



Rewarding Learning

**ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education**

History

Assessment Unit A2 1
Change Over Time

[AHY11]

Assessment

**MARK
SCHEME**

General Marking Instructions

Introduction

The main purpose of the mark scheme is to ensure that papers are marked accurately, consistently and fairly. The mark scheme provides teachers with an indication of the nature and range of students' responses likely to be worthy of credit. It also sets out the criteria which they should apply in allocating marks to students' responses.

Assessment objectives

Below are the assessment objectives for **GCE History**.

Students should be able to:

- AO1** Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.
- AO2** Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.
- AO3** Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Quality of students' responses

In marking the examination papers, teachers should be looking for a quality of response reflecting the level of maturity which may reasonably be expected of a 17 or 18-year-old which is the age at which the majority of candidates sit their GCE examinations.

Flexibility in marking

Mark schemes are not intended to be totally prescriptive. No mark scheme can cover all the responses which students may produce. In the event of unanticipated answers, teachers are expected to use their professional judgement to assess the validity of answers.

Positive marking

Teachers are encouraged to be positive in their marking, giving appropriate credit for what students know, understand and can do rather than penalising students for errors or omissions. Teachers should make use of the whole of the available mark range for any particular question and be prepared to award full marks for a response which is as good as might reasonably be expected of a 17 or 18-year-old GCE candidate.

Awarding zero marks

Marks should only be awarded for valid responses and no marks should be awarded for an answer which is completely incorrect or inappropriate.

Type of mark scheme

Mark schemes for questions which require students to respond in extended written form are marked on the basis of levels of response which take account of the quality of written communication.

Levels of response

In deciding which level of response to award, teachers should look for the 'best fit' bearing in mind that weakness in one area may be compensated for by strength in another. In deciding which mark within a particular level to award to any response, teachers are expected to use their professional judgement.

The following guidance is provided to assist teachers.

- **Threshold performance:** Response which just merits inclusion in the level and should be awarded a mark at or near the bottom of the range.
- **Intermediate performance:** Response which clearly merits inclusion in the level and should be awarded a mark at or near the middle of the range.
- **High performance:** Response which fully satisfies the level description and should be awarded a mark at or near the top of the range.

Quality of written communication

Quality of written communication is taken into account in assessing students' responses to all questions that require them to respond in extended written form. These questions are marked on the basis of levels of response. The description for each level of response includes reference to the quality of written communication.

For conciseness, quality of written communication is distinguished within levels of response as follows:

Level 1: Quality of written communication is basic.

Level 2: Quality of written communication is satisfactory.

Level 3: Quality of written communication is good.

Level 4: Quality of written communication is of a high standard.

In interpreting these level descriptions, teachers should refer to the more detailed guidance provided below:

Level 1 (Basic): The student makes only a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 (Satisfactory): The student makes a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 (Good): The student makes a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 (High Standard): The student successfully selects and uses the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high degree of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

General guidance for Teachers marking A2 1

1. Do not be afraid to award maximum marks at the top of Level 4 for an excellent response.
2. Reward evidence and analysis which is valid and plausible but does not appear in the mark scheme.
3. Do not let the existence of a mistake or inaccuracy prevent you from awarding the maximum mark in the appropriate level. While mistakes cannot receive any credit, the existence of an error should not prejudice you against the rest of what could be a perfectly valid answer.
4. The mark you award should be determined by the level descriptors. When you have decided which of the four levels is most appropriate for the answer, start in the middle of that level and make a judgement about whether it should remain in the middle or deserves to be placed closer to the top or bottom of the level.

General Assessment Criteria

1. In Unit A21 students answer a synoptic essay covering a period of approximately 100 years. Students are required to demonstrate **breadth** of historical knowledge and understanding by ranging comprehensively across the period of study as a whole. Students should make links and comparisons which are properly developed and analysed. Students' knowledge and understanding should come from more than one perspective and they should demonstrate understanding of the connections or interrelationship between these perspectives.
2. Typical A21 essays require students to assess or evaluate a statement or a quotation, discussing both sides of the argument. Answers should focus in some depth on the proposition – at least a third of the response should be on the proposition raised in the question. They should also put forward evidence which refutes the proposition, supporting their arguments with relevant evidence and drawing logical conclusions based on it.
3. **However**, since students only have one hour 15 minutes to write an essay on a period of 100 years, they should **not** be expected to provide detailed supporting evidence across the whole period. Bear in mind that students will have to be very selective in the evidence they deploy. Students should **not** be penalised for the omission of a particular event (unless, of course, it is the proposition of the essay). You should not have a list of points that you want to see in the responses – this is not a check-list exercise. The idea is to reward students who consistently engage with the question, deploying appropriate evidence to support their arguments across the period.
4. Reward answers which are clearly structured. Students are expected to include an introduction and a conclusion. No interpretations are required. If students provide relevant quotations or refer to schools of thought, they should receive credit in the same way as other forms of evidence.
5. Quality of written communication is assessed in these questions. In the event of a student displaying very good or very poor written communication, you may adjust the mark but only within the same Level. Occasional grammatical mistakes and spelling errors should be overlooked.
6. While students will be expected to range across the period of study as a whole, they should not be penalised for omitting periods which have little or no bearing on the question. For example, students taking Option 5 should not be expected to mention the regime of either Andropov or Chernenko.

Specific advice relating to different options

Option 1

Although this option focuses on Crown and Parliament in the period 1625–1714, students are not required to study the Interregnum (1649–1660).

Option 2

In assessing essay questions on the option 'Ireland under the Union 1800–1900', teachers should bear in mind that there is more to say about some aspects of the content than others – for example, the period after O'Connell and before Butt.

Option 3

Students should not be expected to provide detailed supporting evidence relating to all of the wars which took place in Europe in the period 1848–1945 in order to access top mark levels.

Option 4

While students are required to demonstrate breadth of historical knowledge, they should, of course, not be expected to mention all 18 US Presidents who held the office between 1901 and 2000. In their answers, students should concentrate on those presidents who are most relevant to the question asked.

Option 5

In Option 5 questions focus on the period 1917–1991. While it is acceptable for answers to focus more on Soviet foreign policy than that of the Western governments, it is not acceptable for responses to focus exclusively or heavily on Soviet policy. There has to be a reasonable balance to access the higher mark levels. Answers which focus exclusively on Soviet foreign policy should not be awarded above top Level 2; responses which provide an excellent analysis of Soviet policy but contain relatively little explanation and analysis of the policy of Western governments should be awarded a maximum of top Level 3.

Option 1: Crown and Parliament in England 1625–1714

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Answer **either** Question 1 or Question 2.

- 1 “The reign of Charles II (1660–1685) transformed the relationship between Crown and Parliament more than any other reign in the period 1625–1714.” To what extent would you accept this verdict?

Synoptic Assessment

Examiners should assess the candidate’s ability to draw together knowledge and skills in order to demonstrate overall historical understanding. Candidates’ answers should demonstrate breadth of historical knowledge and understanding by ranging comprehensively across the period of study as a whole. They should make links and comparisons which are properly developed and analysed and thus indicate understanding of the process of historical change. The knowledge and understanding of the subject should come from more than one perspective – political or cultural or economic – and there should be understanding demonstrated of the connections or interrelationship between these perspectives.

This question targets AO1: the candidate’s ability to demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[10])

Answers at this level may recall some accurate knowledge and display understanding of mainly one part of the period and one perspective. The answer will be characterised throughout by limited accuracy and a lack of clarity. Answers may provide a descriptive narrative of events. There will be few links and comparisons made between different parts of the period. Answers will be mainly a series of unsubstantiated assertions with little analysis of whether Charles II’s reign transformed the relationship between Crown and Parliament more than any other reign in the period 1625–1714. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([11]–[20])

Answers at this level may recall and deploy knowledge which draws from examples across the period. The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy and at times lack clarity. The answer will provide some explanation, though at times will lapse into narrative. Links and comparisons will be made but these will not be fully developed or analysed. Answers will contain some unsubstantiated assertions but also arguments which are appropriately developed and substantiated about whether Charles II’s reign transformed the relationship between Crown and Parliament more than any other reign in the period 1625–1714. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation,

spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Level 3 ([21]–[30])

Answers at this level will recall and deploy knowledge accurately, drawing from all parts of the period with clarity and focus. Answers provide focused explanations and make links and comparisons which are developed and analysed, indicating an understanding of the process of historical change. Arguments are developed, substantiated, illustrated and reach a judgement about whether Charles II's reign transformed the relationship between Crown and Parliament more than any other reign in the period 1625–1714. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([31]–[40])

Answers at this level will demonstrate accurate recall of knowledge from across the period studied with clarity and precision. Answers will provide detailed and focused insightful explanations, drawing on actions, events, issues or perspectives across the period, and there is an excellent understanding of the connections or interrelationships between these. A judgement is reached using arguments that are fully developed, illustrated and substantiated about whether Charles II's reign transformed the relationship between Crown and Parliament more than any other reign in the period 1625–1714. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high standard of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Indicative Content

(a) Charles II 1660–1685

Charles II inherited virtually the same powers as Charles I, although the reforms of the 'Constitutional Revolution' remained in place. Given that his father had been executed, and he had spent his formative years in exile, it was a remarkable comeback. It is arguable that the Restoration Settlement saw the King transform his relationship with Parliament by enhancing the position of the monarchy. His loyal Cavalier Parliament passed a series of censorial and protective Bills which lessened the likelihood of Charles II facing as much opposition as his father. A revised Triennial Act weakened the Act of 1641, stating that the King only 'ought' to call parliament. The Militia Act reasserted the Crown's sole right to control the armed forces and the power and stability of the monarchy was further enhanced by the alliance of gentry, Crown and the church created by the Clarendon Code. The strength of the King's position is evident in Charles II's ability to survive the Exclusion Crisis, although this incident also reveals the extent of the damage to the Crown's relationship with Parliament by the end of the 1670s. During his brief period of Personal Rule, Charles II created a strong Tory alliance and left his brother a stronger and more stable throne than he himself had inherited. However, his Declarations of Indulgence and links with France had also increased fears of Catholicism and absolutism.

(b) Charles I 1625–1649

By 1629, Charles I had alienated Parliament through his foreign policy failures and money-raising methods, culminating in the Petition of Right of 1628. Although Parliament never met during the King's Personal Rule, it was to have a damaging impact upon their relationship, as Charles I's abuse of his prerogative financial devices, changes to the church and the closed court all contributed to perceptions by the gentry of the King's growing Catholicism and absolutism. The Constitutional Revolution represented a significant transformation in the relationship, as Parliament was able to restrict the King's prerogative powers and increase the scope and regularity of its role in government. Despite these changes, many of the major parliamentary reforms never made the statute books and the Crown retained most of its major prerogative powers. The two Civil Wars illustrate the extent to which the relationship between Crown and Parliament had broken down and were to have a long-term impact upon the English political, social and religious world. It could be argued that the execution of Charles I represented the ultimate victory of Parliament. However, Charles I was not executed by the Long Parliament but by the Rump, and the restoration of his son in 1660 suggests that it was an attack upon the person of Charles rather than the institution of monarchy. It could be argued that the relationship had been completely transformed but only temporarily.

(c) James II 1685–1688

Although James II may have been aiming primarily to secure religious and political toleration for Catholics, his actions were interpreted as a deliberate attempt to forcibly convert England and establish an absolute monarchy. Despite inheriting a strong political and financial position, James quickly alienated his Tory supporters in Parliament by maintaining a standing army and using his dispensing power to promote Catholic officers. By the end of 1685 he had already prorogued Parliament and it would never meet again during his brief reign. Establishing the Court of Ecclesiastical Commission and issuing two Declarations of Indulgence were perceived as an attack on the Anglican Church and his subsequent 'wooing' of the Dissenters only succeeded in uniting his opponents against him. While the prerogatives of the monarchy were not directly changed by the events of James II's reign, it was his abuse of these powers that led to the Glorious Revolution and the creation of a new settlement between Crown and Parliament.

(d) William and Mary 1688–1702

The relationship between Crown and Parliament was transformed by the events of the Glorious Revolution and the settlement which followed. Parliament was integral in the creation of a joint Protestant monarchy and, through the Coronation Oath, Bill of Rights and revised financial arrangements, its role and status were increased. Despite these changes, it could be argued that the relationship had not been revolutionised and the monarchy's position remained dominant. Indeed, the new monarchs had agreed to the terms of their coronation and it was William who had insisted on a joint monarchy. The most significant transformation in the relationship came as a result of the 'King's War' in Europe, which enabled the creation of a partnership in government. A revised Triennial Act and the establishment of the Commission of Accounts, Civil List and Bank of England secured Parliament a more regular and influential role. However, arguably a 'working relationship' had existed back in 1625. Furthermore, the Crown still retained the most important prerogative powers, including the right to

choose ministers, determine foreign policy and call, dissolve and prorogue parliament.

(e) Anne 1702–1714

Queen Anne continued the co-operative relationship between Crown and Parliament. The lengthy War of the Spanish Succession left Anne in financial difficulty and it was in her interest to appoint ministers who could work effectively with Parliament. Her reign was more notable for conflict between political parties than between Crown and Parliament. The Union between England and Scotland in 1707 resulted in an increase in the size of Parliament, making it even more important. Parliament now met every year and was a permanent part of government. It also effectively controlled the income of the Crown.

Any other valid material will be awarded appropriately.

[40]

40

AVAILABLE
MARKS

- 2 “The emergence of political parties was the most important factor in changing the power and position of Parliament in the period 1625–1714.”
How far would you agree with this assessment?

Synoptic Assessment

Examiners should assess the candidate’s ability to draw together knowledge and skills in order to demonstrate overall historical understanding. Candidates’ answers should demonstrate breadth of historical knowledge and understanding by ranging comprehensively across the period of study as a whole. They should make links and comparisons which are properly developed and analysed and thus indicate understanding of the process of historical change. The knowledge and understanding of the subject should come from more than one perspective – political or cultural or economic – and there should be understanding demonstrated of the connections or interrelationship between these perspectives.

This question targets AO1: the candidate’s ability to demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[10])

Answers at this level may recall some accurate knowledge and display understanding of mainly one part of the period and one perspective. The answer will be characterised throughout by limited accuracy and a lack of clarity. Answers may provide a descriptive narrative of events. There will be few links and comparisons made between different parts of the period. Answers will be mainly a series of unsubstantiated assertions with little analysis of whether the emergence of political parties was the most important factor in changing the power and position of Parliament in the period 1625–1714. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([11]–[20])

Answers at this level may recall and deploy knowledge which draws from examples across the period. The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy and at times lack clarity. The answer will provide some explanation, though at times will lapse into narrative. Links and comparisons will be made but these will not be fully developed or analysed. Answers will contain some unsubstantiated assertions but also arguments which are appropriately developed and substantiated about whether the emergence of political parties was the most important factor in changing the power and position of Parliament in the period 1625–1714. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([21]–[30])

Answers at this level will recall and deploy knowledge accurately, drawing from all parts of the period with clarity and focus. Answers provide focused explanations and make links and comparisons which are developed and analysed, indicating an understanding of the process of historical change. Arguments are developed, substantiated, illustrated and reach a judgement about whether the emergence of political parties was the most important factor in changing the power and position of Parliament in the period 1625–1714. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([31]–[40])

Answers at this level will demonstrate accurate recall of knowledge from across the period studied with clarity and precision. Answers will provide detailed and focused insightful explanations, drawing on actions, events, issues or perspectives across the period, and there is an excellent understanding of the connections or interrelationships between these. A judgement is reached using arguments that are fully developed, illustrated and substantiated about whether the emergence of political parties was the most important factor in changing the power and position of Parliament in the period 1625–1714. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high standard of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Indicative Content**(a) The emergence of political parties**

The emergence of the Whigs and Tories during the reign of Charles II signalled a significant shift in the power and position of Parliament. Although the exclusion of James II was the issue which initially helped to shape these ‘parties’, they had more clearly defined identities and beliefs by the end of the period. During his short period of Personal Rule, Charles II pursued a campaign to promote loyal Tories, at the expense of the Whigs, in local government. As a result, James II inherited a packed Tory Parliament in 1685. Although his pro-Catholic policies united the Whigs and Tories, divisions were to be exposed again during the reign of William and Mary. The Triennial Act and the emergence of a free press to debate political issues furthered the development of party politics. Increasingly, the Crown sought to appoint ministers who could work effectively with Parliament. Although the position of Prime Minister did not emerge until the reign of George I, Queen Anne relied on ‘managers’ such as Godolphin, Churchill and Harley, who tended to side with a particular political party in order to further the Crown’s policies. Although Anne retained and used her extensive personal powers, she needed to work with either the Whigs or Tories to govern effectively.

(b) Clashes over foreign policy

Parliament placed restrictions upon the expeditions of Buckingham and openly criticised their failure. Under Charles II, failures in the expensive war with the Dutch drew criticism from Parliament, although his most contentious action was signing the Treaty of Dover with France. These

links with absolutist France increased during the reign of James II. Even though William accepted limitations imposed by Parliament in 1688 in order to remove James II, the key factor in the transformation of the relationship between Crown and Parliament during the reign of William and Mary was the outbreak of war in Europe. The King was willing to accept a financial revolution and constitutional restrictions as the cost of pursuing his war with Louis XIV. Arguably, it was not conflict over foreign policy but rather agreement which led to the enhanced inter-dependence of Crown and Parliament. Queen Anne also faced a long and extensive war with France, furthering the need for her ministers to maintain a working relationship with Parliament. However, the War of the Spanish Succession was ultimately to prove politically divisive and, as the expensive war progressed, the Tories emerged as the 'Peace Party'.

(c) Clashes over finance

In 1640 Parliament was able to use the financial weakness of Charles I to make him accept some of its demands in the Constitutional Revolution. Although Charles II enjoyed a stronger financial position than his father, he was forced to suspend repayments in the Stop of the Exchequer in 1672 and was saved by Parliament after promising to withdraw the Declaration of Indulgence. The financial revolution which followed the Glorious Revolution paved the way for the emergence of a constitutional monarchy and rendered the changes in the Crown-Parliament relationship irreversible. The creation of a Public Accounts Commission and Civil List helped to develop a greater level of trust as Parliament had become a regular and necessary part of the administration. Anne, like William, faced the financial challenge of a huge European war and thus the need for a co-operative Parliament. Candidates may note that arguably Parliament had always used its financial muscle to influence the monarchy; for example, in the 1620s it had refused to finance the wars of Charles I without some means of holding advisers like Buckingham accountable.

(d) Clashes over religion

During the Personal Rule of Charles I, the Laudian reforms in the church and the influence of Henrietta Maria at Court resulted in attempts by Parliament, in the Constitutional Revolution, to restrict the perceived Catholic threat. The resulting Civil Wars had a religious element and saw the emergence of dissenters in the army. While the execution of Charles I was not solely due to religious issues, Puritan leaders were at the forefront of the decision to kill the King and directly challenge the whole concept of the Divine Right of Kings. Although the Clarendon Code helped to restore the church and state partnership, the reign of Charles II saw clashes with Parliament over his Declaration of Indulgence and links with France. Opposition culminated in the attempt to exclude James from the throne. James II's pro-Catholic policies directly led to his downfall in the Glorious Revolution. Religion continued to be a contentious issue in the reigns of William and Mary as well as Anne.

(e) Key events

Candidates may alternatively choose to compare the importance of the emergence of political parties with key events during the period 1625–1714. The Constitutional Revolution saw Parliament increase its influence by restricting the prerogative powers of the monarchy, even if not all of its aims were achieved. The execution of King Charles I in 1649 transformed

the position of Parliament by removing the Crown entirely. However, it struggled to find a working political settlement and, arguably, it was the army which had gained most power by removing the King. The Restoration confirmed that the monarchy was far from dead and Charles II was restored to a position of strength. The Glorious Revolution marked a significant advancement in the power and position of Parliament and this was enhanced considerably during the Nine Years' War. The War of the Spanish Succession cemented the dependence of the monarchy upon the finance provided by a regular Parliament.

Any other valid material will be awarded appropriately.

[40]

Option 1

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

40

40

Option 2: Ireland Under the Union 1800–1900

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Answer **either** Question 1 or Question 2.

- 1 “Daniel O’Connell was the only political leader in Ireland who achieved any significant successes in the nineteenth century.” To what extent would you accept this verdict on political developments in Ireland between 1800 and 1900?

Synoptic Assessment

Examiners should assess the candidate’s ability to draw together knowledge and skills to demonstrate overall historical understanding. Candidates’ answers should demonstrate breadth of historical knowledge and understanding by ranging comprehensively across the period of study as a whole. They should make links and comparisons which are properly developed and analysed and thus indicate understanding of the process of historical change. The knowledge and understanding of the subject should come from more than one perspective – political or cultural or economic – and there should be understanding demonstrated of the connections or interrelationship between these perspectives.

This question targets AO1: the candidate’s ability to demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[10])

Answers at this level may recall some accurate knowledge and display understanding of mainly one part of the period and one perspective. The answer will be characterised throughout by limited accuracy and a lack of clarity. Answers may provide a descriptive narrative of events. There will be few links and comparisons made between different parts of the period. Answers will be mainly a series of unsubstantiated assertions with little analysis of whether Daniel O’Connell was the only political leader in Ireland who achieved any significant successes in the nineteenth century. Other political leaders may not be discussed. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([11]–[20])

Answers at this level may recall and deploy knowledge which draws from examples across the period. The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy and at times lack clarity. The answer will provide some explanation, though at times will lapse into narrative. Links and comparisons will be made but these will not be fully developed or analysed. Answers will contain some unsubstantiated assertions but also arguments which are appropriately developed and substantiated about whether Daniel O’Connell was the only political leader in Ireland who achieved any significant successes in the nineteenth century. O’Connell may be dealt with in a basic way and some other notable political leaders may be introduced at this level. Candidates make a reasonable

selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([21]–[30])

Answers at this level will recall and deploy knowledge accurately, drawing from all parts of the period with clarity and focus. Answers provide focused explanations and make links and comparisons which are developed and analysed, indicating an understanding of the process of historical change. Arguments are developed, substantiated, illustrated and reach a judgement on whether Daniel O’Connell was the only political leader in Ireland who achieved any significant successes in the nineteenth century. Several key political leaders should be discussed at this level. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([31]–[40])

Answers at this level will demonstrate accurate recall of knowledge from across the period studied with clarity and precision. Answers will provide detailed and focused insightful explanations, drawing on actions, events, issues or perspectives across the period, and there is an excellent understanding of the connections or interrelationships between these. A judgement is reached using arguments that are fully developed, illustrated and substantiated about whether Daniel O’Connell was the only political leader in Ireland who achieved any significant successes in the nineteenth century. A range of political leaders should be discussed at this level, including constitutional and revolutionary nationalists, as well as unionists. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high standard of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Indicative Content

(a) Daniel O’Connell was undoubtedly one of the key political leaders of the nineteenth century in Ireland and he did achieve significant successes.

O’Connell’s creation of the Catholic Association and the tactics he employed could be discussed as a way of illustrating his success. His utilisation of the power, influence and backing of the Catholic Church to mobilise mass support could be cited as another success. Candidates may go on to debate the degree of success Catholic Emancipation delivered and could discuss how it was more of a symbolic victory. O’Connell was not as successful, however, with the Lichfield House Compact and his campaign for Repeal. He was ultimately frustrated and outmanoeuvred by the British in the alliance with the Whigs and was forced to call off the agreement, but there had been some reforms which could be regarded as successful. The Repeal campaign sought to repeat the tactics and the type of organisation used with Emancipation. This led to O’Connell being outmanoeuvred again by Peel until the whole movement was abandoned with little significant success. Candidates may conclude that, whilst O’Connell did experience some astounding successes, his career also contained a significant amount of failure.

(b) Other leaders of constitutional nationalism also experienced success at different points of the nineteenth century.

Henry Grattan's success was more apparent retrospectively and he became a significant nationalist figure whom others followed, but his achievements were limited by the strengths of the British governments he faced. Isaac Butt was a capable man but a poor politician and leader. He was viewed retrospectively as the originator of Home Rule but failed to make an impact at Westminster and was ultimately sidelined and replaced by younger, more radical Irish Parliamentary Party (IPP) politicians such as Charles Parnell. The massive victory of the IPP in the 1885 general election showed the degree of Parnell's success. His ability to mobilise mass popular support and his association with the Land League and Davitt led to the New Departure of 1879, which brought together mass popular support, the endorsement of the Catholic Church and co-operation with some of the more radical elements of nationalism. Successes were soon apparent such as the Land Act of 1881 and the Arrears Act of 1882. However, Parnell did not experience complete success. Whilst Home Rule was introduced into Parliament in 1886, it ultimately failed to pass even in the Commons. The Catholic Church was lukewarm in its support and this ultimately cost Parnell his support base after the O'Shea scandal, leading to his rejection by Gladstone, his own party and the masses, ultimately bringing about his failure.

(c) There were also leaders within revolutionary nationalism who achieved some successes.

Robert Emmet suffered the failure of his rebellion but experienced a measure of posthumous success, becoming hailed as a great nationalist hero and an example for future nationalists. Young Ireland, led by Smith O'Brien, again experienced the failure of its rebellion but its leaders similarly came to be viewed as nationalist martyrs and an example for successive generations, although maybe not to the same degree as Emmet. The Fenians suffered problems of leadership under Stephens between the Irish and American elements of the organisation and this weakened them significantly, contributing again to the failure of their rebellion. But they did give the British a significant scare, enough to lead to Gladstone's renewed legislation for Ireland. Candidates could point to this as a success.

(d) There were also leaders within unionism who achieved some successes.

Candidates could comment on the support enjoyed by Ulster and Southern unionists and regard this as a success. Ulster unionists, due to sheer demographics, enjoyed mass support and had no problem mobilising it due to their numerical advantage in the north. The number of organisations, such as the Ulster Loyal and Patriotic Union and the Ulster Defence Union, were also a sign of success in the north, where unionism enjoyed a strong majority. Southern unionists were able to exert their influence in the House of Lords, as well as use their considerable financial power to back their defence of the union; these were advantages not possessed in the same way by their northern counterparts and again could be seen as a success of sorts. Regarding key individuals, the quality of leadership could be discussed, with men like Cooke, Saunderson and Sinclair able to mobilise support in the north. While Southern unionists such as Lansdowne and Midleton were key figures, arguably they could not inspire the same kind of following as their Ulster counterparts, although they could bring their influence to bear at Westminster. Again, responses could comment on the degree of success

compared to O'Connell.

Any other valid material will be awarded appropriately.

[40]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

40

- 2 “Despite the strengths of some Irish political movements in the nineteenth century, British governments were the truly dominant political force.” How far would you agree with this verdict on political developments in Ireland in the period 1800–1900?

Synoptic Assessment

Examiners should assess the candidate’s ability to draw together knowledge and skills in order to demonstrate overall historical understanding. Candidates’ answers should demonstrate breadth of historical knowledge and understanding by ranging comprehensively across the period of study as a whole. They should make links and comparisons which are properly developed and analysed and thus indicate understanding of the process of historical change. The knowledge and understanding of the subject should come from more than one perspective – political or cultural or economic – and there should be understanding demonstrated of the connections or interrelationship between these perspectives.

This question targets AO1: the candidate’s ability to demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[10])

Answers at this level may recall some accurate knowledge and display understanding of mainly one part of the period and one perspective. The answer will be characterised throughout by limited accuracy and a lack of clarity. Answers may provide a descriptive narrative of events. There will be few links and comparisons made between different parts of the period. Answers will be mainly a series of unsubstantiated assertions with little analysis of whether British governments were the truly dominant political force in Ireland in the nineteenth century. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([11]–[20])

Answers at this level may recall and deploy knowledge which draws from examples across the period. The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy and at times lack clarity. The answer will provide some explanation, though at times will lapse into narrative. Links and comparisons will be made but these will not be fully developed or analysed. Answers will contain some unsubstantiated assertions but also arguments which are appropriately developed and substantiated about whether British governments were the truly dominant political force in Ireland in the nineteenth century. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([21]–[30])

Answers at this level will recall and deploy knowledge accurately, drawing from all parts of the period with clarity and focus. Answers provide focused explanations and make links and comparisons which are developed and analysed, indicating an understanding of the process of historical change. Arguments are developed, substantiated, illustrated and reach a judgement about whether British governments were the truly dominant political force in Ireland in the nineteenth century. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([31]–[40])

Answers at this level will demonstrate accurate recall of knowledge from across the period studied with clarity and precision. Answers will provide detailed and focused insightful explanations, drawing on actions, events, issues or perspectives across the period, and there is an excellent understanding of the connections or interrelationships between these. A judgement is reached using arguments that are fully developed, illustrated and substantiated about whether British governments were the truly dominant political force in Ireland in the nineteenth century. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high standard of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Indicative Content**(a) It could be strongly argued that there were dominant Irish political movements in the first half of the nineteenth century.**

Daniel O’Connell’s rise to dominance was remarkable in the 1820s with the formation of the Catholic Association. He forced his presence and the issue of Emancipation on the British government and so clearly dominated the decade. The way in which he manipulated Wellington’s government over the Emancipation issue could be cited to illustrate how dominant O’Connell was at this time. However, a strong counter-argument could also be made to support the proposition, pointing out that Peel and Wellington placed so many limitations on the Emancipation Bill of 1829, including increasing the franchise qualification, thus ensuring that they had the final say and were therefore the truly dominant political force. The British government had bowed to the pressure of O’Connell’s movement but ultimately it controlled the outcome. O’Connell’s years in the Lichfield House Compact proved less fruitful and ultimately forced him into a campaign to Repeal the Union. The failure of the Lichfield House Compact would again back up the proposition as the Whigs gained far more from the arrangement than O’Connell ever did, and he suffered some loss of reputation and support. When he embarked on the campaign for the Repeal of the Union, O’Connell enjoyed less support but still dominated the political landscape through his monster meetings. Despite its ultimate repression by Peel, constitutional nationalism had again risen to prominence in the political scene of the 1840s. However, Peel’s successful reading of the situation and his eventual political defeat of the Repeal movement again lends weight to the proposition in the question.

(b) Candidates could also argue in support of the proposition with regard to revolutionary nationalists in the first half of the nineteenth century.

Despite the political and military failure of both Emmet's rebellion of 1803 and the Young Ireland Rebellion of 1848, both movements developed significance in terms of their legacy as the century progressed. Emmet's speech from the dock became a rallying call for future nationalists, as did the romantic failure of the rebels of 1848. Young Ireland also promoted the belief in a cultural as well as political form of nationalism which slowly gathered momentum over the remaining decades of the century. However, despite these limited successes, the British governments were so successful in suppressing these attempts at armed rebellion that it is difficult to disagree with the proposition regarding revolutionary nationalists in the first half of the century.

(c) The latter half of the nineteenth century saw the rise again of a revolutionary force in the Fenians and their attempted rebellion of 1867.

The Fenian Rising of 1867 was the most serious revolutionary threat faced by the British in the century, showing that revolutionary nationalism was still a powerful force as late as the 1860s. As with previous attempts at armed insurrection, the Fenians were easily defeated by the British but the fact that their strategy had changed and they had taken their activities to England caused panic amongst the British public and parliament. It could be claimed that fear over their tactics led Gladstone to introduce his reforms which went some way to resolving some of Ireland's traditional problems. It could be argued that this showed the dominance of the British government over affairs at that time. However, the Fenians were never successfully repressed by the British, continuing in many guises for several decades and becoming arch-infiltrators of almost every future nationalist organisation. This strategy perhaps reached its peak under the New Departure and the preceding land agitation of Michael Davitt, showing again that an argument could indeed be made as to the dominance of the Fenians in the later nineteenth century.

(d) The rise of constitutional nationalism under the Irish Parliamentary Party (IPP), and especially Parnell, could also be used to show the dominance of an Irish political movement.

Parnell's oratory and his relationship with Davitt bridged the gap between the revolutionary and constitutional traditions. Parnell's dominance as a leader, coupled with his harnessing of public support to win huge victories in the election of 1885, forced Gladstone to accommodate him. Responses could argue that Parnell's dominance of not only the IPP, but also the House of Commons, holding as he did the balance of power after 1885, proves again that constitutional nationalism was still dominating politics as late as 1890. Parnell's spectacular fall from grace and eventual death would, however, send constitutional nationalism into decline for the rest of the century.

(e) Unionism also played its part in the nineteenth century, although it was arguably less dominant.

Unionism did not really rise to prominence until the threat posed by the growing momentum of the Home Rule movement in the 1880s. Its leaders such as Cooke, Saunderson, Midleton and Lansdowne were able to articulate unionist fears into campaigns that gave rise to a range of organisations such as the Ulster Defence Union (UDU) and the Irish Loyal

& Patriotic Union (ILPU). A combination of the political influence wielded by Southern unionists, especially in the House of Lords, coupled with the more violent rhetoric of Ulster unionists secure in their majority in the northernmost province, meant that unionists collectively were able to threaten and cajole the British into defeating Home Rule. This shows a temporary dominance of Irish affairs at this time and meant that for approximately the last quarter of the nineteenth century, unionism could be said to have been the dominant political force as it ultimately defeated constitutional nationalism. The accuracy of the claim that British governments were the dominant political force of the nineteenth century could therefore be debated.

(f) The role of the British government should be considered in this period to argue in favour of the proposition.

The British government was successful in putting down the immediate Fenian threat in the aftermath of 1867 and Gladstone's reforms ultimately helped to reduce the appeal of revolutionary nationalists in Ireland, showing that a British government, with the right Prime Minister, could legislate in Ireland's best interests. Gladstone did become the dominant figure in Irish politics in the latter half of the century. The four occasions on which he held the premiership help to prove this. Even though his conversion to Home Rule and support for Irish grievances split the Liberal Party time and again, it was always forced to have him return, such was his popularity and, as such, Gladstone was able to pursue his agenda intermittently yet consistently from the 1860s until the 1890s. This would suggest that Gladstone and his governments were the dominant force in the latter stages of the century.

Any other valid material will be awarded appropriately.

[40]

Option 2

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

40

40

Answer **either** Question 1 or Question 2.

- 1 “The desire to gain territory was the main cause of the wars fought in Europe between 1848 and 1945.” How far would you accept this verdict?

Synoptic Assessment

Examiners should assess the candidate’s ability to draw together knowledge and skills in order to demonstrate overall historical understanding. Candidates’ answers should demonstrate breadth of historical knowledge and understanding by ranging comprehensively across the period of study as a whole. They should make links and comparisons which are properly developed and analysed and thus indicate understanding of the process of historical change. The knowledge and understanding of the subject should come from more than one perspective – political or cultural or economic – and there should be understanding demonstrated of the connections or interrelationship between these perspectives.

This question targets AO1: the candidate’s ability to demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[10])

Answers at this level may recall some accurate knowledge and display understanding of mainly one part of the period and one perspective. The answer will be characterised throughout by limited accuracy and a lack of clarity. Answers may provide a descriptive narrative of events. There will be few links and comparisons made between different parts of the period. Answers will be mainly a series of unsubstantiated assertions with little analysis of whether the desire to gain territory was the main cause of the wars fought in Europe between 1848 and 1945. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([11]–[20])

Answers at this level may recall and deploy knowledge which draws from examples across the period. The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy and at times lack clarity. The answer will provide some explanation, though at times will lapse into narrative. Links and comparisons will be made but these will not be fully developed or analysed. Answers will contain some unsubstantiated assertions but also arguments which are appropriately developed and substantiated about whether the desire to gain territory was the main cause of the wars fought in Europe between 1848 and 1945, possibly concentrating on only one or two wars. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([21]–[30])

Answers at this level will recall and deploy knowledge accurately, drawing from all parts of the period with clarity and focus. Answers provide focused explanations and make links and comparisons which are developed and analysed, indicating an understanding of the process of historical change. Arguments are developed, substantiated, illustrated and reach a judgement about whether the desire to gain territory was the main cause of the wars which broke out in Europe between 1848 and 1945. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([31]–[40])

Answers at this level will demonstrate accurate recall of knowledge from across the period studied with clarity and precision. Answers will provide detailed and focused insightful explanations, drawing on actions, events, issues or perspectives across the period, and there is an excellent understanding of the connections or interrelationships between these. A judgement is reached using arguments that are fully developed, illustrated and substantiated about whether the desire to gain territory was the main cause of the wars fought in Europe between 1848 and 1945. At this level there will be consideration of other causes, and an appropriate conclusion drawn. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high standard of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Indicative Content

The desire to gain territory was indeed a main cause of the wars fought in Europe between 1848 and 1945. This desire for territory was often simply an urge to expand the homeland, but could also be linked with nationalism. Economic needs sometimes played an important role, such as when Germany sought to expand eastwards for raw materials and markets in the 1930s. The best responses will note not only instances where the basic desire to gain more territory caused war, but also show an awareness that other factors could also lead to war.

- (a) The Crimean War (1853–1856) was, arguably, the result of a continuing campaign by Russia to acquire territory alongside the western coast of the Black Sea, with the long-term aim of control of the Straits. The North Italian War in 1859 was caused by Piedmontese ambitions to unite the northern part of Italy under its control, thus gaining additional territory, while its ally France fought partly to gain Nice and Savoy.
- (b) The Wars of German Unification offer further examples of the desire to gain territory. In 1864, Denmark sought greater control over the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein, but Prussia, the eventual victors, also coveted them. The Seven Weeks' War was declared by Austria to maintain its hold over the Confederation rather than to increase territory. Prussia, however, wanted to supplant the Habsburg Empire's control over "Germany," and absorb neighbouring states. Without the diversionary involvement of Italy, which

sought and was promised Venetia, Prussia might not have gone to war in 1866. The Franco-Prussian War came about as a result of the Hohenzollern candidature, but also because of French frustration over lack of territorial compensation for its neutrality in 1866. The war satisfied German ambition for more territory, with the Empire acquiring Bavaria, Baden and Württemberg.

- (c) Wars in the Balkans between 1877 and 1913 were inspired by the urge to acquire territory. The Russo-Turkish War (1878) was ostensibly fought by Russia for Bulgarian nationalism, but the powers feared Russian domination of a newly created Bulgarian state. Russia also promoted the creation of the Balkan League and the wars which it in turn initiated. Clearly Russian ambition to secure territory on the Mediterranean remained strong. Greece, Serbia, Montenegro and Bulgaria also wanted additional territory, taken from a dying Ottoman Empire.
- (d) Serbia had campaigned for a Southern Slav state, arguably a desire for more territory, to be carved out of the Habsburg Empire, whose annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1908, itself a blatant extension of imperial borders, had thwarted this ambition and worsened Austro-Serb relations. Italy joined the Great War in 1915 on the basis of promises of territorial gains. Germany's position was more aggressive. With the decision to give Austria a "blank cheque" to deal with Serbia crucial in triggering the war, the German September Programme takes on great significance. This document expressed grandiose aims: turning France and Belgium into vassal German states, seizing much of the western part of the Russian Empire and creating a *Mitteleuropa*, a German-dominated trading bloc. Some might argue, however, that the September Programme only appeared in the heated atmosphere of war conditions.
- (e) Hitler's expansionist aims echo the September Programme and were instrumental in provoking the Second World War. Even before Hitler, Germans, many of them moderate, believed that their country had been harshly treated in the Treaty of Versailles. Hitler's territorial demands therefore built on a pre-existing sense of grievance. In addition to the return of lands lost in 1919, he had wider horizons. He wanted to unite all Germanic peoples, so the German areas of the former Habsburg Empire were targets. Hitler's ambitions also encompassed the need for *Lebensraum* for a growing German population hemmed in by Germany's encircled position. In 1934 Hitler attempted to absorb Austria into the Reich, but it was 1938 before he could do so. In the same year he gained the Sudetenland, and the industrial west of Czechoslovakia in 1939. Also in that year he agitated for the Polish Corridor, succeeding in his aim but sparking war against France and Britain as a consequence. Finally, in 1941, his desire for *Lebensraum* led Germany to invade the USSR, escalating the World War.
- (f) Better responses will also consider other causes besides the desire to gain territory. The North Italian War of 1859, for example, although predominantly driven by both the Piedmontese and French desires for territory, could be seen to have underlying nationalist causes. In the following decade, in addition to Prussian expansionism, the German Wars of Unification had nationalist aspects, especially surrounding the nationalists' outrage at Danish claims on the duchies and, in 1870, French ambitions towards the southern German states of Bavaria, Baden and Württemberg. The Balkan Wars

clearly include an element of nationalism, as various Balkan peoples sought to achieve independence from Ottoman rule. The approach to the War of 1914–1918 might also be seen to have nationalist elements, as France sought revenge on Germany for the defeat of 1871, while the ideas of racial struggle which influenced both Russian and German policy in the run-up to the war might be categorised as nationalist. The First World War could also be seen as the result of binding alliances which inexorably led to widespread war in 1914, while responses might refer to the domestic problems which led Great Powers to risk war as a distraction. The Second World War might be seen as a result of ill-judged post-war treaties and the weakness of France, Britain and an inadequate League of Nations. In addition, the war might be, to a significant extent, attributed to economic causes, as Hitler sought high quality iron ore, found in Lorraine and Sweden, which partially explains Germany attacking France and, to secure its supply lines for the ore, Norway. To feed a growing German population, a German conquest of the USSR would open up the wheat-growing prairies of the Ukraine, an aim Hitler sought to accomplish when invading the Soviet Union in 1941.

Any other valid material will be awarded appropriately.

[40]

40

AVAILABLE
MARKS

- 2 “Wars were more likely to break out when countries were seen to be weak.”
To what extent would you agree with this statement on the outbreak of wars in Europe in the period 1848–1945?

Synoptic Assessment

Examiners should assess the candidate’s ability to draw together knowledge and skills in order to demonstrate overall historical understanding. Candidates’ answers should demonstrate breadth of historical knowledge and understanding by ranging comprehensively across the period of study as a whole. They should make links and comparisons which are properly developed and analysed and thus indicate understanding of the process of historical change. The knowledge and understanding of the subject should come from more than one perspective – political or cultural or economic – and there should be understanding demonstrated of the connections or interrelationship between these perspectives.

This question targets AO1: the candidate’s ability to demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[10])

Answers at this level may recall some accurate knowledge and display understanding of mainly one part of the period and one perspective. The answer will be characterised throughout by limited accuracy and a lack of clarity. Answers may provide a descriptive narrative of events. There will be few links and comparisons made between different parts of the period. Answers will be mainly a series of unsubstantiated assertions with little analysis of whether wars were more likely to break out in Europe in the period 1848–1945 when countries were seen to be weak. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([11]–[20])

Answers at this level may recall and deploy knowledge which draws from examples across the period. The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy and at times lack clarity. The answer will provide some explanation, though at times will lapse into narrative. Links and comparisons will be made but these will not be fully developed or analysed. Answers will contain some unsubstantiated assertions but also arguments which are appropriately developed and substantiated about whether wars were more likely to break out in Europe in the period 1848–1945 when countries were seen to be weak. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([21]–[30])

Answers at this level will recall and deploy knowledge accurately, drawing from all parts of the period with clarity and focus. Answers provide focused explanations and make links and comparisons which are developed and analysed, indicating an understanding of the process of historical change. Arguments are developed, substantiated, illustrated and reach a judgement about whether wars were more likely to break out in Europe in the period 1848–1945 when countries were seen to be weak. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([31]–[40])

Answers at this level will demonstrate accurate recall of knowledge from across the period studied with clarity and precision. Answers will provide detailed and focused insightful explanations, drawing on actions, events, issues or perspectives across the period, and there is an excellent understanding of the connections or interrelationships between these. A judgement is reached using arguments that are fully developed, illustrated and substantiated about whether wars were more likely to break out in Europe in the period 1848–1945 when countries were seen to be weak. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high standard of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Indicative Content

The suggestion that war is more likely to occur when opponents perceive weakness and are tempted to take advantage was particularly apparent in South East Europe, as the Ottoman Empire struggled, in the face of rising nationalist consciousness, to maintain its grip in Europe. Aggressive states, such as Nazi Germany in the 1930s, were emboldened in their expectations when those who might have stood up to them were weak and lacked the will or the firepower to do so. In all periods such states were more likely to use force when they sensed weakness.

- (a) The Crimean War (1853–1856) may be seen in the light of Turkish weakness, which encouraged Russia to invade the Turkish provinces of Moldavia and Wallachia. The war in northern Italy fits the proposition less well. Austrian weakness became a feature of European affairs after 1859, but was perhaps less clear in the late 1850s, as Cavour was unprepared to risk war until Piedmont was guaranteed French assistance. In 1864 Denmark was clearly weaker than Prussia, encouraging Prussian attack, but when Prussia entered the Seven Weeks' War Bismarck was far from confident of the outcome: Austrian artillery was known to be superior and the Habsburgs had greater manpower. The 1866 war, therefore, does not necessarily support the proposition. The final step towards German unification, the Franco-Prussian War (1870–1871), was undertaken by the Prussians with confidence in their own superiority, and in comparative French weakness. France entered the war without allies, while its weakness had already been evident in the Mexican fiasco, with Prussia superior in

terms of numbers, armaments and mobilisation.

- (b) In the Russo-Turkish War (1877–1878), Russia headed a coalition including Bulgaria, Rumania, Serbia and Montenegro. Nevertheless, Russian perception of terminal Ottoman weakness would have encouraged it to fight alone, if necessary. A later version of this alliance, the Balkan League, was formed in 1913, when Bulgaria, Serbia, Greece and Montenegro went to war to liberate Balkan Ottoman territories. Responses may note, however, that, individually, these countries would not have taken on even a clearly weakened Turkey.
- (c) The Great War (1914–1918) does not necessarily lend itself as well as other wars to the “weakness” theory. Nonetheless, each side perceived weakness in its opponents. The German War Council in 1912 argued for a pre-emptive strike before Russian rearmament reached completion in 1916, suggesting that Russia was perceived as comparatively weak in 1914, when war did begin. Russia considered the Austrian failure to retain control over Germany, Italy and Hungary symptomatic of a country in terminal decline, and correspondingly took a bullish approach. Russia and France assumed Italian unreliability would lead it to renege and abandon the Triple Alliance. Responses may consider alternative reasons for the outbreak of war in 1914, for example the Alliance system, which risked escalation from localised to world war, while the Schlieffen Plan virtually guaranteed British entry into a war. The “blank cheque” offer to Austria might be seen as encouraging fateful decisions by the Austro-Hungarian government, while the fear of being left behind in the all-important rush to mobilise might also be seen as a more important cause of the outbreak of war in 1914.
- (d) In the 1930s Hitler showed himself a master at capitalising on the weakness of his opponents and his victims, eventually causing the Second World War. Hitler’s aims involved the return of territory lost by Germany, the gathering together of all ethnic Germans in the Reich and a quest for additional lands in Eastern Europe. The opposition Hitler faced was threefold: the targeted countries themselves, the European powers and the League of Nations. The targets were all militarily weaker than Germany, while Britain and France, burdened by economic troubles and haunted by the 1914–1918 war, had not rearmed to the same extent as Germany. The USSR, shunned by the western democracies, had turned inwards, while the League of Nations, without the USA or USSR, realistically depended almost entirely on Britain and France. Thus, Hitler’s early breaches of the Treaty of Versailles, the increase in army numbers, the formation of the *Luftwaffe* and the remilitarisation of the Rhineland, went unchallenged. The German takeover of Austria was unopposed, the victim itself too small and weak to resist, and the western powers unwilling to intervene. When Hitler began to agitate for the Sudetenland, Britain and France blustered, but ultimately backed down, and Hitler, in 1939, seized the Czech part of the country, Slovakia becoming its dependency. The next target was Poland, whose corridor to the sea split Germany in two. Hitler might have expected Russia to step in to prevent German invasion, but it was dissuaded by a cynical partition deal between the two ideological enemies. By this time the western powers had come to realise that Hitler’s ambitions were not limited, but the German leader, wrongly sensing continued weakness of will, was confident that he could attack with impunity. His complacency was misplaced, conflict breaking

out on 3 September 1939. The invasion of Russia in 1941 may be seen as contradicting the proposition, as the Soviet Union was now stronger than it had been, yet it is likely that Hitler was persuaded of its weakness and consequently suitability for conquest.

Any other valid material will be awarded appropriately.

[40]

Option 3

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

40

40

Option 4: The American Presidency 1901–2000

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Answer **either** Question 1 or Question 2.

- 1 “The most significant change in presidential power in the twentieth century occurred during the period of the Imperial Presidency (1945–1963).” How far would you agree with this statement?

Synoptic Assessment

Examiners should assess the candidate’s ability to draw together knowledge and skills in order to demonstrate overall historical understanding. Candidates’ answers should demonstrate breadth of historical knowledge and understanding by ranging comprehensively across the period of study as a whole. They should make links and comparisons which are properly developed and analysed and thus indicate understanding of the process of historical change. The knowledge and understanding of the subject should come from more than one perspective – political or cultural or economic – and there should be understanding demonstrated of the connections or interrelationship between these perspectives.

This question targets AO1: the candidate’s ability to demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[10])

Answers at this level may recall some accurate knowledge and display understanding of mainly one part of the period and one perspective. The answer will be characterised throughout by limited accuracy and a lack of clarity. Answers may provide a descriptive narrative of events. There will be few links and comparisons made between different parts of the period. Answers will be mainly a series of unsubstantiated assertions with little analysis of whether the most significant change in presidential power in the twentieth century occurred during the period of the Imperial Presidency (1945–1963). Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([11]–[20])

Answers at this level may recall and deploy knowledge which draws from examples across the period. The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy and at times lack clarity. The answer will provide some explanation, though at times will lapse into narrative. Links and comparisons will be made but these will not be fully developed or analysed. Answers will contain some unsubstantiated assertions but also arguments which are appropriately developed and substantiated about whether the most significant change in presidential power in the twentieth century occurred during the period of the Imperial Presidency (1945–1963). Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning

clear.

Level 3 ([21]–[30])

Answers at this level will recall and deploy knowledge accurately, drawing from all parts of the period with clarity and focus. Answers provide focused explanations and make links and comparisons which are developed and analysed, indicating an understanding of the process of historical change. Arguments are developed, substantiated, illustrated and reach a judgement about whether the most significant change in presidential power in the twentieth century occurred during the period of the Imperial Presidency (1945–1963). Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([31]–[40])

Answers at this level will demonstrate accurate recall of knowledge from across the period studied with clarity and precision. Answers will provide detailed and focused insightful explanations, drawing on actions, events, issues or perspectives across the period, and there is an excellent understanding of the connections or interrelationships between these. A judgement is reached using arguments that are fully developed, illustrated and substantiated about whether the most significant change in presidential power in the twentieth century occurred during the period of the Imperial Presidency (1945–1963). Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high standard of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Indicative Content

A strong case can be made in support of the proposition, focusing on the presidencies of Truman, Eisenhower and Kennedy. This was a unique era in US presidential history as, for the first time, the President willingly took on the role and unofficial title of leader of the free world in the context of the advent of the Cold War. It might also be noted that the US held a monopoly of nuclear power from 1945 to 1949.

(a) Harry Truman

President Harry S. Truman confronted unprecedented challenges in international affairs during his nearly eight years in office. He guided the United States through the closing stages of World War II – including the use of the nuclear bomb against Japan – the beginning of the Cold War and intervention in the conflict between North Korea and South Korea. Furthermore, Truman’s foreign policy established some of the basic principles and commitments which marked American foreign policy for the remainder of the twentieth century. He announced in March 1947 what came to be known as the Truman Doctrine, pledging US support for the pro-Western governments of Greece and Turkey and, by extension, any similarly threatened government. When the Soviet Union blocked Western access routes to Berlin, Truman was determined not to abandon the city and ordered an airlift of food and fuel to break the blockade. In 1949, he led the

United States into its first ever peacetime military alliance under the terms of the North Atlantic Treaty.

It was also under Truman that the governmental support structure was created to allow America – and its President – to effectively act as leader of the free world. This was put in place by the National Security Act of 1947, which established the Department of Defense, the National Security Council and the Central Intelligence Agency. Truman’s immediate successors, Eisenhower and Kennedy, had at their disposal awesome military power, which they deployed with varying degrees of discretion.

While Truman’s domestic policy was not as spectacular as his foreign policy, it is still worthy of note. The President set out an ambitious social reform agenda, known as the Fair Deal, but Truman’s proposals were largely blocked by conservatives in Congress. He also issued executive orders (at the end of his first term) to end segregation in the US armed forces and prohibit discrimination in federal government jobs.

(b) Dwight D. Eisenhower

The second of the Cold War and “imperial” presidents, Eisenhower, like Truman, was primarily focused on international affairs. He and his Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, worked hard at achieving peace by constructing collective defence agreements and threatening the Soviet Union with “massive retaliatory power”; both strategies were designed to check the spread of communism. Another strategy was unknown to the public at the time but was heavily criticised in later years: the use of the Central Intelligence Agency in covert operations to overthrow governments in Iran (1953) and Guatemala (1954).

Eisenhower was also able to negotiate a truce for the Korean War in July 1953. In September 1954 Eisenhower and Dulles succeeded in creating the Southeast Asia Treaty Organisation (SEATO) to prevent further communist expansion. NATO was strengthened in 1955 by the inclusion of West Germany.

Yet Eisenhower was fundamentally a cautious leader, perhaps because of his own experience as a commander in World War II. Dulles may have spoken of “liberating” captive peoples in communist countries, but the administration limited itself to protests when uprisings occurred in East Germany (1953) and Hungary (1956).

(c) John F. Kennedy

Kennedy’s words were always more idealistic than his actual deeds, which tended toward the cautiously pragmatic. Even though he was disappointingly timid about, for example, the civil rights movement, he possessed an aura which made people think of him as a champion of freedom and hope. Moreover, he had the valuable talent of inspiring others to be bolder and nobler than he himself was. His legislative record may be unimpressive, but the galvanising power of his image has lasted.

While it would be difficult to assess the abortive Bay of Pigs operation in April 1961 as anything other than a failure for Kennedy, his handling of the Cuban missile crisis of October 1962 has generally been judged a master class of Cold War leadership. Similarly, JFK’s response to the building of the

Berlin Wall can be considered an achievement in that he was not drawn into a possible direct confrontation with the Soviet Union in the summer of 1961, but at the same time gave reassurance to the population of West Berlin that they were not going to be abandoned by their allies. His Berlin speech of June 1963 confirmed America's resolve to stand shoulder to shoulder with the people of that city and keep the torch of freedom alight.

However, while American presidential power had never seemed greater than during the imperial era – especially when contrasted with the way the office became damaged by the Vietnam War under Johnson and Nixon – candidates can construct a counter-argument by considering, for example, the landmark presidency of Franklin Roosevelt (FDR). Arguably, FDR permanently changed the nature of the American presidency. Elected during the Great Depression, he expanded the size and scope of the federal government. As a result, the government became involved in many aspects of its citizens' lives. FDR's New Deal policies included social security, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Works Progress Administration and several other programmes designed to give jobs to the unemployed. World War II furthered the scope of the President's power as commander-in-chief. During the war, for example, FDR curtailed civil liberties and nationalised industries to aid the war effort. He also revolutionised the way Presidents communicate with the public, initiating the practice of delivering frequent addresses to the American people over the radio: the "fireside chats". Perhaps the key factor in FDR's impact on the presidency was his decision to seek an unprecedented third term in office in 1940 (and a fourth term in 1944), which meant that he served longer (more than 12 years) than any other President and therefore had more scope to influence the shape of the institution. Others might contend that Ronald Reagan's restoration of presidential power in the 1980s, after the damage done to the presidency by Vietnam, Watergate and the Iran hostage crisis, was an even more remarkable feat than that of the imperial presidents. Dealing skilfully with Congress, Reagan obtained legislation to stimulate economic growth, curb inflation, increase employment and strengthen national defence. In foreign policy, Reagan sought to achieve "peace through strength". He sharply increased defence spending, but sought to improve relations with the Soviet Union. With Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, he negotiated a treaty which eliminated intermediate-range nuclear missiles. Reagan also brought victory for the West in the Cold War within reach. The presidency that he bequeathed to Bush and Clinton was much stronger than the one he had inherited in 1981 from Jimmy Carter.

Any other valid material will be awarded appropriately.

[40]

40

- 2 “Woodrow Wilson (1912–1920) achieved more in his economic and domestic policies than any other American President of the twentieth century.” How far would you accept this verdict?

Synoptic Assessment

Examiners should assess the candidate’s ability to draw together knowledge and skills in order to demonstrate overall historical understanding. Candidates’ answers should demonstrate breadth of historical knowledge and understanding by ranging comprehensively across the period of study as a whole. They should make links and comparisons which are properly developed and analysed and thus indicate understanding of the process of historical change. The knowledge and understanding of the subject should come from more than one perspective – political or cultural or economic – and there should be understanding demonstrated of the connections or interrelationship between these perspectives.

This question targets AO1: the candidate’s ability to demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[10])

Answers at this level may recall some accurate knowledge and display understanding of mainly one part of the period and one perspective. The answer will be characterised throughout by limited accuracy and a lack of clarity. Answers may provide a descriptive narrative of events. There will be few links and comparisons made between different parts of the period. Answers will be mainly a series of unsubstantiated assertions with little analysis of whether Woodrow Wilson achieved more in his economic and domestic policies than any other American President of the twentieth century. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([11]–[20])

Answers at this level may recall and deploy knowledge which draws from examples across the period. The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy and at times lack clarity. The answer will provide some explanation, though at times will lapse into narrative. Links and comparisons will be made but these will not be fully developed or analysed. Answers will contain some unsubstantiated assertions but also arguments which are appropriately developed and substantiated about whether Woodrow Wilson achieved more in his economic and domestic policies than any other American President of the twentieth century. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([21]–[30])

Answers at this level will recall and deploy knowledge accurately, drawing from all

parts of the period with clarity and focus. Answers provide focused explanations and make links and comparisons which are developed and analysed, indicating an understanding of the process of historical change. Arguments are developed, substantiated, illustrated and reach a judgement about whether Woodrow Wilson achieved more in his economic and domestic policies than any other American President of the twentieth century. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([31]–[40])

Answers at this level will demonstrate accurate recall of knowledge from across the period studied with clarity and precision. Answers will provide detailed and focused insightful explanations, drawing on actions, events, issues or perspectives across the period, and there is an excellent understanding of the connections or interrelationships between these. A judgement is reached using arguments that are fully developed, illustrated and substantiated about whether Woodrow Wilson achieved more in his economic and domestic policies than any other American President of the twentieth century. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high standard of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Indicative Content

In support of the proposition, candidates will focus largely on Woodrow Wilson's first term in office, when he concentrated on economic and domestic policy, and before America entered World War I, which dominated his second term as President.

(a) Woodrow Wilson

Woodrow Wilson came into the White House intent on expanding economic opportunity for people at the bottom of society and eliminating the special privileges enjoyed by the nation's richest and most powerful citizens. Before setting out his agenda, Wilson consulted extensively with congressional leaders to ensure that his programmes would be dealt with sympathetically when Congress considered them. In April 1913, at the opening of a special session of Congress called by the President to consider tariff reform, Wilson appeared personally before a joint session of the House and Senate to explain his programme, demonstrating his intention to play a dominant role in policymaking.

Wilson focused first on tariff reform, pushing through Congress the Underwood-Simmons Act, which achieved the most significant reductions in import duties since the Civil War. He argued that high tariffs created monopolies and hurt consumers, and his lower tariffs were especially popular in the South and West.

Next, Wilson tackled the currency problem and banking reform. Since the Civil War, Democrats and agrarians had wanted a more flexible money supply and system of banking that would allow adjustments in the amount

of money and credit available in times of economic expansion or crisis. By the early twentieth century, bankers and businessmen had also begun to demand reform. Reformers wanted a strong federal system that would regulate credit and oversee the nation's currency. In response to the demand for reform, Wilson pushed for the Federal Reserve Act of 1913, which established twelve regional reserve banks controlled by the Federal Reserve Board, a new federal agency whose members were appointed by the President. This new federal system could adjust interest rates and the nation's money supply. Additionally, the Federal Reserve was empowered to adjust interest rates and determine the amount of money banks would hold as a reserve fund for times of economic crisis. This Act was probably the most important domestic achievement of the Wilson administration, one which still provides the framework for regulating the nation's banks, credit and money supply.

Wilson's support of the Clayton Antitrust Act, which Congress passed in 1914, endeared him to trade unions and farmers because it excluded their organisations from antitrust prosecution under the Sherman Antitrust Act. It also fulfilled a campaign promise of 1912 by prohibiting some anti-competitive business practices, such as price-fixing and interlocking directorates (in which the same people sit on the executive boards of competing companies in one industry). This act complemented the Federal Trade Commission law passed in the same year, which created a new government board appointed by the President and empowered to investigate and publicise corrupt, unfair or anti-competitive business practices. Wilson strengthened his support from trade unions and industrial workers when a new Department of Labour was created.

In 1916, Wilson pushed through a law to eliminate child labour (the Keating-Owen Act), but the Supreme Court ruled it unconstitutional in 1918. When American railway unions threatened to strike in 1916, Wilson supported and signed into law a bill securing an eight-hour working day for railway employees (the Adamson Act), which paved the way for shorter working hours for all industrial workers.

A counter-argument to the proposition may consider the claims of Franklin Roosevelt, Lyndon Johnson and Teddy Roosevelt to have achieved more in economic and domestic policies.

(b) Franklin D. Roosevelt

Faced as he was by economic catastrophe, Franklin Roosevelt had little choice but to prioritise economic and domestic policies – in that order. By the time FDR was inaugurated on 4 March 1933, the Depression had reached desperate levels, including 13 million unemployed. Roosevelt began the momentous first 100 days of his presidency by closing all banks for several days until Congress could pass the Emergency Banking Relief Act. Other key pieces of legislation during FDR's first "Hundred Days" created some of the most important programmes and institutions of Roosevelt's New Deal, including the Agricultural Adjustment Administration (AAA), the Public Works Administration (PWA), the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) and the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA). Roosevelt also initiated a number of reforms directed at the financial sector, notably the creation of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC), to protect depositors' accounts,

and the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), to regulate the stock market and prevent abuses of the kind that led to the Wall Street Crash in 1929. In 1935, after the economy had begun to show signs of recovery, Roosevelt asked Congress to pass a new wave of domestic reforms, known as the “Second New Deal”. These included the Social Security Act (which for the first time provided Americans with unemployment and disability relief and old age pensions) and the Works Progress Administration. The Democratic-led Congress also raised taxes on large corporations and wealthy individuals, an increase that was known as the “soak-the-rich” tax.

(c) Lyndon Johnson

Soon after taking office, Johnson declared a “War on Poverty”. He actively pushed Congress to pass legislation attacking illiteracy, unemployment and racial discrimination. Johnson introduced a range of new domestic reforms which, he said, would build a “Great Society” for all Americans. His ambitious legislative agenda created the Medicare and Medicaid programmes to provide federal health insurance for elderly and poor Americans. It also included measures aimed at improving education, preventing crime and reducing air and water pollution. Johnson also made great strides in attacking racial discrimination by signing the historic Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Voting Rights Act of 1965. His wide-reaching achievements improved the lives of millions of Americans and contributed to economic growth and prosperity.

(d) Teddy Roosevelt

As President, Teddy Roosevelt challenged the ideas of limited government and individualism. In their place, he advocated government regulation to achieve social and economic justice. He used executive orders to help accomplish his goals, especially in conservation. Roosevelt worked to ensure that the government improved the lives of American citizens. His “Square Deal” domestic programme reflected the progressive call to reform the American workplace, initiating welfare legislation and government regulation of industry. In 1902, Roosevelt used the Sherman Antitrust Act to bring a lawsuit which led to the break-up of a huge railroad conglomerate, the Northern Securities Company. Roosevelt pursued this policy of “trust-busting” by initiating lawsuits against 43 other major corporations during the next seven years. In 1906, he pressed Congress to pass the Pure Food and Drug and Meat Inspection Acts, which created agencies to assure protection to consumers. He was also the nation’s first environmentalist President, setting aside nearly 200 million acres for national forests, reserves and wildlife refuges.

Any other valid material will be awarded appropriately.

[40]

Option 4

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

40

40

Option 5: Clash of Ideologies in Europe 1900–2000

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Answer **either** Question 1 or Question 2.

- 1 “In the period 1917–1991 the foreign policies of Western governments achieved greater success in Europe than Soviet foreign policy.” To what extent would you agree with this assessment?

Synoptic Assessment

Examiners should assess the candidate’s ability to draw together knowledge and skills in order to demonstrate overall historical understanding. Candidates’ answers should demonstrate breadth of historical knowledge and understanding by ranging comprehensively across the period of study as a whole. They should make links and comparisons which are properly developed and analysed and thus indicate understanding of the process of historical change. The knowledge and understanding of the subject should come from more than one perspective – political or cultural or economic – and there should be understanding demonstrated of the connections or interrelationship between these perspectives.

This question targets AO1: the candidate’s ability to demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[10])

Answers at this level may recall some accurate knowledge and display understanding of mainly one part of the period and one perspective. The answer will be characterised throughout by limited accuracy and a lack of clarity. Answers may provide a descriptive narrative of events. There will be few links and comparisons made between different parts of the period. Answers will be mainly a series of unsubstantiated assertions with little analysis of whether the foreign policies of Western governments achieved greater success in Europe than Soviet foreign policy in the period 1917–1991. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([11]–[20])

Answers at this level may recall and deploy knowledge which draws from examples across the period. The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy and at times lack clarity. The answer will provide some explanation, though at times will lapse into narrative. Links and comparisons will be made but these will not be fully developed or analysed. Answers will contain some unsubstantiated assertions but also arguments which are appropriately developed and substantiated about whether the foreign policies of Western governments achieved greater success in Europe than Soviet foreign policy in the period 1917–1991. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation,

spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Level 3 ([21]–[30])

Answers at this level will recall and deploy knowledge accurately, drawing from all parts of the period with clarity and focus. Answers provide focused explanations and make links and comparisons which are developed and analysed, indicating an understanding of the process of historical change. Arguments are developed, substantiated, illustrated and reach a judgement about whether the foreign policies of Western governments achieved greater success in Europe than Soviet foreign policy in the period 1917–1991. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([31]–[40])

Answers at this level will demonstrate accurate recall of knowledge from across the period studied with clarity and precision. Answers will provide detailed and focused insightful explanations, drawing on actions, events, issues or perspectives across the period, and there is an excellent understanding of the connections or interrelationships between these. A judgement is reached using arguments that are fully developed, illustrated and substantiated about whether the foreign policies of Western governments achieved greater success in Europe than Soviet foreign policy in the period 1917–1991. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high standard of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Indicative Content

(a) Revolutionary Russia and Opposition from Western Governments 1917–1924

Candidates could argue that Soviet foreign policy enjoyed success at first through withdrawal from World War One in 1918, through the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. However, the Treaty could also be viewed as a failure for Soviet Russia due to the huge amounts of land and resources it lost. Additionally, initial expectations of a ‘World Revolution’ were not realised and attempts to support revolutionary movements in Germany, Finland and the Baltic states ended in disappointment. The signing of the Treaty of Rapallo in 1922 could also be viewed as a partial success.

Democratic hostility towards the USSR, through intervention by the Western powers during the Civil War, was not very successful and the Bolsheviks were ultimately victorious. Despite the initial isolation of Soviet Russia at Versailles and the League of Nations, democratic regimes reluctantly accepted the existence of Soviet Russia, as illustrated by trade agreements concluded with Britain in 1921 and 1924.

(b) Isolation, Co-operation and Conflict 1924–1945

Candidates could discuss the policy of 'Socialism in One Country' and Stalin's attempts to increase levels of rearmament as protection against potential attacks by Western governments. A significant disappointment was Stalin's failure to achieve Collective Security in the 1930s, in the face of the growing threat of Fascism. In 1934, the Soviet Union joined the League of Nations as the Nazi threat increased. Intervention in the Spanish Civil War in 1936 could be viewed as a partial success for the Soviet Union with the acquisition of Spanish gold, but ultimately ended in a victory for Fascism.

Candidates could discuss a phase of temporary success for Fascist governments in the 1930s. Fascist opposition developed with the Anti-Comintern Pacts in 1936 between Germany and Japan and in 1937, when Italy joined. The Nazi–Soviet Pact in 1939 failed to prevent the Nazi invasion of the USSR in 1941, which was an attempt to destroy the Communist state by force.

In June 1941, the Nazi invasion of the USSR forced it into a temporary successful alliance with capitalist states. The Grand Alliance saw the USSR, USA and UK allied against Nazi Germany during the period 1941–1945 and could be viewed as a success for the Soviet Union as it survived the invasion by Nazi Germany and was able then to push the Germans out of the USSR. By 1945 it could be argued that Western governments had experienced greater failures as the two Fascist states had been defeated and the democratic regimes, though victorious in the war, were unable to prevent Stalin from liberating countries in Eastern Europe from Hitler.

(c) The Search for Security 1945–1956

At this juncture, candidates could claim that, three decades after its inception, the Soviet Union was stronger and more successful than ever before. By the time of the Potsdam Conference the war was over in Europe. The Red Army had liberated most of Eastern Europe, where Stalin had started to create a Red Empire. Western governments enjoyed partial success through the introduction of the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan, which gave vital economic aid to democratic states in Western Europe. This was broadly successful in producing stable economies and reducing the chances of internal Communist revolutions.

The Berlin Blockade of 1948–1949 can be interpreted as a Western success and a defeat for the Soviet Union. Western governments promised to defend West Berlin against the Communist threat, and in May 1949 Stalin called off the blockade. Candidates could also discuss the relative merits of the formation of NATO by Western governments in 1949 and the Soviet response in the shape of the Warsaw Pact in 1955.

(d) Co-operation and Co-existence 1956–1979

With the death of Stalin in 1953, and the emergence of Khrushchev as his successor, candidates could argue that, from this point onwards, Western governments experienced much greater success as no other state in Europe fell under Communist control. Khrushchev, with his foreign policy of 'peaceful co-existence', brought stability to relations and this could also be viewed as a success for the Soviet Union.

Candidates could also discuss the Hungarian Uprising in 1956. This damaged the improvement in relations Khrushchev had achieved with Western governments but ensured that Soviet control of Hungary remained in place. The West was not prepared to intervene militarily in the Soviet sphere of influence in Hungary in 1956 when the Soviets invaded. Furthermore, the Berlin issue remained unresolved, and in 1961 the Berlin Wall was built, an event which candidates could analyse in relation to the question.

The Brezhnev era (1964–1982) could be interpreted by candidates as a success for the USSR, but in fact much of this success was because of American weakness. The West did not intervene in 1968 in Czechoslovakia and the acceptance of Eastern Europe as a Soviet sphere of influence was acknowledged in the 1975 Helsinki Accords.

(e) The Second Cold War and the Collapse of Communism (1979–1991)

The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 was the final act of Communist aggression and united Western governments in their opposition to the revived Soviet threat in Europe. This led to what is called the Second Cold War, ultimately ending in success for the Western governments.

It could be argued that, when Gorbachev became leader of the Soviet Union in 1985, he enjoyed success in ending the Cold War through his four summits, promising to cut nuclear weapons and abandoning the Brezhnev Doctrine. However, the collapse of the Soviet Empire in 1989 and the USSR in 1991 were primarily due to Gorbachev, who, as a result of the economic crisis in the USSR, was not prepared to engage in an expensive arms race with the USA. This collapse could be seen to characterise Soviet foreign policy in the period 1917–1991 overall as a failure, despite its apparent successes in the 1940s. Candidates should also assess the role of Western governments in bringing about the demise of the Soviet Union.

Any other valid material will be awarded appropriately.

[40]

40

- 2 “Stalin was the most influential leader in determining relations in Europe between the Soviet Union and Western governments in the period 1917–1991.” How far would you accept this verdict?

Synoptic Assessment

Examiners should assess the candidate’s ability to draw together knowledge and skills in order to demonstrate overall historical understanding. Candidates’ answers should demonstrate breadth of historical knowledge and understanding by ranging comprehensively across the period of study as a whole. They should make links and comparisons which are properly developed and analysed and thus indicate understanding of the process of historical change. The knowledge and understanding of the subject should come from more than one perspective – political or cultural or economic – and there should be understanding demonstrated of the connections or interrelationship between these perspectives.

This question targets AO1: the candidate’s ability to demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[10])

Answers at this level may recall some accurate knowledge and display understanding of mainly one part of the period and one perspective. The answer will be characterised throughout by limited accuracy and a lack of clarity. Answers may provide a descriptive narrative of events. There will be few links and comparisons made between different parts of the period. Answers will be mainly a series of unsubstantiated assertions with little analysis of whether Stalin was the most influential leader in determining relations in Europe between the Soviet Union and Western governments in the period 1917–1991. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([11]–[20])

Answers at this level may recall and deploy knowledge which draws from examples across the period. The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy and at times lack clarity. The answer will provide some explanation, though at times will lapse into narrative. Links and comparisons will be made but these will not be fully developed or analysed. Answers will contain some unsubstantiated assertions but also arguments which are appropriately developed and substantiated about whether Stalin was the most influential leader in determining relations in Europe between the Soviet Union and Western governments in the period 1917–1991. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([21]–[30])

Answers at this level will recall and deploy knowledge accurately, drawing from all parts of the period with clarity and focus. Answers provide focused explanations and make links and comparisons which are developed and analysed, indicating an understanding of the process of historical change. Arguments are developed, substantiated, illustrated and reach a judgement about whether Stalin was the most influential leader in determining relations in Europe between the Soviet Union and Western governments in the period 1917–1991. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([31]–[40])

Answers at this level will demonstrate accurate recall of knowledge from across the period studied with clarity and precision. Answers will provide detailed and focused insightful explanations, drawing on actions, events, issues or perspectives across the period, and there is an excellent understanding of the connections or interrelationships between these. A judgement is reached using arguments that are fully developed, illustrated and substantiated about whether Stalin was the most influential leader in determining relations in Europe between the Soviet Union and Western governments in the period 1917–1991. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high standard of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Indicative Content**(a) Stalin 1924–1953**

Candidates could observe that, at the time of Lenin's death, the USSR still had poor relations with the West, which continued at first under his successor Stalin. However, the adoption of 'Socialism in One Country', with less significance being placed on ideological activity outside the Soviet Union, meant that hostilities between the USSR and Western governments decreased slightly.

In the 1930s the emergence of the Fascist threat led to a greater engagement by the Soviet Union with the wider international community through the policy of 'Collective Security' and joining the League of Nations in 1934. By trying to improve relations with Western democratic countries against the Nazi threat, Stalin could be regarded as very influential in determining relations as the new policy of 'Collective Security' arguably led to better relations between the Soviet Union and some Western powers.

However, appeasement and the Munich Agreement in 1938 forced Stalin to agree to the Nazi-Soviet Pact with his ideological enemy, Nazi Germany. This was also important in determining East-West relations. Soviet neutrality ended with Operation Barbarossa in 1941, and Stalin found himself in a wartime alliance with Western democratic powers, his former adversaries. The Grand Alliance did improve relations between the USSR and Western democracies, but by 1945 divisions between Stalin and the Western leaders were growing.

Conferences in Tehran, Yalta and Potsdam between 1943 and 1945 could also be viewed as highly significant as Stalin's increasing demands shaped relations and contributed to the ensuing Cold War.

The period 1945–1953 provides additional evidence that candidates could deploy in arguing that Stalin was the most influential leader in determining relations. The creation of the buffer zone in Eastern Europe and Stalin's actions over Berlin in 1948-1949 can also be regarded as significant in East-West relations in Europe. From 1949 until his death in 1953, tensions between the Soviet Union and Western governments were high and many feared that it could lead to a nuclear war in Europe.

(b) Lenin 1917–1924

In October 1917, the Bolsheviks took power in Russia and in 1918 Lenin made peace with Germany, withdrawing Russia from World War I to ensure the survival of the Communist state. His policies, for example the establishment of Comintern in 1919 and his attempts at rapprochement with the West in 1921, provide candidates with the opportunity to view Lenin as the most influential leader as he laid the foundations of relations between the Western governments and the Soviet Union until its collapse in 1991.

(c) Hitler 1933–1945

The emergence of Mussolini in the 1920s and Hitler in 1933 saw the development of hostile policies towards the Soviet Union. Hitler made no secret of his hatred of Bolshevism and considered it to be an ideology which had to be destroyed. Fascist opposition developed with the Anti-Comintern Pacts in 1936 and in 1937. The signing of the Nazi-Soviet Pact in 1939, Operation Barbarossa in 1941 and the Second World War provide candidates with the opportunity to argue that it was Hitler who was the most influential leader in determining relations in Europe between the Soviet Union and Western governments.

(d) Truman 1945–1953

Truman's involvement in Europe in the period 1945–1953 played a part in the deterioration of East-West relations after the Second World War. His tough approach at Potsdam in 1945, the introduction of the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan contributed significantly to the emergence of a Cold War in Europe and worsening East-West relations. The adoption of Containment by the USA saw Western governments stand up to Soviet aggression during the Berlin Blockade of 1948-1949 amid continuing mutual hostility.

(e) Khrushchev 1953–1964

In 1956, Khrushchev attacked the legacy of Stalin in his famous secret speech. He talked of peaceful co-existence with the West leading to a thaw in relations and candidates could view this as significant. They could argue that Khrushchev was an influential leader since he tried to improve relations with Western governments. This can be seen through the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Austria in 1955, his willingness to engage with US Presidents and his attempts to find a solution to the question of Berlin. Additionally, Khrushchev's actions in the Hungarian Uprising in 1956 and the building of the Berlin Wall in 1961 could be analysed. This era also provides the opportunity for a brief analysis of the significance of Eisenhower and Kennedy in determining relations.

(f) Brezhnev 1964–1982

In 1964, Khrushchev was replaced by Brezhnev, who continued to try and maintain better relations with the Western governments. However, when a crisis developed in Czechoslovakia in 1968, the Soviets acted quickly to crush opposition and justified their actions with the Brezhnev Doctrine. Brezhnev and Nixon could be regarded as influential leaders in improving East-West relations with the emergence of détente in the 1970s. There was the success with SALT and the Helsinki Treaty but the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 marked the end of the era of détente. The invasion of Afghanistan under Brezhnev could be regarded as evidence that he was the most influential leader in determining relations as it sparked off a 'Second Cold War'.

(g) Reagan 1981–1989 and Gorbachev 1985–1991

The first years of Reagan's presidency were marked by high military expenditure and hostile rhetoric towards the Soviet Union. In fact, he referred to the Soviet Union in 1983 as the 'Evil Empire', which further increased 'East-West' tension. However, on his accession to power in 1985, Gorbachev introduced new thinking. He introduced reforms in the USSR, such as his abandonment of the Brezhnev Doctrine, helped to improve relations with Western governments and ended the Cold War in Europe. These decisions contributed to the collapse of Soviet-controlled Eastern Europe in 1989 and the USSR itself by 1991. For these reasons it may be argued that Gorbachev was the most influential leader in determining relations in Europe between the Soviet Union and Western governments in the period 1917–1991.

Any other valid material will be awarded appropriately.

[40]

Option 5

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

40

40

