relevant and accurate knowledge to the Interpretations in order to test the views. The response acknowledges that both Interpretations have their strengths and weaknesses, and is therefore able to offer a judgement which synthesises the two views. The knowledge used is often detailed, although the quotation from Bonar Law is quite exceptional and would not be deemed necessary for a high level response. The response does all that the mark scheme requires, the interpretations are explained, own knowledge is directly applied and a judgement is reached and therefore the response would be awarded a high level.

Y316 – Britain and Ireland 1791-1921

Section B

'Governments up to 1867 were more successful in pacifying Ireland than those from 1868 to 1921.'
How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1798 to 1921?

Medium level response

British governments throughout the period from 1798 to 1921 faced challenges in pacifying Ireland and were more successful at some times than others. However, throughout the period there was unrest with Tone's rebellion at the start and the Anglo Irish War at the end, suggesting that they were not very successful in pacifying Ireland. Many of the policies adopted by British governments failed to tackle the major problems in Ireland, and when they were addressed often failed to consider the whole issue and this resulted in the policies often failing or encouraging further unrest. It would therefore suggest that throughout the period British governments were not successful in pacifying Ireland.

The government was able to successfully crush Wolf Tone's rebellion in 1798, but this was because the rebellion was badly led and poorly organized and this made the task that much easier. The response of the British government, with the 1800 Act of union, did little to pacify Ireland as it was not accompanied by Roman Catholic Emancipation, as Pitt had wanted, and therefore left a large part of the population angry and encouraged the development of the mass movement in the 1820's led by Daniel O'Connell.

The government went some way to pacifying O'Connell's movement by passing Roman Catholic Emancipation in 1829. It gave Irish Catholics full civil and political rights. However, this did not pacify Ireland as many in Ireland did not see the benefits of the Union as they believed that England still had contempt for Catholicism and viewed Irish culture as inferior. It also appeared to many in Ireland as if they were not getting the benefits of the economic growth that was taking place and saw the Union producing a subordinate equality. As a result, the 1840s would see further unrest, with monster meetings held at places such as Clontarf, which aimed at repeal of the Union, providing further evidence that government policies had not pacified Ireland.

However, the reforms of the Whigs and then the Conservatives under Peel, which although they tackled administration, the Poor Law and education, did appear to have some success in pacifying the country. The Repeal campaign was curbed in the period 1843-4 and collapsed with the death of O'Connell in 1847. However, this was only short-term as the government had failed to address the major issues of land, religion and government. As Disraeli commented 'Thus you have a starving population, an absentee aristocracy, and an alien Church', it was therefore hardly surprising that the government had failed to pacify the country.

There was relative tranquillity in Ireland from the late 1840s until 1867, which it could be argued suggests that the government policy was successful. However, much of the tranquillity was the result of the devastating impact of the Irish famine, rather than any other reason. However, problems resurfaced when Gladstone came to power in 1867, despite his attempts to solve the Irish problem. His reforms to both the Church and Land were aimed at building up support for the Union, by resolving Irish grievances. The Disestablishment Act of 1869 destroyed the privileged status of the Anglican Church which went a long way to solving the religious problem. The Land Acts of 1870 and 1871 however did little to resolve the problems of the rural economy and did not bring support for the Union as the Irish Land League emerged. There was much rural violence and by 1885 even Gladstone acknowledged that his policy had failed with his conversion to Home Rule. Similarly, the emergence of Charles Parnell and the Irish Home Rule Party was further evidence that government policy had not pacified Ireland.

Government policy from 1886, with the introduction of the First Home Rule Bill, to 1921 also failed to pacify Ireland. The attempt to bring in Home Rule simply encouraged greater militancy with the formation of various Unionist Clubs and the Ulster Volunteer Force established to fight to keep the Union and the Irish Volunteers to try and ensure the passing of Home Rule.

Incidents such as the Larne gun-running and the Curragh mutiny were clear examples that the government policy to pacify Ireland had failed. This became even clearer in 1916 with the Easter Rising, which although it was crushed and was initially viewed with distaste by many in Ireland soon led to further unrest when its leaders were executed in the aftermath. The opposition to Home Rule from Ulster, who saw it equating with Rome rule, ensured that government policy would fail, particularly as they were able to count on support from the mainland, particularly among the Conservative party. The promise of Home Rule failed to pacify Ireland, particularly as the Liberals, after 1910, were dependent upon the support of Irish Nationalist MPs, and therefore had to try and push legislation through which simply hardened the resistance of Ulster and created deeper divisions between the two sides.

Compromise solutions also failed to solve the problem, but the situation was made even worse when Sinn Fein won almost every seat in southern Ireland in the 1918 election and demanded an English withdrawal. They set up their own parliament and this plunged the country into civil war, which the government was only able to end in 1921 with the Anglo-Irish treaty, with a divided Ireland. The problem of the long drawn out negotiations is further evidence that the policy had not brought peace and it was probably only war weariness that brought the sides to an agreement.

Governments throughout the period struggled to pacify Ireland. It is true the problem was much harder in the second half of the period with the eventual outbreak of civil war, but throughout policies failed to resolve the problems of Ireland and often increased rather than reduced unrest.

Examiner commentary

The essay is focused on the question and there is some argument which ranges across the whole period. However, the approach is chronological and there is no comparison between the period before and after 1867. Although the answer does attempt to argue and show that governments throughout the period failed to pacify Ireland, a more thematic approach would allow comparisons to be made and therefore synthesis to be shown. The answer does show a sound knowledge of developments across the period and uses, rather than imparts the material, to produce a sound argument.

High level response

There were difficulties in pacifying Ireland throughout the period, with clear problems at the very start with Wolf Tone and at the very end with the Anglo-Irish war. There were also times throughout the period when British governments were more successful at pacifying Ireland, as with Roman Catholic Emancipation and some of the reforms of Gladstone, suggesting that there was no clear pattern to the success of British governments in pacifying Ireland and that they were neither more or less successful in the first part of the period than the second. However, as the period progressed it did become more difficult to satisfy the Irish and despite quite far reaching reforms after 1867 the problem appeared intractable with growing divisions between Catholics and Protestants in Ireland, suggesting that governments were more successful in the first half of the period despite the limited policies that were enacted.

Throughout the period unrest was a problem. The government was more successful in crushing unrest in the first part of the period than the second, Wolf Tone's rebellion was crushed easily, although in part that was due to poor leadership and organization, whereas the government struggled in the twentieth century to deal with the unrest of the 1916 Easter Rising, particularly in its handling of the aftermath which created even greater hostility towards the British with the execution of its leaders, and the Anglo-Irish War, which led to a vicious war between the two sides. The greater willingness of British governments in the earlier period to use coercion and force to pacify Ireland certainly seemed more successful than later governments who preferred to try and find a political solution through Home Rule, which ultimately led to the 'Ulster problem' and issues such as gun running and threat of mutiny in the British army.

It could therefore also be argued that the government was more successful in the first half of the period in preserving the Union. In the second half of the period the government was less able to deal with the challenge of Home Rule or the growing militancy of the Unionists. Through reforms, such as Peel's administrative measures to deal with education, the Poor Law and local government his administration was able to pacify some in Ireland, seen in the curbing and eventual collapse of the Repeal campaign after the death of O'Connell in 1847. However, the government was less successful in dealing with the unrest caused by the issue of Home Rule, with Ulster able to mobilise, along with support in Britain, and defeat it in 1886 and 1893. Moreover, in the period after 1910, when the Liberal government depended upon the support of Irish Nationalist MP's, it was unable to deal with the resistance of Ulster Unionists, backed by the Conservative party in England, who were willing to use Ulster extremism to destroy the Home Rule bill, with some MPs going as far as to claim 'Ulster will fight and Ulster will be right', encouraging further unrest.

During much of the period governments did attempt to pacify Ireland through reform legislation and whilst there was some success in the first part of the period, it would be incorrect to argue that there was little success in the second half. Religious issues were tackled just as successfully in the second half of the period, with Gladstone's Irish Disestablishment Act of 1869 destroying the privileged status of the Anglican church and removing a major grievance from many of the population who had been paying tithes to a church to which they did not belong. Similarly, the Roman Catholic Emancipation Act was also successful in giving Roman Catholics full civil and political rights. However, it could be argued that this was actually less successful than Gladstone's legislation as many Catholics still did not see the benefits of the Union and still believed that that Roman Catholicism and Irish culture was treated with contempt. However, it was not just religious legislation that could be seen to be more successful in the second part of the period, but also the issue of land. Governments in the first part of the period did nothing to solve the land question and it was only under Gladstone and later administrations that the issue was tackled with Gladstone's Land Acts of 1870 and 1871 and the Wyndham Land Act of 1903. Although these acts did not completely solve the land issue, they at least attempted to tackle it and provide fair rents, security of tenure and the chance for tenants to buy, and therefore invest in, the land they farmed. In contrast earlier governments had largely ignored the land issue for fear of angering the Protestant ascendancy which dominated the land market.

Despite legislation which addressed the major concerns of the Irish population in the second half of the period, governments were more successful in pacifying the Irish in the first half of the period. The religious and land reform of the second half of the period only encouraged further demands and persuaded Gladstone that the only solution was Home Rule. However, in the first half of the period the British government was more able to win support among the Irish despite the limited nature of its reforms. In part this was due to the emergence of major political movements in Ireland in the second half of the period, with the Irish Land League and also the rise of Charles Parnell and the Home Rule Party. In part as well the failure in the second half of the period was due to the growing militancy of Ulster, which saw Home Rule as Rome Rule and was therefore determined to oppose the measure and with support on the mainland it was much harder for the government to succeed.

There were difficulties for governments throughout the period, but the rising militancy and divisions as the period progressed did mean that governments were more successful in the first half of the period. The unrest and menace of O'Connell's monster meetings at Clontarf were not as serious as the violence that broke out in 1916 and in particular from 1920. Legislation, although more limited in the first half did help bring some tranquility to Ireland, which surprisingly was further aided by the famine, but attempts to tackle the major issues in the second half of the period served only to unleash greater problems. Therefore, although many of the issues remained throughout the period, there was less unrest in the first half of the period despite the failure to solve the problems.

Examiner commentary

The essay adopts a comparative approach and deals with a good range of issues. The focus on the question is maintained throughout and there is a consistent analytical approach. The response deals with the whole period and constantly makes comparisons across a range of themes, therefore showing a good level of synthesis to reach a judgement which is firmly based on the main body of the essay.

Y317 – China and its Rulers 1839-1989

Section A

Evaluate the interpretations in both of the two passages and explain which you think is more convincing in explaining why Mao launched the Cultural Revolution.

Medium level response

The Passages offer different views as to why the Cultural Revolution was launched, with Passage A focusing on Mao's desire to create an society which would automatically obey him, whilst Passage B focuses more on his desire to bring about change and introduce a series of reforms that up until then had been impossible and implement greater democracy and socialism. However, both Passages do suggest that the Cultural Revolution was part of a power struggle within the party, with Passage A mentioning that Mao feared that there was a plot against him, whilst Passage B argues that there was a power struggle with his politburo rivals, most notably Liu Shao-chi. Both Passages also agree that the instrument of the Cultural Revolution would be first and foremost students and younger elements in society as they had radical tendencies and would attack the counter-revolutionaries described in Passage B.

Passage A's main focus is on the desire of Mao to implement a drab culture, and ensure that a cult focused on himself was established. This is further enforced by phrases such as the 'cult of Mao', but also by the fact that the little Red Book was issued to everyone which contained his sayings. This was all part of Mao ensuring that there was just obedience to himself. Mao did not want people to be thinking for themselves and the Passage argues that this policy had already started, but that insufficient progress had been made and therefore a far greater purge, the Great Purge, was needed in order to bring it about. The attack on culture, hence the name the Cultural Revolution, was just the first part of this process of eliminating challenges to his authority, which he feared. Therefore, although the Passage hints that some of the original dynamism within the communism movement had been lost, the Passage is more concerned to stress that the Revolution's main concern was to strengthen Mao's position and increase his personal standing, hence the focus on his 'cult' and the emphasis in propaganda, such as the Red Book, on his wisdom.

Passage B puts forward the view that Mao wanted to bring about change and was concerned that after the Chinese communist Party took power in 1949 they had ossified and that the revolutionary spirit that had driven it had lost its drive. The loss of this revolutionary spirit, according to Passage B, meant that the changes and reforms he wanted to bring in had been prevented and therefore the Cultural Revolution was the way to bring this about. The Passage then goes on to argue that the Revolution was about attaining 'higher levels of democracy, socialism and collective spirit', which seems more positive than the goals and aims mentioned in Passage A. The Passage also argues that Mao was keen to prevent the party from becoming bureaucratic and counter-revolutionary, losing its links with the ordinary man and instead becoming as Mao said 'representatives of the bourgeoisie'. It was these concerns that worried him and he wanted to restore the revolutionary spirit that had helped to bring them to power.

Both Passages are correct to mention Mao's desire to increase his own power and influence as it had been under threat. However, Passage B is less convincing in its view that he wanted to carry out reforms that had not been possible as the Cultural Revolution did not result in any real positive changes for the ordinary man and instead just saw an increase in his control and violence. As a result, Passage A is more convincing in its explanation of the reasons for the Cultural Revolution as much Chinese culture was destroyed and therefore the comment about 'a life without entertainment and colour' was largely accurate.

Examiner commentary

The response explains the views offered in the two passages and these are fully and clearly developed. There is some realisation that there are some similarities as well in the explanation they offer. Some own knowledge is present and there are hints of evaluation, but that knowledge needs developing and closer

links made to the actual Interpretation so that evaluation is explicit rather than implied. There is a judgement, with some development, and again there are hints of knowledge to support that judgement.

High level response

The two interpretations have a different emphasis on the reasons for the Cultural Revolution. The focus of Interpretation A is on Mao's desire to bring about a drab culture where the entire focus is on him and this is shown in the reference to the 'cult of Mao' and the publication and hand-out of the little 'Red Book'. However, the focus of Interpretation B is on the internal quarrels within the Chinese Communist Party. Mao was concerned that the party had lost its revolutionary zeal since the 1949 Revolution and that bourgeois developments were enveloping it, as had happened in the Soviet Union. His concern, therefore, according to Interpretation B was to rekindle the crusade for democracy and socialism, which had been there when the party came to power. However, both Interpretations also suggest that Mao was concerned about his own position and that he wanted to protect it, as Interpretation A suggests that there was a plot against him.

There is some merit in the view offered in Interpretation A that Mao wanted to create an arid society as the attack on art and culture, which as the Interpretation states was the first phase of the Revolution, did destroy centuries of art and closed down many theatres, bringing about what A describes as 'a life without entertainment and colour'. However, the Interpretation argues that the purpose behind this was so that the nation would be brain-dead and simply carry out his orders. This would, as the Interpretation suggests help establish the cult of Mao, which appears to underpin much of this and was made clear with the publication of the little Red Book, which was given to everyone and stressed the wisdom of Mao, as opposed to that of his opponents, particularly Liu. Therefore the argument that the Cultural Revolution was for higher motives is incorrect, instead as the Interpretation emphasises, it was subordinate to Mao's personal gain. The Interpretation also argues that Mao feared Russia was involved in a plot to remove him and there is some justification for his concern given developments in the Soviet Union, particularly as he believed that the attack on Stalin's cult of personality in the late 1950s was a veiled attack on him and his leadership of China and this fear was added to with the fall of Khrushchev in 1964, supposedly for 'hairbrained economic schemes', which could again be compared with events in China.

However, Interpretation B also has merit in explaining the reasons for the Cultural Revolution. The Interpretation stresses Mao's concern that he had been unable to implement all the changes and reforms he desired and that the party had lost its revolutionary zeal since taking power in 1949. The Interpretation is correct to stress that Mao was concerned about the party becoming bureaucratic and counter-revolutionary as many within the higher echelons of the party were more concerned with personal power. This view is reinforced by Mao's belief that revolution was a historical event but a continuous process and therefore the Chinese Revolution could not stand still if it was to be a genuine revolution. The Interpretation is therefore correct that Mao was worried that the achievements of 1949 would be destroyed and therefore the Interpretation is correct to argue that Mao appealed directly to the people in order to circumvent the vested interests in the party. The Interpretation also suggests that this is why Mao made his appeal to the young, but this could also be because the younger members of the party had not been tested by events such as the Long March or the war against the GMD. The Interpretation is correct to stress that Mao did not want affairs to be run by bureaucrats as he wanted to preserve the revolution as essentially a peasant movement and therefore there was a gap between Mao and some of the other leaders, who had distrusted events such as the Great Leap Forward.

Neither Interpretation offers a complete explanation for the Cultural Revolution as there are weaknesses to both. Interpretation A is correct to argue that Mao wanted obedience to himself and did need to reassert his authority after the power struggles of 1961-6, it ignores Mao's constant emphasis on a continual Revolution, which is stressed in Interpretation B. The violence that accompanied the Cultural Revolution may undermine the view offered in B, but given Mao's constant concern about counter-revolution and his views about developments in the Soviet Union it offers a more convincing view for the reasons behind the Cultural Revolution.

Examiner commentary

This is a very full answer which is consistently focused on the question. It shows a thorough understanding of the Passages and is able to explain the views they offer, acknowledging areas of similarity. Own and contextual knowledge are applied to the Interpretations in order to evaluate both the strengths and limitations of the views they offer. The knowledge is often detailed and there is a good awareness of the wider context of the Cultural Revolution. There is a clear judgement, which is both explained and developed.

Y317 – China and its Rulers 1839-1989

Section B

Assess the view that the people of China enjoyed better standards of living under Communism after 1949 than they had done in the previous century.

Medium level response

Throughout the period China was essentially an agricultural and peasant dominated nation. Mao had gained a great deal of support for the CCP by winning the support of the peasantry against the repressive landlords from whom many rented land. Moreover, when the CCP came to power they provided greater employment opportunities as they developed industrial centres, which encouraged many to leave the countryside and seek the new opportunities that the growing towns and cities offered, suggesting that living standards were better after 1949. However, many of the initial gains were short-term and it was not until the latter part of the period that living standards rose.

In the nineteenth century the conditions of the peasantry, who made up over 90 per cent of the population were poor. They rented land from landlords, and although feudalism had been abolished in the eighteenth century, they were dependent upon the landlord for their survival as he could put rent and force the peasant from the land. With a growing population in the nineteenth century and a backward agrarian economy that still relied on wooden ploughs, even into the twentieth century, life was very harsh for the peasantry and this is shown through both the number of amines, but also peasant unrest. The most notable of the rebellions was the Taiping Rebellion of 1850-64, which was largely due to the economic conditions. Conditions on the land can therefore be seen to be very harsh in the nineteenth century. Similarly, conditions in industrial enterprises were poor. Even in western companies workers were paid low wages and local industries were known as sweatshops, further supporting the view that living standards were poor in the period before 1949.

Living conditions were really no better in the first half of the twentieth century. Levels of taxation and rent burdens continued to remain high for the peasantry and workers. Added to this was the growing problem of inflation, which became a particular problem after the fall of the Manchu dynasty. Changes in the nature of the rural elite during the rule of GMD also made conditions worse for many of the peasantry as there was an increase in the number of absentee landlords as army officers and bureaucrats bought up land with the sole intention of extracting as much rent as possible. The result of these changes was that poverty continued to be a major issue and led to many peasants supporting the CCP in the belief that their conditions would only improve under them. This certainly appeared to be the case in areas that Mao and the CCP seized as landowners were rounded up and often shot, whilst the land was given to peasants who agreed to establish soviets. Little had therefore changed for the majority of the population under GMD, although the commercial elite in the cities and the richer peasants gained, but they made up only 4-5 per cent of the population. However, for many living conditions did not improve and were actually made worse because of the war against Japan which disrupted economic life and incomes, let alone the damage it caused.

The CCP did attempt to address the land issue, but the extent to which the reforms they brought in improved living conditions for the masses is open to debate. Initially it could be argued that the peace the CCP brought and Mao's unwillingness to attack the richer peasants allowed them to flourish, as happened with the 1950 Agrarian Reform Law. However, the extent to which living conditions improved varied from area to area, in some regions 40 per cent of land was redistributed and 60 per cent of the population benefited and therefore saw an improvement as rural poverty was tackled and social inequalities were tackled as landlords and village bullies were denounced and removed. As a result of the reforms poor peasants and the owners of no land gained, whilst the gentry and some richer peasants did lose out. The collectivization of agriculture in the 1950s also brought some improvements as the process was not brutal as it had been in the Soviet Union. Even richer peasants were tempted join collectives because of the compensation that was paid in instalments for the use of their superior equipment or greater number of animals. Whilst Mao followed a practical approach to the issue of land and agriculture it could be argued that living conditions improved.

However, the improvement was short-lived as with the Great Leap Forward living conditions for most in China deteriorated and were probably worse than anything seen under either Imperial rule or the GMD. Peasant's private plots were abolished, as private pigs and poultry, as was private eating and cooking. There was no allocation of reward other than need. Families lost ownership and richer villagers saw a decline in their living standards as they now had to share everything with poorer neighbours. Living conditions declined even further as agricultural productivity declined and famines that were worse than those witnessed in the nineteenth century gripped the country, added to by drought and the decision to continue to export to the USSR to pay for heavy machinery. As a result some 20 to 30 million died and others were reduced to eating bark and grass. There was some improvement in the first part of the 1960s as private plots were restored and more land made available for them, fairs and markets were also allowed again and rewards were to be based on effort and work, which encouraged people to produce more and work harder. Despite this, improvements were short-lived as the Cultural Revolution of 1966-9 saw a further decline due to the chaos it caused, with many of the victims being sent to the countryside where they faced a decline in their living standards as a result of the hard labour they faced.

Although there had been a short-term improvement in the standard of living for many when the CCP had come to power, it was really only with the growth of economic liberalism rise, but again there were regional variations, with the coastal states seeing far bigger rises than inland areas and also the Han communities benefiting at the expense of the non-Han communities. Many peasants were able to take advantage of this economic liberalism, as they were now able to sell for private profit. SOE's that had been set up were also forced to modernize and employees were paid according to performance which gave some the opportunity to improve their standard of living, although some workers were unwilling to put job security and their 'iron rice bowl' at risk and it was not until 1986 that change was possible.

Improvements in living standards were therefore very variable during the whole period. Many gains that were made were often short-term, as seen in the period between 1949 and the mid-1950s and it was not until after the death of Mao and economic liberalism that any significant progress was made and even then it was more evident in some areas and for some peoples than others. Given the size of China's population generalisations are difficult and there were considerable regional variations, even in the earlier period, but overall improvements were limited.

Examiner commentary

The essay adopts a chronological approach and breaks the period down into three or four periods, but there is little comparison or synthesis between the periods, which means that the response will not reach the higher levels. The knowledge is sound, but in places somewhat thin, particularly on the earlier period where the response tends to rely on generalisations. However, there is an attempt to argue and the main issues are considered, although much of the focus is on the living standards of the peasantry rather than industrial workers. The answer might have commented more on the decline of the more wealthy and middle class in the post revolution period. Despite this, there is sufficient argument for the essay to be awarded a low level 4.

High level response

In the period from 1839 to 1989 China went from being a backward nation to a modern super-power with rural poverty, that was the common feature of much of the early period either disappearing or at least declining, with the result that standards of living improved for many. However, not only was the improvement largely at the end of the period, but there were also significant regional and ethnic variations, with some doing much better than others. Improvements in other parts of the period were usually short-lived or confined to a few members of society rather than bringing benefit to most of the population. Issues such as land holding and working conditions and practices provide a clear indication of the extent to which there were improvements for the Chinese people over the one hundred and sixty years.

Land was a major issue that determined the standard of living for many in China throughout the period and for much of the time its control either by rich landlords, wealthier peasants or the state ensured that living standard remained low for most Chinese, even if rural poverty declined. At the start of the period most peasants rented their land, but their position was insecure as landlords could put rents and drive them off the land. Similarly, during the rule of the GMD many bureaucrats and army officers bought land and were concerned solely about extracting the highest possible rents from the peasants, which again did little to improve their standard of living, but as in the 1850-64 Taiping Rebellion created hostility towards the landowning class. Although the standard of living did initially improve with the coming to power of the CCP in 1949 and their land redistribution programme, which although it allowed even the wealthy to keep enough to survive, gave out some 60 per cent of land to the poorer class, which brought them some benefit. Even the establishment of collectives brought gains to the wealthier peasants who were tempted to join because of the compensation paid in instalments for the use of their superior equipment and their greater number of animals. However, this improvement in their position and the position of other peasants was short-lived as with the Great Leap Forward in 1958 the standard of living for those in the country declined considerably and this would continue for many during the Cultural Revolution of 1966-9. The standard of living, rather than improving during the Great Leap Forward declined for the peasantry as private plots were abolished, as were private pigs and poultry. Similarly private eating and cooking was ended as private life was brought firmly under state control, with no allocation of reward other than need and peasants who wanted to move required internal passports. Similarly, during the Cultural Revolution, many party functionaries and Red Guards were sent to the countryside for re-education and hard labour and therefore witnessed a sharp decline in their standard of living. It was only with the policy of economic liberalism that followed the death of Mao that many of the peasants saw an improvement in their standard of living as private plots were restored and they were allowed to sell for profit. As a result, for much of the period, the land issue saw little improvement in the position of the peasants until the very end of the period.

Food supplies also saw no improvement in the period after 1949, in fact with the famine that followed the Great Leap Forward a decline in living standards was more apparent. Famine, particularly in Northern China had been quite frequent in the nineteenth century with 1850-73 being particularly bad, but also 1876-9 and 1896 and 1897. This continued in the twentieth century with 1907, 1911, 1920-1 and 1928-30, all of which resulted in the standard of living remaining low for many peasants. However, the Great Famine of 1958-62 was far worse, with some 20-30 million deaths, and saw an even greater decline in living standards for those who survived as many were forced to eat bark and grass, although there was also evidence of cannibalism, as had occurred in the earlier period. This latter period saw hardships that far exceeded anything of either the Imperial period or the Republic.

The living standards of the peasantry varied considerably depending upon their status. The wealthy or rich peasants did well in the early period when they could sell produce from their private plots, but their position declined under Mao as even with the passing of the Agrarian Reform Law of 1950, which should have ensured a moderate approach towards them, they suffered as a result of 'struggle' meetings where they were denounced and sometimes executed. Mao's Land Reform was completed by 1952 and destroyed many of this old group who lost their land, wealth and status. Therefore, if there was any improvement it was among the poorer peasants who gained from the land redistribution, but with collectivization and the establishment of communes even their gains were short-lived and they were little better off than they had been in the earlier period.

Industrial workers also saw little gain in the initial period after the CCP came to power. In the nineteenth century many Chinese workers had worked in western industrial enterprises for low wages and in poor conditions because the Chinese domestic economy had nothing better to offer, in fact Chinese enterprises were described as sweatshops. However, there had been some improvement in the condition of workers during the rule of the GMD as some industrial enterprises offered opportunities for the peasants to move to the cities and towns, with places such as Shanghai witnessing the start of a consumer society for a few, with the construction of shopping malls and the introduction of electricity. Such development was disrupted by the years of war and even after the CCP took control in 1949 there was little improvement in living standards until after the death of Mao when economic liberalism brought benefits for some, but the inequality and regional variations that accompanied it were similar to those during the rule of the GMD. It was therefore not the coming to power of the CCP that witnessed an improvement in living standards for workers but the later period after the death of Mao.

Despite the improvements that have taken place in living standards since the death of Mao, rather than in the period from 1949 to 1976, the size of China and ethnic divisions means that generalisations have to be treated with care. There are serious regional and ethnic inequalities to the argument that living standards have improved in the period after 1976. There has been a far greater improvement in the provinces nearer the coast, whilst provinces such as Tibet suffered from repression. Similarly, where gains in living standards were made it was for the Han, rather than the non-Han population as discrimination against them persisted.

It would be true to say that for some there has been an improvement in living standards since 1949. However, much of that has been since the death of Mao and that continuity in low living standards has been the norm for China and its people from 1839 to 1976, with any improvements being the exception and short-lived. Yet, even this does not take account of the continued low living standards of some, even if rural poverty has largely been eradicated and famines on the scale of 1958-62 have been eradicated.

Examiner commentary

The response is consistently focused on the question and is analytical throughout. The response covers the whole period and attempts to compare and explain similarities and differences, showing a good level of synthesis. The argument is well-supported, although it would benefit from a little more precise detail when analysing the earlier period. However, the thematic approach allows for comparisons to be made and a judgement on each issue, which is reflected in the overall judgement. The response would therefore be awarded a low level 6.

Y318 - Russia and its Rulers 1855-1964

Section A

Evaluate the interpretations in both of the two passages and explain which you think is more convincing about the impact of the domestic policies of Alexander II.

Medium level response

Passage A argues that Alexander II's rule as Tsar was 'an era of great reforms', of which the most important was the Emancipation of the Serfs in 1861. It argues that it should be seen alongside similar changes that were carried out in France, Prussia and Austria as it took twenty million people out of serfdom and also led to reforms in areas of the army, law and local government. Passage B argues that Russia needed reforms and that Alexander did bring in radical measures but they did not go far enough. The reforms that were brought in caused unrest and the Emancipation Act did not really free the serfs, whilst there was little benefit to agriculture or the economy.

Passage A sees the reforms as positive and argues that they modernised Russia following its humiliating defeat in the Crimean War. The scale of the reforms, particularly the Emancipation was such that Alexander earned himself the title 'Tsar Liberator'. There were a number of reforms in the period as Alexander introduced Zemstvas in 1864, also brought in legal reforms, abolished censorship and then in 1874 began to reform the army. He was determined to preserve autocracy and believed that such reforms would prevent revolution and allow the Romanov dynasty to survive. He was aware the war had shown that Russia was inefficient as the farming system was backward and that many peasants lived in medieval conditions, but his attempts to change this were limited. Russian farming on the eve of the First World War was still backward and Russia also lost the Russo-Japanese War in 1904-5, as well as going on to be defeated in the First World War. The Emancipation of the peasants did appear to be a step towards modernizing Russia as the peasants were no longer serfs under the control of the nobility. In the period after Emancipation they were subject to the village commune, or Mir, so little actually changed for them suggesting that the Emancipation did not go that far.

Passage B sees Emancipation as having little impact in solving the problems that Russia faced as it did not go far enough. Peasants were often allocated poorer quality land and received less than they had been farming before the Edict. Many struggled to earn enough from the land to meet the redemption payments they had to pay for the land, which they believed was theirs anyway, which created unrest. Peasants were not totally free as they were now answerable to the mir, with the village elders deciding what was to be grown and how the crops were to be cultivated. Subsistence farming continued in Russia and this meant that not only was there little incentive for the more able peasant farmers to produce more, but it meant the levels of production did not really rise. It also meant that the peasants saw little point in investing in the land to improve it. The disappointment in the act is clearly seen by the fact that peasant unrest increased in the period after the Act. The reform did however suggest that change was happening in Russia and this can be seen in the other reforms that are not mentioned in the Passage, such as local government, the army and the law so even if the economic impact was not great the other changes were.

The Passages offer different views about the impact of the reforms of Alexander II, with the first Passage offering a more positive view than the second, although the focus of the second is just on the Emancipation of the Serfs. Its view on the Emancipation is correct, but A is also correct because there were lots of reforms so it is not fair just to focus on one.

Examiner commentary

The answer is focused on the reforms of Alexander II and shows a sound understanding of what each Passage is saying about the reforms. The Passages are explained. There is much own knowledge in the response, but it is largely deployed rather than used to evaluate the views in the Passages. At best, there are

some hints of evaluation but this is not developed and there is little attempt to link the own knowledge to either challenge or support the views offered. There is an attempt at a judgement, but this is not really supported and at best this would reach Level 3.

High level response

Both Passages A and B argue that the reforms brought in by Alexander II were urgently needed, particularly in light of the situation in the country revealed by the defeat in the Crimean War. However, although both argue that reforms were urgently needed they differ as to how far the reforms actually went in tackling the problems Russia faced. Passage A argues that the reforms had a significant impact and did much to change Russian society and that their impact should be seen alongside those of the French Revolution. However, Passage B argues that the impact of the reforms, particularly the Emancipation of the Serfs was disappointing and did little to modernise the state.

Passage A is positive about the impact of the reforms and argues that although the Emancipation of the Serfs in 1861 was the centerpiece of the reforms, releasing as it did 20 million peasants from bondage, it led to a series of other reforms which had a significant impact on Russia. The Passage is correct to argue that Emancipation led to other reforms as Alexander II oversaw reforms to the army, local government and the judiciary which helped to modernise Russia, although there was little political reform. The Passage is also correct to see the reforms as essential in preserving autocracy, which was an important element behind them, the Tsar was more concerned to see reform from above than revolution from below, which was looking increasingly possible if changes were not made. In bringing about these changes he was able to make autocracy work more efficiently as there was more incentive for the peasantry to work the land if they owned it, although this view is challenged in Passage B. The Passage is also correct in arguing that the nobility were opposed to the reform, but they were struggling to maintain their estates before emancipation and the revenue they obtained from the redemption payments that followed Emancipation did help them repay debts. Although the Passage argues that Emancipation granted the peasants 'individual freedom and a minimum of civil rights' this is not completely true as the peasants still had to answer to the mir; decisions about what was to be produced and how crops were to be cultivated had to be made by the village elders. Therefore, although it encouraged further reform Passage A is incorrect in seeing the changes as completely positive and it could also be argued that it appears to have little impact on Russia's ability to fight wars any more successfully given their performances in 1904-5 and in the First World War.

Passage B views the reforms, particularly the Emancipation as having a limited impact and in many ways this view is correct. The peasantry did not gain their freedom because of the role of the mir. The Passage also argues that Emancipation failed to bring about the modernisation of agriculture or create the conditions for economic advance and this is certainly valid as one of the responsibilities of the mir was to ensure the continuation of subsistence farming, which as the Passage argues ensured that obsolete agricultural techniques continued to be used. This also meant that more able peasant farmers had no incentive to produce surpluses and were reluctant to invest to improve the land, supporting the view in the Passage that there was little investment. Not only is the Passage correct to argue that Emancipation did not bring about an agricultural advance as such measure held back advances, but the passage is also correct to note that many peasants lost land as a result of the Edict, farming less and often poorer quality land than had been the situation beforehand. This also meant that many peasants struggled to earn enough from the land to meet the redemption payments they faced and this situation was made even worse by the rural poll taxes they had to pay. The Passage also argues that the negative impact of Emancipation is also reflected in the peasant unrest which followed and this is certainly true and is further supported by the need for further reforms in the later period. However, despite the limitations of the Edict, the Passage ignores the symbolic importance of the reform – it did appear to be a symbol of change – even if as the Passage correctly argues the economic impact was much more limited than had been hoped.

Although both Passages argue that the reforms of Alexander II were significant, Passage B offers the more convincing view about the impact of Emancipation. The impact on agriculture was limited as a view of Russian farming on the eve of the First World War, the lack of mechanization and the frequent famines reveals. Although Passage A is correct to argue that the nobility opposed the reform, Passage B is correct in arguing that for the peasantry little changed, they replaced the control of the nobility for the control of the village mir and therefore did not gain their freedom as instead of paying dues to the noble they were paid to the village elders. However, the Passage does ignore the symbolic nature of the reform as it was the first major change to the system and did, as A argues bring about reforms in other areas.

Examiner commentary

The answer is consistently focused on the issue in the question. The views of the two passages are clearly explained and analysed. Own knowledge is used to evaluate the views and this knowledge is clearly linked to the two Passages, helping to take the response into the higher levels. A clear and supported judgement is reached.

Y318 - Russia and its Rulers 1855-1964

Section B

'War brought about more change in the period before 1917 than after.' How far do you agree with this view of the period 1855 to 1964?

Medium level response

In the period from 1855 to 1964 Russia was involved in a considerable number of wars, mostly against external enemies, but also internally with the Civil War which followed the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917. These wars brought about a number of changes in Russia and this essay will examine each of the major conflicts before concluding whether it was the period before or after 1917 that saw wars bring about the greatest change.

The Crimean War certainly brought about considerable change as Alexander II realised that, following defeat, Russia needed to modernize. Probably the greatest change that the war brought about was the Emancipation of the Serfs in 1861 as this ended the institution of serfdom and gave the peasants the right to own the land they had farmed for many years. It brought an end to them being the property of the nobles and therefore changed the social system in Russia. The war also saw changes in the judiciary and army which helped to make both systems fairer. There was even some change in the political system, but here it was only at a local level with the introduction of the Zemstvas; in terms of the autocracy nothing changed as Alexander was determined to protect that. However, the war had damaged Russia's reputation and was no longer viewed as a major power.

If the Crimean War brought about a significant change in Russia's status this was simply confirmed by the Russo-Japanese War and the humiliating defeats suffered by Russia on land at Mukden and at sea in the Battle of Tsushima Bay. Not only that, but it also caused internal problems which led, at least in part to the 1905 Revolution and helped to bring about political change. It was defeat in the war that forced Nicholas II to introduce the representative and elected Duma as well as make concessions with the October Manifesto. However, although the war did bring about political change, much of it was short-lived as the Fundamental Laws undermined many of the gains and the electoral system for the Duma was changed to favour more conservative elements in society.

The First World War brought about considerable change and was probably the most significant of the wars in creating change. It brought an end to the Romanov dynasty after 300 years and the Tsarist system and initially gave Russia its only democratic government in the period. Even though this was short-lived it brought about further change as it was losses and conditions in the war that helped to bring about the Bolshevik Revolution, which saw a regime based on Marxist ideology replace one based on the supposed divine will of God.

However, it was probably the Russian Civil War which followed which brought about the greatest amount of change. The War resulted in increased state centralization as the Bolsheviks increased their control over people and this resulted in far greater repression and terror, seen in War Communism with the use of the Red Terror, grain requisitioning squads and the use of the Cheka. It, along with the First World War, also made the government aware that industrially it was a long way behind industrially and encouraged Stalin to embark on the Five Year Plans to enable Russia to catch up with the West and increase its security. It also brought about the state's greater involvement in agriculture so that troops could be fed and led to the policy of collectivization, which would have a dramatic impact on social conditions.

The Second World War also brought about much change as victory turned Russia into a global super-power and developments in the war encouraged the technological advances that followed and allowed it to take part in the Space Race. This change in Russia's status was evident in its ability to control much of Eastern Europe after the war. The war also served to strengthen the position of Stalin and ensure that his position could not be challenged having united the country in the Great Patriotic War. It made opposition even harder and allowed repression to continue. In order to secure victory, industrialization had also speeded up and factories were moved away from the Russian advance bringing industrialization to new areas.

All the wars brought about changes in the nature of government, the modernization of the economy and changes in society. However, in looking at all the wars it would appear that more change took place in the period after 1917 as the nature of government changed, industrialization was greater and Russia's reputation improved.

Examiner commentary

Although the answer is focused on the question, there is little or no comparison between the wars pre and post 1917. The structure of the response makes it difficult for the candidate to make comparisons, and when the limited comparison is made in the conclusion it is little more than assertion. There is explanation of the changes each of the major conflicts brought about and the knowledge is usually relevant and accurate. However, the lack of comparison and synthesis means the answer will not go into the higher bands.

High level response

As Trotsky argued war was the locomotive of change, but not all wars that Russia was involved in had as great an impact on the political, economic and social development of the country as others. Russia was involved in numerous wars in this period, with the First World War often seen as a turning point in political developments as it led to the overthrow of the Romanov dynasty and Tsarist government and their replacement by a Communist dictatorship of the proletariat, however the Crimean War and the Second World War would also have a significant impact on the country.

In terms of political development it does appear as if the First World War brought about the most change in Russia. Although the Crimean War had led to changes in local government, with the establishment of the Zemstvas, there was no change in central government and the autocracy remained in place. However, it did appear that the political change that followed the Russo-Japanese war was significant as it created an elected national assembly, the Duma, and resulted in concessions with the October Manifesto. Yet the changes promised in the October Manifesto were short-lived with the passing of the Fundamental Laws, whilst the Dumas became more and more under the influence of the Tsarist regime as the system of election was manipulated. In comparison to these limited changes the First World War and the Second World War did bring about changes that were not only fundamental but long lasting. The First World War also saw the creation of the only democratic government that Russia had in this period, further supporting the view that it was the period after 1917 that witnessed more change, even if this was as short-lived as the October Manifesto. However, it was the overthrow of the 300 year old Romanov dynasty and the replacement of a regime that claimed to be divinely ordained by a godless Communist regime, whose ideology was based on Marx, that represented the greatest change as it witnessed a complete change in ideology from autocracy to communism. If the period before the First World War had seen some limited representation through the Dumas and Zemstvas, the later wars after saw far greater centralization, with War Communism and the Second World War seeing the Communist governments take on ever increasing powers to run both the war and the country. Not only that, but the wars after 1917 saw the state increase repression, with the use of Red Terror during the Civil War and continued purges during the Second, which went far beyond any of the repression witnessed in the period before 1917. In contrast, it could be argued that the Crimean War and the Russo-Japanese Wars did lead to greater freedom than any of the later wars, with the reforms under Alexander II, such as reforms to both the judiciary and military that followed the Crimean War in complete contrast to the increased control over the state that Stalin was able to gain through his victory in the Second World War, which made criticism of him almost unthinkable.

Industrial change as a result of war was present throughout the period. Although the Crimean War and Russo-Japanese wars encouraged industrial development, particularly through foreign investment to build railways, it was the wars after 1917 that had the greatest impact on industrialization. Throughout the period Russia was desperate to catch up with the West, but it was the First and Second World Wars and the Russian Civil War that did most to bring about industrial change. It was the realization during the First World War and the damage caused to industry in the Civil War that encouraged the Five Year Plans and the dramatic growth in industry in the 1930s to ensure Russian security, whilst victory in the Second World War turned Russia into a superpower and encouraged the technological developments that allowed it to take part in the Space Race against the USA. In comparison, the wars before 1917 had encouraged industrial development, but not on the same scale and Russia remained predominantly an agrarian country with no great industrial centres, such as Magnitogorsk that grew up in the 1930s, being developed. Production levels increased after both the Crimean War and Russo-Japanese Wars as Russia responded to being behind the west, but this increase did not compare with the growth in output in heavy industry that followed the Civil War.

In terms of agriculture, war played a significant role in the two most important agriculture developments of the period. It could be argued that the Crimean War brought about the greatest change as it ended the long-established serf system with the abolition of serfdom in 1861 as Alexander II realised the need to modernize the country following its defeat. However, although this brought an end to a social system that had been present in Russia for a long-time its actual impact can be questioned as control by the nobility was simply replaced by control by the Mir. In contrast, it could be argued that the Russian Civil War had a greater impact as it led to the government introducing grain requisition and ultimately, collectivization, so that it controlled both grain production and the lives of farmers, which had a greater impact than the Emancipation. Yet in both cases peasants were told what they could grow and their movement was limited by redemption payments and internal passports, suggesting that the changes following the Crimean War were simply reinforced and taken to a new level after the Civil War.

The Wars had a great impact on Russia itself, changing its image and stability. In the period before 1917 Russia suffered two humiliating defeats in the Crimean War and the Russo-Japanese war, which did much to destroy its reputation and confirm that it was not a major power following such defeats. In contrast the Second World war and the sacrifices Russia made and the ultimate victory of the allies turned the country into one of the two global superpowers, reflected in its involvement in the Space Race and its ability to dominate Eastern Europe. Similarly wars before 1917 created instability in Russia, with the Russo-Japanese War and the First World war, at least in part, contributing to the 1905 and 1917 revolutions respectively, whereas the Civil War and to an even greater extent, the Second World War, created unity, seen

in the sacrifices made in battles such as Stalingrad and helping to create the image of the Great Patriotic War, which can be contrasted with the demonstrations that soon followed defeats in the First World War.

All of the wars Russia was involved in brought about change, but in terms of political change, both internally and externally, it was the period after 1917 that brought about the most significant change. The country became a world power and established the first communist system – dramatic changes indeed. In terms of industry again it was the wars of 1914 and beyond that brought the greatest change with rapid modernisation. However, in terms of agriculture, both periods saw significant changes resulting from war, although the period after the Russian Civil war did see the state gain greater control over the peasantry. It is therefore clear that it was the wars after 1917 that brought about the greatest change in Russia.

Examiner commentary

The answer is consistently focused and does range across the whole period. Although the knowledge provided is not dramatically detailed, it is used and does support the argument put forward and to cover such a range of themes it would be unreasonable to expect greater depth in 45 minutes. There is considerable comparison and synthesis between the two periods, made easier by the thematic approach, which takes the answer into Level 6.

Y319 – Civil Rights in the USA 1865-1992

Section A

Evaluate the interpretations in both of the two passages and explain which you think is the more convincing explanation of the impact of the New Deal on Trade Union and Labour Rights.

Medium level response

Passage A is mostly about the impact of the Wagner Act and argues that it brought gains for workers in the USA and improved the position of Trade Unions. It puts forward the view that it led to a reduction in violence against workers and it also resulted in the growth of union membership, which suggests it was good for them. Passage B argues that the changes brought about in the 1930s were not as effective and did not bring an end to violence against workers, it mentions that police still fired on strikers in Chicago to support this view.

The main focus of Passage A is the Wagner Act, or National Labor Relations Act, which was passed in 1935. The act gave workers the right to elect their own representatives to take part in collective bargaining and therefore was a considerable gain for them. Legislation also established a National Labor Relations Board which had the right to bargain on behalf of workers. The Passage also suggests that employers recognized Unions and that membership of Union rose, both of which would be evidence of considerable success for workers. It also says that the act forbade the sacking of workers for being members of a union and provided them with some legal protection, which would all be considered gains for the workers. It should also be remembered that the Wagner act was just part of a number of reforms passed in the 1930s that benefited workers with the government passing the National Industry recovery Act which set up the National Recovery Administration. Union membership grew in the 1930s which suggest that the workers thought it was worthwhile joining a union and employers such as General Motors did recognize Unions. A minimum weekly wage was also created by the Fair Labor Standards Act and the Committee of Industrial Organisations was established. All of these developments suggest that the 1930s was a good time for workers.

Passage B is far less positive about the impact of the 1930s on the position of workers. It argues that industrial relations did not improve dramatically and that violence continued to be seen during strikes. It might be correct to argue that during a period of economic decline the position of workers would not improve as their job security was limited with rising unemployment. There was much that happened in the 1930s that supports this view. The NIRA was declared unconstitutional and some employers would not recognize unions. When strikes did occur employers were still willing to use violence to end them as had happened in the 1890s. There were reforms introduced to try and help workers as is suggested in Passage A but there were limits to what was achieved.

The passages have different views about the legislation of the 1930s. Passage A is more positive about the impact than Passage B. Both passages have some parts which can be supported but B is more accurate as the position did not improve that much.

Examiner commentary

The response does understand the views of the two Passages and is able to explain them. It has a clear understanding of the different arguments put forward. There is also some quite detailed knowledge shown in the second paragraph, but it is not used to evaluate the actual passage, seen in the absence of evaluative words – evaluation is by implication. In the third paragraph the response is more generalized, own knowledge is limited and attempts to argue rely on sweeping assertions. The conclusion attempts a judgment, but there is no real support for

the claim made. There is, at best partial evaluation and despite the considerable amount of knowledge shown in the second paragraph it would probably reach only the top of Level 3.

High level response

The New Deal is often seen as playing a pivotal role in the development of Union and Labour rights, with some claiming that, despite a period of severe economic downturn Unions were able to make considerable gains, whilst others have argued that little progress was made as workers were more concerned about simply keeping their job at a time of rising unemployment. Passage A argues that the New Deal, and in particular the Wagner Act, had a positive impact on labour relations, whereas Passage B is less positive as it suggests that the changes led to the unions being able to exert less effective pressure. Passage A argues that the legislation played a significant role in reducing violence in industrial disputes, whereas Passage B claims that violence did not end with the passing of the National Labor Relations Act, claiming that police were still firing on strikers in Chicago.

The focus of Passage A is on the passing of the National Labor Relations Act, which it argues had a positive impact on labour relations, claiming that it was 'a landmark in US history as it forced employers to recognize unions' and this is a valid claim as some major industries, such as General Motors and US Steel now recognized unions after years of resistance. The passage is certainly correct to stress that if success is judged by the number of union members then it was a triumph as membership rose from 3.7 million in 1933 to 9 million in 1938. The passage also hints at other improvements in the position of workers with creation of the National Labor Relations Board and this should be seen as part of a wider series of measures, which included the National Recovery Act and the National Recovery Administration which were also established during the period of the New Deal and helped to improve relations between employer and employee. It is certainly true that workers gained from the right from the National Labor Relations Board being able to bargain on behalf of the workers and this represented considerable progress from the earlier situation for workers. Passage A also correctly notes that labour relations in the USA had been characterized by violence with serious unrest going back into the nineteenth century with events such as the Haymarket Affair, the Homestead and Pullman Strikes, however the extent to which they were solved by this legislation is debatable and is raised in Passage B which notes that violence did not end. Moreover, Passage A appears to assume that the improvement in the position of workers was due to the legislation of the Second New Deal, yet a case could be made to argue that it was the result of rearmament and US involvement in the Second World War which led to gains for workers.

Passage B offers a more negative view of industrial relations and the significance of the measures, but it fails to recognize that in the period after the War employers and the government looked to reduce the power and influence of the Unions, suggesting that this period had been one of advance for Unions. However, the Passage correctly notes that the acts did not bring an end to violence as employers were still willing to use strong-arms tactics to break strikes and intimidate workers. Passage B is also correct to see the limitations to the measures as employers, such as Henry Ford, did not recognize the NIRA or the Wagner Act, which limited its effectiveness. It should also be mentioned, which Passage A neglects, that the Supreme court declared the NIRA unconstitutional, further suggesting that the reforms of the New Deal were less important and supporting the view put forward in Passage B. Passage B also argues that workers gained more before unions were recognized and there had been some gains during the 1920's but these were limited and B overplays the significance of other periods in comparison with the 1930s, which many have seen as the high-point of union power.

Passage A offers a more convincing view, as although Passage B is correct to see the limitations in the improvement, the New Deal certainly represented a period of gain for workers. However, neither passage notes that unskilled workers benefited from the improvements, nor did women as pay differentials were upheld by the NIRA and the Fair Labor Standards Act. However, despite these limitations the gains were considerable as A stresses and this is seen most clearly in the dramatic growth in membership, which surpassed anything seen before.

Examiner commentary

The response has a clear understanding of the views of both passages and is focused on the views they offer about the position of labour in the period of the New Deal. The views of both passages are clearly explained and they are evaluated by the application of relevant own knowledge. Throughout the response the knowledge is used and not simply deployed. A judgment as to which is more convincing is reached, although to go to the top of the band this would benefit from greater development.

Y319 – Civil Rights in the USA 1865-1992

Section B

'Opposition to African-American civil rights remained powerful throughout the period from 1865 to 1992.' How far do you agree?

Medium level response

With the ending of the Civil War in 1865 it appeared that with a period of Reconstruction opposition to the civil rights of the African Americans was not strong, but that was short-lived and strong opposition continued for much of the period as an examination of events such as lynching, the response of the police in Birmingham, Alabama and the murder of Rodney King at the end of the period.

Reconstruction appeared to show that opposition was not strong. The passing of the Military Reconstruction Act in 1867 insisted that states had to draw up new constitutions that allowed African Americans to vote and accept the 14th Amendment, which struck down the Black Codes and guaranteed all citizens equality before the law. This was followed by the 15th Amendment which said that the right to vote could not be denied because of colour. The ratifying of these two Amendments in 1868 and 1870 are clear evidence that opposition to African American civil rights was not strong.

However, in the period after 1870 opposition was strong and as a result segregation was introduced. African Americans lost their right to vote as opposition grew. Southern whites believed that the African Americans were racially inferior and argued that the period of reconstruction had been a period of rape, murder and arson. As a result a number of white supremacist groups, such as the Rifle Clubs and Red Shirts were able to use violence to stop many African Americans from voting. The position was made more difficult for African Americans as there was opposition from Southern state legislatures, which introduced income and literacy qualifications to prevent them from voting. This situation was reinforced by the Supreme Court, which stated in the Plessy v Ferguson case that separate but equal was not against the 14th Amendment. As a result, African Americans faced hostility from both ordinary people but also the Federal Government, which appeared unwilling to help them.

Opposition continued to remain strong in the period during and after the First World War, despite many African Americans fighting, albeit in segregated regiments. The Klu Klux Klan, the most famous of the racist groups opposed to African American civil rights grew after 1915, so that by the mid-1920s it had some 4 million members. However, it was not just at a popular level that opposition was strong. President Wilson supported segregation, arguing that it was 'not humiliating, but a benefit'. He also praised the Klu Klux Klan for helping to save the South from African American rule. There was further evidence of strong opposition to African Americans with race riots in 25 cities in 1919 often caused by the large influx of African Americans into white neighbourhoods. Therefore, despite their contribution to the First World War, there was opposition when they returned because they were competing for both jobs and housing.

Opposition continued to be evident in the 1930s. Although it could be argued that the New Deal did benefit many African Americans this was because much of the legislation was designed to help the poor, not specifically African Americans. In fact, although President Roosevelt had sympathy with their position, opposition from Southern white Democrats was so strong that he could not bring in specific legislation to help African Americans.

The Second World War did appear to diminish opposition as African Americans and whites had to work together. However, it did not mean that all opposition disappeared as is evident from the unrest at Alabama Dry Dock Company in 1943 when it employed African Americans. However, it does appear that opposition from the Federal Government was less strong in the period after the Second World War. The Supreme Court overturned the Plessy v Ferguson case in 1950 and in 1954 ruled against segregated schools and in 1958 declared it unconstitutional. Despite these apparent advances, it is evident that there was still a strong sense of racism in the South as seen in the Emmet Till Case and in the 1948 Presidential election when Southern Democrats nominated Strom Thurmond on a platform that advocated segregation and the 'racial integrity of each race', whilst others criticized Truman's civil rights programme.

It appears that opposition was less strong from the 1960s as Kennedy and Johnson were able to embark on a civil rights programme which not have been possible if there was strong opposition. Not only that, but many whites took part in the March on Washington to show their support for change. Despite this, there was still some opposition as seen in the behaviour of the police in Birmingham, Alabama. However, despite this and the resurgence in support for the KKK open opposition to African American civil rights was less strong by the end of the period as racist attitudes, even in the south had declined. However, Congress was still able to prevent Johnson passing a bill to prevent housing discrimination and polls showed that 70% of white voters opposed large numbers of African Americans living in their neighbourhood.

Although there was still some opposition at the end of the period, as seen in the police brutality towards Rodney King and the poor economic position a large number of African Americans were still in, opposition was less strong, but its decline had really only occurred towards the end of the period and even so the KKK witnessed a revival in the 1970s, with its membership tripling, whilst integrated schools caused a significant number of white parents to withdraw their children and move to the suburbs or establish white private schools. It is therefore clear opposition remained, but in most instances was not as violent.

Examiner commentary

The answer is focused on the question, but the chronological approach means that comparison and synthesis is largely absent. There is an argument and an analysis in each paragraph. The argument is well-supported by detailed and relevant knowledge, which is used, not simply imparted and if a thematic approach had been taken a strong answer could have been produced. The judgment is supported and this could take the answer to the lower end of Level 4.

High level response

Opposition to African-Americans civil rights was present throughout the period from 1865 to 1992, but the strength of that opposition varied considerably and it could even be argued that at certain points, such as during Reconstruction, the Second World War and the 1960s in particular it was limited. Opposition came from a variety of groups, including the Federal Government, pressure groups and ordinary citizens, whose attitudes to political, social and economic equality varied across the period.

The hostility of the Federal Government towards African American civil rights suggests that there was strong resistance to equality. However, although some Presidents, such as Wilson, were opposed to civil rights and even praised the Klu Klux Klan for saving the south from black rule during Reconstruction, others such as Johnson and Carter were more supportive, with Johnson's presidency witnessing the passing of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the appointment of the first African American, Thurgood Marshall to the Supreme Court. Similarly Carter appointed more African Americans to the judiciary, with the percentage of African American federal judges rising from 4 per cent in 1977 to 9 per cent in 1981. Despite supportive Presidents, there were occasions, as under Roosevelt, when Presidents were unable to do more to aid African Americans, who had been particularly badly hit by the Depression, because of opposition from Democrats in the Senate. However, although not specifically aimed at African Americans, federal aid during the Depression did benefit them as they were among the poorest in America and is further evidence that, even if inadvertently, the Federal Government was not consistently opposed. Kennedy went even further and took unprecedented interventionist action in the Southern states, using federal force and injunctions to get interstate buses and terminals and universities desegregated, but as with Roosevelt, he was also slow in promoting further change, not because he opposed or his party opposed it, but because many Southern whites felt he was moving too fast. Even Presidents sympathetic to change had to tread carefully because of opposition.

The attitude of the Supreme Court, particularly in the early part of the period suggests that opposition was powerful. The Supreme Court did nothing about the Jim Crow Laws that legalized segregation and even argued in the *Plessy v Ferguson* case that separate but equal facilities were not against the 14th Amendment. Similarly, the court did not uphold the 15th Amendment which said that African Americans should be able to vote, allowing the South to ignore the US constitution. However, opposition from the Court was not consistent and in 1944 the Supreme Court's decision in the *Smith v Allwright* case served to increase African American political rights in the South. It could even be argued that after the Second World war, the Supreme Court, rather than being a strong opponent of African American civil rights did much to enhance them with the *Shelley v Kramer* case in 1948 when they ruled against restrictive covenants to stop African Americans purchasing houses in white areas and, more importantly in 1954 when they went against the wishes of the President in the *Brown v Board of Education* and supported the view that separate education was psychologically harmful to African American children, culminating in the decision over Little Rock case which forced Eisenhower to enforce the *Brown* ruling. The Supreme Court's attitude changed over the period from being an opponent of civil rights to upholding them and even forcing a President to implement their rulings.

Popular opposition to African American civil rights was powerful for much of the period, reflected in the support for the Jim Crow laws at the start of the period through to the attitude of the police chief, 'Bull' Connor in Alabama in 1963. This attitude was reflected in the support for the KKK, which was strong for much of the period, with a membership of 40,000 in Tennessee alone in 1871 and some half a million across the South. The strength of this opposition was also reflected in the number of lynchings that took place, with some 2700 between 1885 and 1917, showing that opposition was such that African Americans had no legal protection in the early part of the period. The strength of opposition is still evident in the 1950s when Emmett Till was murdered and the lawyer defending the men accused of his murder said that he was sure 'that every last Anglo-Saxon one of us has the courage to free them', as indeed they were. However, although support for the KKK did decline in the 1930s due to scandals and the cost of membership during the Depression, it recovered at the end of the period with membership tripling in the 1970s, suggesting that opposition was still quite numerous. Despite this, popular attitudes towards African Americans do appear to have changed over the period, further suggesting a decline in the strength of opposition. Some Southern Whites were opposed to the granting of civil rights to African Americans, whilst the police treatment of Rodney King suggests that racism still existed, but this was a minority movement. In contrast, there was much white support for the Civil Rights movement of the 1960's, with significant numbers involved in the March on Washington. Even if there was still some support at the end of the period for racist pressure groups, there had been a significant change, which saw a substantial decline in the acceptability of racism, further supporting the view that opposition was not strong throughout the period.

There were periods when opposition was particularly strong, particularly in the period after Reconstruction, but even when opposition was not as openly strong African Americans still found it difficult to achieve civil rights. Although it would appear that opposition was less strong at the end of the period because they had obtained political rights and made progress in education, there was still hidden or indirect opposition as African American poverty had increased, a third lived below the poverty line and a third were working in low skilled jobs, whilst their housing was also of a poorer quality. Therefore, although open hostility seen in the actions of the KKK or lynching's may have disappeared, opposition was still able to prevent the achievement of full civil rights and equality.

Examiner commentary

The question remains focused on the strength of the opposition. It adopts a thematic approach and the response makes comparisons across the whole period, analysing both similarities and differences. The argument is, in places, quite subtle, suggesting that although open opposition was less strong, there was still hidden opposition which was able to prevent full civil rights. The argument is well supported with relevant and accurate material. There is a well-supported judgement, which offers a more nuanced view to the overall argument pursued.

Y320 – From Colonialism to Independence: The British Empire 1857-1965

Section A

Evaluate the interpretations in both of the two passages and explain which you think is more convincing in explaining the consequences of British Rule for India from 1857–1876.

Medium level response

The two Passages offer different views of the consequences of British rule for India in the period from 1857 to 1876. Passage A, written by Piers Brendon, suggests that despite good intentions the results of British rule for the Indians was largely negative. It suggests that this was due to administrative incompetence, with British civil servants remote from their subjects. Interpretation B, written by M.G. Singh, offers a different view and argues that the experience for India was very positive and compares that with their experience of Mughal rule. Singh sees it as a period of 'development and enlightenment' in which much was achieved.

Passage A acknowledges that the British faced a problem in ruling India, suggesting that to ensure stability they had to rule despotically, but that enlightened rule was needed to bring in the changes to the infrastructure that were required, such as sanitation, transport and hospitals. Instead of good government, the Passage argues that it was a muddle and that the mistakes and poor ruling led to the development of Indian nationalism. However, the Passage argues that this was not deliberate and uses the example of Mayo, who took advice from people such as Florence Nightingale over hospitals, but were prevented from achieving much because of 'subcontinental muddle'. The Interpretation uses the example of famines to support its argument and claims that the British government was unwilling to spend the money required to deal with problems.

The failure to develop infrastructure mentioned in Passage A is directly challenged in B, which gives examples of such developments to challenge the list made in A of what was required – Education, Hospitals, Roads, Bridges, Navigation – and therefore by the examples suggests that the view is valid, with the development of an education system of colleges and universities and a road and rail network. The Interpretation also goes further and argues that British rule brought uniformity from which many gained as laws applied to all and Hindus were given religious freedom. Because of these developments Singh is right to claim that India progressed more under 200 years of British rule than it did in 600 years under Mughal rule. However, the Interpretation ignores the failure of the British to deal with issues such as the 1896 famine which might have killed as many as 10 million. In fact, it could be argued that Interpretation B ignores any negative consequences of British rule, with only a passing reference to 'there were no doubt some aberrations' and instead focuses entirely on the achievements, such as the postal service and the armed forces and going on to say that 'the monuments to British rule are legion'. However, the lack of balance and the nature of the language used, which appears exaggerated, with the use of words such as 'admiration' and 'almost close to the earlier Golden Age' does make the validity of the view offered somewhat questionable. The Passage also fails to consider, even if all these changes were brought in, whether everyone in the country benefited or whether it was just part of the population.

The two Passages offer contrasting views of the impact of British rule on India in the period. However, Passage A is more convincing as it attempts a more balanced approach and does acknowledge that there were attempts to improve the situation and that 'muddle' and probably a lack of resources made the task difficult, whereas B is far less balanced and sees only success, with the closest it comes to acknowledging failure when it notes there were some aberrations, but they are not explained. This is made even more apparent by the language used in B, which is exaggerated. Therefore, although B does have examples, which are often lacking in A, its lack of balance does make one question the validity of the view offered.

Examiner commentary

The response explains the views of the two passages and there is some evidence over the famine of own knowledge being used, but this is not consistent enough or developed to take the response into the higher levels. The response relies largely on the content of the two Passages, which is thoroughly used to explain the view offered, although there is some reference to the nature of the language in Passage B. A judgement is reached, which is explained and there is some support for the claim, although again this is based on the content of the Passages rather than own knowledge.

High level response

Interpretation A argues that, on balance and despite good intentions, British rule was largely negative for Indians in the period 1857-1876. In contrast, Interpretation B puts forward the view that British rule was a positive experience for Indians, arguing that the period from 1857 to 1876 was a period of 'development and enlightenment'. Interpretation A does not suggest that it was deliberate British policy to have a negative impact, but instead it argues that British rule was negative because of incompetence or 'muddle', with civil servants 'impossibly remote from their subjects'.

The negative view of British rule in India does have some credence. The Interpretation argues that Britain was trying to transform India in a short period of time, whilst other nations who have modernized took much longer; this problem was made more difficult by the fact that not only did Britain face a considerable challenge in trying to develop such a vast country, but that the Indian Civil Service, who would organize the task was small with only 1000 men, who as the Passage says were 'remote from their subjects', making the task all that much harder. The negative impact of British rule is given further credence by the failure of the British to deal with a series of natural disasters, such as the famine of 1896 when Curzon's limited response and approach led to the death of anything up to ten million people. However, the passage is less justified in arguing that the British did little to develop the infrastructure of India. This is illustrated clearly in the other Interpretation which considers the development of both a road and rail network across the sub-continent. Furthermore, there were some developments in India at this time, not only was much of India brought under direct British rule and therefore Interpretation A is incorrect to argue that Britain supported the 'old order'. This is made more evident by the development of the Indian Civil Service and Imperial Police, as well as a standing army, suggesting that new developments were taking place and that British rule was well organized.

Interpretation B is much more positive in its view of British rule, to the extent of seeing nothing wrong with it and suggesting that India progressed more under British rule than it had under the Mughals. The Interpretation correctly highlights a number of infrastructure projects that were undertaken during British rule, most notable the transport developments that helped to bring the country together and create a greater sense of unity. However, the list provided by the author is much more comprehensive and appears as a litany of achievements. Although it is undeniable that such developments did take place, the author does not examine the actual impact that these developments had and the extent to which they actually benefited the whole of the Indian population. The Interpretation does acknowledge that there were 'no doubt some aberrations', but this is not examined and fails to take account of the small size of the Civil Service available to carry out the reforms, or that despite promises of equal access for all races it was largely the white British upper and middle class who ran the country, whilst the large rural population of India continued to live in poverty and suffer from the ravages of famine, as was seen in 1896. The Interpretations exaggerated or hyperbolic language does suggest that not all of the view is completely valid as the account is far from balanced and does not take account of the failings and negative consequences of British rule that are highlighted in Interpretation A.

The views offered are contrasting and whilst B provides a list of precise examples of success, and A does not really provide precise examples of failings, B is too positive in its view to be completely trusted. At the same time, it would be incorrect to deny that there were achievements, as suggested in B, but they do need to be tempered by the shortcomings that a small civil service would inevitably bring. It would therefore be fair to suggest, and in light of the evidence of such events as the 1896 famine, that although B is correct to highlight the great advances that took place, there were limitations to this achievement, which are noted only in passing by B, but developed more fully in A, suggesting that neither Interpretation is completely convincing.

Examiner commentary

The two interpretations are explained very thoroughly and contrasts between them are drawn. Own knowledge is applied to both Interpretations and the response uses this to consider both the strengths and limitations of the two Interpretations. The knowledge used is relevant and accurate, although in places some further details of the reforms under various viceroys would have made the argument more convincing. A judgement is reached which brings together the views of the two Interpretations and is supported by reference back to own knowledge. The response does all that is asked.

Y320 – From Colonialism to Independence: The British Empire 1857-1965

Section B

'Rivalry with Germany was the most important international influence on Britain's Empire.' To what extent do you agree with this view of the period 1857-1965?

Medium level response

There were many international influences on the British Empire in the period from 1857 to 1965. Germany did influence the British Empire, particularly in the period from the mid-1880s to the 1920s, but Russia, France and America, as well as Japan also had an influence at various stages during the period and some had a far greater influence than Germany, influencing the Empire for most of the period. In this essay we will consider the influence of the different nations throughout the period in order to reach a conclusion as to which was the most influential.

At the start of the period Germany was not influential, as it was not a united country. It was Russia that was the most influential influence on the Empire. This was because the British viewed Russia as a direct threat to its 'jewel in the crown', India. It was this that led to the British invasion of Afghanistan in 1879 in order to create a buffer between Russia and India. It was also Russia that had a considerable impact on British policy in the Mediterranean and Balkans in the period from 1857 to the late nineteenth century as Britain was determined to prevent Russia from acquiring a warm water port and threatening Britain's sea route to India following the purchase of shares in the Suez Canal by Disraeli. Britain also acquired Cyprus at the Congress of Berlin as it was strategically important and would help protect the sea route further. Therefore, Russia was the most important international influence on the Empire in the period from 1857 to the late nineteenth century.

France and Germany were important international influences on the Empire in the latter part of the nineteenth century. It was Bismarck's call for a meeting of the Great Powers to discuss West Africa that meant Germany became an influence. By acquiring territory in West Africa, taking Togoland and the Cameroons, as well as Tanganyika in East Africa, it encouraged Britain to support men on the spot and issue Royal Charters to the National Africa Company, to the South Africa Company and the British East Africa Company. Germany also caused Britain problems in Southern Africa with its support for Paul Kruger. Germany was an important international influence as not only did it create imperial tensions and rivalry, but it used its colonies to develop technology which ultimately led to the naval race, a crucial factor in the outbreak of the First World War, in which the two nations would fight on opposite sides. However, it was not just Germany who was an important international influence in the late nineteenth century, but also France. France had made gains in both West and North Africa and their growing imperial influence almost resulted in a clash between the two powers at Fashoda in 1898. However, as the French acquisitions were not seen as that important or threatening to British trade routes it had little serious impact on Britain and in fact Fashoda ultimately led to a resolution of colonial issues between the two powers and British support for France against Germany in the Morocco crisis.

The First World War also meant that Germany was an important influence on the British Empire. Its defeat and apportionment of its former Empire to some of the victorious powers meant that the British Empire reached its greatest size. However, it also had an impact in that the colonies Britain received were as mandates and this began to change attitudes towards Empire as countries were now not only responsible for the well-being of the people under their rule, but accountable to the League of Nations. The War also had an impact on the influence of Russia as with the triumph of communism it now looked to spread communism, which would force Britain to consider again its ability to protect its colonies. This was also the case with the rising power of Japan, who following its unequal treatment at the Peace Conferences looked to expand its power and dominate the Pacific, which was a direct threat to the scattered British colonies and forced Britain to begin to redevelop its naval base at Singapore.

Although the protection of the Empire was important in the 1930s and during the Second World War, it was the period after the Second World War that saw international influence play an even greater role in the development of the Empire. Even during the War, the signing of the Atlantic Charter by the USA, which called for self-determination of people,

was a threat to the Empire. After the war American influence on the Empire increased as Britain needed American aid, but America was unwilling to support imperialism and therefore it played a significant role in encouraging Britain to grant independence to its colonies. Russia and China were also influential as there were concerns to prevent the two communist states from increasing their influence by establishing sympathetic regimes in former colonies and it resulted in Britain fighting a long guerrilla war in Malaya to keep communism out. However, in this period it was America that had the greatest influence, pushing Britain towards granting independence. However, it would be wrong to ignore the international impact of the colonies themselves and the nationalist movements that developed within them which also encouraged independence.

International influence was important throughout the period, at times encouraging expansion and in the end forcing decolonization. Germany was an important influence on this development, but only over a short period. It was Russia that had the longest influence, but probably the US that had the greatest influence, helping to end colonialism.

Examiner commentary

The answer adopts a chronological approach in an attempt to compare the relative importance of the influence of the different nations. As a result of the approach taken there is no evidence of synthesis and although the content is as good as the essay which reached the top level the lack of awareness of continuity and change means that this response will not reach the higher levels. Factual knowledge is used to explain developments and arguments are mostly well supported, but the response fails to demonstrate the key skill needed for the very highest level.

High level response

Whilst it is undoubtedly true that rivalry with Germany was an important influence on Britain's Empire, that influence was limited to the period from around 1880 to just after the First World War. However, other countries, such as France and Russia had a greater influence on Britain's empire as a result of long-term rivalry and concerns over security and their own influence. Influence on Britain's Empire also varied according to the region, with Russia and Japan having a greater impact on the British Empire in Asia and concerns over the Mediterranean, whilst France and Germany had a greater impact on the British Empire in Africa.

German influence on Britain's Empire was particularly important from the mid 1880's because of the changing nature of Bismarck's foreign policy aims, with his calling of a meeting of the Great Powers to 'carve up' parts of West Africa. This dramatic change in Germany attitudes towards colonies caused an expansionist response from Britain, which was encouraged by domestic circumstances that made expansion more acceptable. Backing was given by Britain to 'men on the spot', with for example a Royal charter granted to Goldie's National Africa Company and also the granting of a charter to Rhodes' British South Africa Company. Similar developments took place in East Africa to prevent, in the long-term, the influence of the German trader Carl Peters from spreading. Furthermore, in the 1890s the Kruger telegram sparked disquiet in Britain, whilst German attempts to cause difficulties in Morocco for France in the early twentieth century pushed Britain and France closer together. Germany used colonial expansion in this period as a way of testing its technology, particularly its warships and therefore it played a significant role in the naval arms race between Britain and Germany, turning imperial expansion into a power struggle between the two nations and playing a role in the outbreak of the First World War, suggesting that it was a significant influence. Even the defeat of Germany in 1918 did not end the influence on the Empire as Britain acquired some former German colonies, further enlarging the Empire, but also changing its nature as they were ruled as mandates, given the discrediting of pre-war imperialism.

However, German influence was only important in the period from the mid 1880's to the peace treaties that ended the First World War, and that influence was largely confined to Africa, particularly West Africa. More important was the influence of Russia and later the Soviet Union. Concerns about Russian and Soviet expansionism and its threat to the Empire were present for much of the period. In the nineteenth century there were concerns about a Russian invasion of India, which caused Britain to invade and occupy Afghanistan in 1879, seeing it as a vital buffer. Protection of India from Russia, its 'jewel in the Crown' was a major concern for Britain and this encouraged British involvement in Egypt and the purchase of the Suez canal shares so that Britain was able to get to India more quickly. Concern about Russian expansion threatening the Empire also encouraged Britain to exclude Russia from the Mediterranean, preventing any moves into the Balkans or the acquisition of a warm-water port and encouraged Britain to acquire Cyprus at the Congress of Berlin. These concerns about Russia's strategic threat declined somewhat with its defeat in 1905 by Japan, but after the 1917 Revolution there were concerns about the spread of communism, and this was an important issue after the Second World War, when both Russian and Chinese influence looked to spread communism to parts of the British empire, such as Malaya and into Africa. Therefore, throughout the period, unlike the short-term impact of Germany, Britain was anxious to maintain control of strategically important colonies to avoid the growth of Russian influence.

Similarly, the influence of France on the Empire was more long-lasting than that of Germany, although it did not lead to the two nations going to war in this period, that had been a feature of earlier periods. However, it did bring the two nations close to conflict at Fashoda in 1898, yet this also led eventually to a resolution of colonial conflicts and helped bring about co-operation that so worried Germany. French acquisition of colonies in Africa in the mid and later nineteenth centuries did increase tensions between the two nations, with both nations attempting to obtain better trade and border agreements, but after the turn of the century co-operation replaced conflict. Therefore, as with German influence the impact was limited to a relatively short period, and unlike Germany, was followed by a period of co-operation. Moreover, unlike Germany, the acquisition of colonies by the French was not seen as economically important or a threat to British trading routes and, unlike the German threat, did not really prompt a British scramble for more land.

The British Empire was also influenced at times by nations such as Japan and the USA. Japanese influence was limited to a short period in the 1930s and 1940s as Britain sought to unsuccessfully protect its far flung Empire in the Pacific from an expansionist Japan and dragged Britain into a conflict in the Pacific to defend its possessions. However, US influence had a far greater impact and over a longer period of time. It was a cause of Britain's participation in the European carve up of the late nineteenth century, but more importantly in the period after the Second World War it played a crucial role in encouraging decolonization, seen most clearly in its support for the Atlantic Charter, which encouraged self-determination, and in events such as Suez. American attitudes and unwillingness to uphold imperialism were therefore important as Britain was no longer able to sustain its overseas commitments without support of powerful nations like the USA. However, particularly in the period after the Second World War the attitude of colonial nations also had a large impact on Britain's Empire. Both British and other nation's colonies began to demand independence from the mother country and this influence spread between colonies and encouraged independence movements that swept Africa and much of the Caribbean in the 1950s and 1960s and encouraged the ending of Empire.

Although rivalry with Germany did have an impact on the British empire, being a factor in the outbreak of the First World War, its influence was much less than that of Russia who played a significant role throughout most of the period. It was Russia that influenced British policy for most of the nineteenth century in Asia and the Mediterranean, whilst other countries did not have such an impact for so long. French influence was limited, despite the rivalry, as it had reached its zenith in the eighteenth century, whilst other nations also had an impact but only for short periods. It was therefore Russia or the Soviet Union that had the greatest impact on the Empire.

Examiner commentary

The answer is focused on the demands of the question and displays a good understanding of change over time to show how the influence of different nations on the Empire varied. The argument is mostly well supported, with some good detailed knowledge of imperial relations with Germany. The response does attempt comparative evaluation of the importance of the different nations and does not simply list the influence of each nation on the Empire, and it is this that helps take the response into the top mark level. Although some issues could have been developed further, it must be remembered that the candidate has only 45 minutes in which to answer the question.

Y321 – The Middle East 1908-2011: Ottomans to Arab Spring

Section A

Evaluate the interpretations in both of the two passages and explain which you think is the more convincing explanation of Nasser's motives in the period from 1955 to 1958.

Medium level response

The two Passages offer different views about Nasser's motives in the period from 1955 to 1958. Passage A argues that Nasser saw that Arab nationalism had a wide appeal and that he could strengthen both his power and his leadership of the Arab world by broadcasting propaganda on the radio. Passage B puts forward the view that Nasser saw Egypt as the focus for resistance to the imperialism of the west and that the Arab League was a western tool. According to this Passage he wanted to create a series of alliances to end 'Western hegemony.' Both Passages agree that Nasser did not want a union with Syria.

According to Passage A Nasser recognized that he could use the appeal of Arab nationalism to strengthen his own position as leader of the Arab world and preserve the power of Egypt. He was able to do this through the radio which allowed his voice to be heard by millions of Arabs who listened to the 'Voice of the Arabs' as radios were set up in cafes and village squares. Passage A sees this development as important because it helped to unify Arab nationalism, with Nasser as its champion because his speeches appealed to all classes. His opposition to western imperialism won him much support across the Arab world, as was seen during the Suez crisis and even in standing up to the west over Israel, although his military actions were not successful. The Passage is correct in stating that he created so much support within the Arab world that only Iraq was able to sign the Baghdad Pact. The Passage is therefore correct to argue that he played a crucial role in the growth of Arab nationalism in the 1950s and that this helped to strengthen his position within Egypt and Egypt's position in the Arab world, which was seen when Syria insisted in uniting with it.

Passage B has a different emphasis and argues that Nasser's main concern was to create anti-western alliance's so their dominance of the region was ended. Nasser believed that Egypt was the centre of resistance to the 'imperialism of the west'. He was opposed to the Arab circle as he believed that it was used by the west to dominate the region. According to the Passage Nasser was concerned about the pro-west views of Nuri al-Said and it was this that drew him into the politics of Arab nationalism. This view is supported by Nasser's diplomacy with the west as he was willing to do anything to remove them, making arms deals with the Czechs and agreements with the USSR. Passage B also suggests reasons why Nasser was opposed to the Arab League and to al-Said. This was because not only both the League and al-Said were pro-west, but also because he was unable to control either. This is supported by the fact that he got Azzam removed as the League's secretary-general and became involved in Arab nationalism to limit the influence of al-Said. Nasser did not want any alliance with the west, and also with the Soviet Union, but instead wanted the Arabs to be able to defend themselves. This led to countries such as India and China supporting his stance and keeping out of the Cold War and led to the establishment of the Non-aligned countries, which first met in 1955.

The passages have different views about the motives of Nasser, with A arguing he promoted nationalism to enhance his own power and the use of radios suggests that is correct. However, B argues that he wanted to distance himself from the west and that is also valid. They also agree in his view about Syria.

Examiner commentary

The response shows an understanding of the views of the passages and is able to explain them. Little knowledge is actually applied directly to the passages, although some is present in the response, it is not really used to evaluate. Much of the attempt to evaluate is based simply on the content of the passages, with limited use of own knowledge as over Suez and Israel, but it is not fully developed or explained. In dealing with Passage B the

comments about Egypt's non-aligned stance is relevant and could have been linked to the Passage but instead the material is simply deployed. The conclusion does not reach a judgement as to which is the most valid, and the response, therefore, has many characteristics of a mid-range answer, with limited application of own knowledge to the Passages.

High level response

The two passages offer different views of Nasser's motives in the period from 1955 to 1958. In Passage A, Scott- Baumann suggests that Nasser saw that Arab nationalism could strengthen both the power of Egypt and his own leadership of the Arab world. Through the use of the radio A claims that Nasser was able to dominate other Arab powers and use this to defy the west. In Passage B, Mansfield claims that Nasser's motive was to end Western dominance, with Egypt as the focus for driving the west out of the area, with other Arab states as potential allies to achieve this. The Passage argues that Nasser was suspicious of the Arab League, which he believed was being used by imperial powers, such as Britain and France. Therefore A argues that Nasser wanted to promote Arab nationalism, but for personal gains, whereas B argues that he was more concerned with driving the west out and using other states to help achieve this, rather than promoting Arab nationalism. Both passages however do agree on the question of Syria and it forcing itself onto Egypt.

Passage A argues that Nasser used the power of radio to win support across the Arab world and this is true because loud speakers were set up in many places outside Egypt to broadcast 'Voice of the Arabs'. The radio was important as it allowed him to dominate the other Arab powers and attack the west. His speeches attracted large audiences across the Arab world, particularly in cities where many had access to radios. Through these speeches he was able to appeal to all classes and across national borders. The Passage is also correct that only Iraq joined the Baghdad Pact as Nasser's pressure helped to create public pressure in Jordan, Lebanon and Syria so that the governments there did not join. The passage is also correct that his signing of an arms deal with the Czechs in September 1955 had a massive impact on the Arab world as it showed that he was able to take an independent stance against the west and purchase the weapons that allowed Egypt to defend itself. This was important as people celebrated on the streets in other Arab countries who saw Nasser as ending western domination, as he also did during the Suez crisis. The Passage is also correct that Nasser was reluctant to form the UAR in 1958, suggesting that his main concern was to strengthen Egypt, not to unite Arabs. He was concerned that the two countries did not have common borders and that they had different economic and political systems. This was a major concern of Nasser and highlights one of the weaknesses of the Passage as it can be argued that Nasser was less concerned with Arab nationalism and more concerned with strengthening and reforming Egypt through his land reforms and reducing the social inequalities within the country. Moreover, it could also be argued that rather than dominating the Arab world and driving out the western, imperial powers, Nasser simply replaced them with Russian influence, taking both arms and money from the Soviet bloc.

Passage B offers a different view and argues that Nasser's main concern was to develop an anti-western stance and that he distrusted Arab nationalism, particularly the Arab Circle and the Arab League. Instead, it argues that his concern was to limit the influence of Iraq and its pro-western ally, Nuri al-Said. The view of Interpretation B is supported by Nasser's attitude to Britain and France over the Suez Canal and his willingness to take aid from Russia, which suggests his main concern was to curb western influence and this is given further support by the way he came to power, overthrowing the pro-western monarchy with a group of young army officers. His dominating desire to simply remove western powers does appear to be valid as he was willing to make deals with Russia, and its satellite states, even if he claimed to be non-aligned. The interpretation also ignores the view that Arab nationalism could be used to curb western influence and Nasser may simply have chosen to ignore it because he could not control the institutions, such as the Arab League, or leaders, such as the pan-Arabist secretary-general Abdul Rahman Azzam.

Passage A therefore stresses the popular appeal of Nasser and his message across the Arab world and that his motive was to develop it, whilst Passage B emphasises Nasser's concern to increase his own power and build up allies to drive out western influence. Certainly his actions suggest that he wanted to drive out western powers, and particularly its ally Israel, and was aware that he needed widespread support, even if it meant Russia, to achieve it given the military weakness of not just Egypt. Passage A, however is less convincing as although Nasser was reluctant to see the creation of the UAR, and he did broadcast across the Arab world, his main concern was to strengthen Egypt, as seen in his economic and social reforms.

Examiner commentary

The response shows a sound understanding of the views offered in the two Passages and is able to explain the differences, but also noticing the similarities in their attitude towards Syria. Own knowledge is used to support and challenge the views offered in both Passages, although, in places there could be more detailed support for some of the claims, and some of the information is drawn from the passages themselves. A judgement is reached and there is some development, but to reach the very top, some more detailed knowledge is needed and the judgement would need to be developed.

Y321 – The Middle East 1908-2011: Ottomans to Arab Spring

Section B

To what extent were the Great Powers successful in achieving their aims in the Middle East in the period from 1908 to 2011.

Medium level response

The Great Powers of Britain, the USA and USSR had a variety of aims in their dealings with the nations and states in the Middle East. These aims changed over the period, although their concerns were to protect their economic and strategic concerns and ensure that they retained or even increased their influence in the area, given the importance of its location and the importance of it as a supplier of the world's oil. However, their success did vary over the period and there were times, such as during the Second World War when their influence, in at least parts of the region, declined.

Britain was able to achieve its aims in the area in the period from 1908 to 1929. This was an important area for Britain because of India and its colonies in the Far East and therefore it was concerned to protect and keep control of the Suez Canal and the Persian Gulf. The discovery of oil in the south of Persia in 1908 increased British interest in the region and it was able to buy a controlling share in the Anglo-Persian Oil Company that was formed to exploit it. The British were also able to increase their influence in the region after the First World War through a series of mandates to govern certain countries until the Arab people were considered ready to govern themselves and therefore gained influence in Palestine, Transjordan and Iraq. However, after 1929 Britain was less successful in its aims in Palestine with the eruption of violence and then in 1936 the outbreak of the Arab rebellion. In suppressing the unrest Britain lost Arab support as they appeared to side with the Jews. Britain was also less successful in achieving its aims in the period after the Second World War, particularly when Nasser nationalized the Suez Canal and British attempts to restore its position through an invasion led to a humiliating withdrawal and resulted in Egypt become more closely aligned with Russia during Nasser's time in power. Maintaining British influence in the region, through military bases, became an increasing problem, particularly in the post imperial period and therefore British influence has declined, even though in recent years it played a significant role in the Gulf Wars to restore Kuwaiti independence and remove Saddam Hussein.

In contrast to Britain's declining influence in the region, which probably reflects its loss of influence throughout the world, the USA has been more successful in achieving its aims. America has been successful in establishing a reliable ally in the region with the establishment of Israel in 1948 and this has meant that throughout the period America has been successful in influencing developments in the region. Throughout the period America has retained the support of Israel and been able to use it to demonstrate the superiority of its ally over Soviet allies. American influence was further increased after the death of Nasser and in the 1960s through its support for coups in both Syria in 1961 and Iraq in 1963. However, some of this success was only short-term as in both states America has been unable to retain its influence with the emergence of dictators, such as Assad and Hussein. Moreover, with the 1979 Iranian Revolution and the establishment of a fundamentalist Islamic regime America has been less successful in its influence in Iran compared with the period when it was ruled by the Shah. America has also found it much harder to retain its influence in the region because of the rise in terrorism and civil unrest, following its involvement in the Gulf Wars. Although it could be argued that the Gulf Wars brought success for America as it ensured its oil supplies by restoring Kuwaiti independence and toppling Saddam Hussein and establishing an alliance with Saudi Arabia, it resulted in America being drawn into a long conflict in the region to establish a stable regime in Iraq, which it has been unable to achieve. However, throughout the period America has been able to maintain the security of its oil supplies with only the occasional short-term threat to its position, but even then it was able to use its power to force Israel to make peace with Egypt in the late 1970s and to sign the Oslo Accords with the PLO in the 1990s. However, America, despite its military might has found it difficult to secure both its strategic and economic interests in much of the region, although it still retains a trusted ally in Israel, although even this makes it more difficult for America in its relationship with other nations in the region. Despite the difficulties, America has achieved its aim of dominance in the region and been able to restrict Russian influence.

Russia had less success in achieving its aims at the start of the period, when it looked to expand into the region at the expense of the declining Ottoman Empire. However, in the post Second World War and Cold War periods the USSR was more successful in achieving its aims. It was able to counter America's aims to dominate the region and secure not only support but also a market for arms sales, particularly to states such as Egypt when it was under Nasser's rule by supplying economic and military aid, but this success was short lived as America replaced it after 1973. The USSR was able to counter American influence in the region by developing close links with the Baathist regime in Syria in the later 1960s and providing support for the Assad regime. However, if the USSR had hoped to spread communist ideas to the region it was far less successful as no communist state was established. The USSR has been less successful in achieving its aims in the region as in many instances America either directly, or through Israel, has been able to exert its power and influence, although Russia has maintained its influence in Syria.

The Great Powers have had variable success in achieving their aims in the period. America has been the most successful as it has maintained oil security for most of the period and has been able to largely dominate the region. The USSR has seen its influence decline and it has been unable to reduce American influence or spread communism, much of its success was short-lived and by 2011 its influence was largely confined to Syria. Britain, although it has been able to maintain its supply of oil has also failed to maintain its initial success with its inability to maintain control over the Suez Canal, although with the loss of the Empire in Asia this was less important, or to control the oilfields in Iraq and Iran, which they had initially done. It is therefore America who has been the most successful of the Great Powers in achieving their aims.

Examiner commentary

The answer adopts a country by country approach which makes it very difficult for the candidate to demonstrate the higher level skill of synthesis. Some of the issues against which success will be judged are identified in the opening paragraph and it would have been more sensible to use those themes as the structure, rather than dealing with each country separately. However, the success or otherwise of the three Great Powers is analysed and the response is aware how these changed over time. The whole period is covered, although more attention could have been given to the earlier period. The argument is supported by relevant material and it arrives at a judgement which follows logically from the response. The awareness of the changing achievements of the Great Powers and the ability to analyse and reach a supported judgement based on the argument take the response to the mid-range.

High level response

The Great Powers of Britain, America, Russia, and for part of the period France had largely similar aims in the Middle East. The Middle East was strategically important, and at the start of the period was crucial for Britain with its Empire in the Far East and India. Trade and economic issues were important throughout the period, particularly with the discovery of oil in the south of Persia in 1908, and all the Great Powers became increasingly anxious to ensure that they secured and protected their supplies. Maintenance of Great Power status also required involvement in the region and all three states attempted to maintain this over some or all of the period. The USA was also concerned, because of domestic pressure to support and uphold the Israeli state and with the start of the Cold War also wanted to limit Soviet influence in the region. On the other hand, the Soviet Union, particularly in the period after the Second World War was anxious to increase its influence in the region and to spread communism. The extent of their success in achieving these aims varied and by 2011 it was the USA who were the closest to achieving their aims, despite a range of challenges.

The strategic aims of the Great Powers were mostly achieved, particularly from a British view at the start of the period and an American view towards the end. The British were concerned to protect its route, which straddled the Middle East, to India and the Far East. It was mostly successful in achieving this as it was able to maintain its control of the Suez Canal until 1956 and therefore move troops to and from India and beyond and also oil, which became increasingly needed for defence. It was not only able to maintain its strategic interest in the region, but as a result of the First World War, was able to increase through gaining Palestine, Transjordan and Iraq as mandates. However, its success ended in 1956 when Nasser nationalized the Suez Canal and British attempts to retake it ended in embarrassment. However, it could be argued that with the loss of Empire in the Far East and India it mattered less. If strategically Britain was less successful in the Middle East over the period, the same was not true of the USA. As with Britain in the latter part of the period the USA's strategic concerns were closely linked to the supply of oil and restricting the USSR's influence in the region, which was made clear in the Eisenhower doctrine of 1957. For most of the period the USA was successful, establishing a reliable ally in Israel after 1948 and also a good relationship with Egypt after the death of Nasser. In particular the USA was successful in maintaining its security in the region despite the Iranian Revolution of 1979 which threatened to spread fundamentalist Islam. America has been successful in securing the shipping lanes for oil during the Iran Iraq war and in maintaining Kuwaiti independence with the First Gulf War. Moreover its strategic interests have been cemented by working with states such as Saudi Arabia and in overthrowing Saddam Hussein in Iraq so that by the end of the period the US was the dominant power in the region and had prevented the spread of communism. On the other hand, the USSR has been less successful in its strategic aims in the region. The USSR was unable to spread communism and attempts to increase its influence have, on whole been short-lived. It was able to gain influence in Egypt whilst Nasser was leader, but this influence collapsed after his death. Only in Syria was the USSR successful in developing its alliance with the Baathist regime and the Assad family. Strategically it has been the USA and Britain who have been the most successful in achieving their aims, but even the USA's position was challenged during the Cold War and by terrorism.

In terms of trade and, in particular oil supplies, Britain and the USA have been the most successful of the Great powers. Throughout most of the period they have been able to secure supplies and at times control of oil in the region. In the early part of the period Britain was successful in controlling trade with its Empire in Asia through its influence over the Suez Canal. It was also successful in exploiting the oil found in Persia, buying a controlling share in the Anglo-Persian Oil Company in 1914 and continued to be partially successful through the Mossadeq coup in 1953. Despite its loss of influence in the region it has been successful in maintaining its supplies other than for short periods, such as the oil embargo of 1973 and in part during the Iraq attack on Kuwait in 1991. However, the USA has also been largely successful in maintaining oil supplies throughout the period. As with Britain, there have been times when they have not been successful, in part because of their support for Israel during the 1973 oil embargo, but this was overcome by pressurizing Israel into making peace with Egypt in the late 1970s and signing the Oslo Peace accords in the 1990s. America has also been successful in protecting its oil supplies during the Iran-Iraq war of 1980-8, when its presence ultimately forced a truce and it was able to protect shipping in the region, similarly through the Gulf war of 1991 and its invasion of Iraq in 2003 it secured this vital supply. Although Russia has been able to gain oil supplies from the region, it has been less successful in forging economic links with the region. During Nasser's rule it did become the chief supplier of economic and military aid to Egypt, which was a great success in terms of increasing its influence in the region, but this was only short-term as America replaced it after the fall of Nasser. Its economic successes have been limited to states such as Syria.

America has also been successful in establishing and supporting the state of Israel, which was particularly important given the strength of the Jewish lobby in America. This was in contrast to Britain, who after 1929 failed to achieve their aims in Palestine and were faced with unrest. America have been particularly successful at using Israel to curb Soviet influence in the region, using its victories in 1967 and 1973 to demonstrate that it was stronger than the Soviet allies of Egypt and Syria. However, support for Israel has not always been successful and America has been forced to exert pressure on the state in order to secure its own supplies following the embargo of 1973 for its support of Israel and Israeli occupation of Palestinian lands. Despite this, support for Israel has maintained American influence in the region and the aid that it provided has ensured it remained a reliable ally throughout the period.

America and Britain have been more successful in achieving their aims than the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union lost influence in the region after the Cold War and, other than in maintaining relations with Syria, its successes have been short-term. On the other hand, despite some short-term problems America, and to some extent Britain, have been more successful in fulfilling their aims. At times instability within some states made this challenging, particularly with the Iranian revolution of 1979 and the behaviour of dictators, but America have had more success in maintaining their influence in the region than the USSR.

Examiner commentary

The scope of the question is immense, but thematic structure allows a response that tackles the key issues to be developed. The opening paragraph sets out clearly the key themes and these provide the basis for the three main paragraphs in the response. The opening also offers a clear view, which is developed and explained throughout the answer. The response ranges across the whole period and covers a good range of states, with precise and relevant examples used to support the argument. At the end of each theme a clear and supported judgement is reached and this is then developed in the conclusion to reach an overall judgement based on the main body of the answer. The thematic approach allows synthesis to be displayed and comparisons, with explanation, are present in every paragraph, with the result that the answer would be awarded a high level.



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

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

OCR Resources: *the small print*

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

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

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

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

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

Copyright © OCR 2015. All rights reserved.

Copyright

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

ocr.org.uk/alevelreform

OCR customer contact centre

General qualifications

Telephone 01223 553998

Facsimile 01223 552627

Email general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

OCR is part of Cambridge Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge. For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored. © OCR 2015 Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England. Registered office 1 Hills Road, Cambridge CB1 2EU. Registered company number 3484466. OCR is an exempt charity.

