

GCE



CCEA GCE AS
Exemplifying Examination
Performance

History AS1

This is an exemplification of candidates' performance in GCE AS examinations (Summer 2017) to support the teaching and learning of the History specification.



Permission to reproduce all copyright material has been applied for. In some cases, efforts to contact copyright holders may have been unsuccessful and CCEA will be happy to rectify any omissions of acknowledgement in future if notified.

EXEMPLIFYING EXAMINATION PERFORMANCE

GCE History

Introduction

These materials illustrate aspects of performance from the 2017 summer AS examination series of CCEA's revised GCE Specification in 2016.

Students' grade A responses are reproduced verbatim and are accompanied by commentaries written by senior examiners. The commentaries draw attention to the strengths of the students' responses and indicate, where appropriate, deficiencies and how improvements could be made.

It is intended that the materials should provide a benchmark of candidate performance and help teachers and students to raise standards.

For further details of our support package, please visit our website at www.ccea.org.uk

Best wishes



Helen Parks

Education Manager,

Email: hparks@ccea.org.uk

Telephone: 028 9026 1200 ext.2906

GCE: HISTORY

AS1: Historical Investigations and Interpretations

Grade: A Exemplar

Option 1: England 1509–1558

Answer Question 1(a) or 1(b) and Question 2.

Quality of written communication will be assessed in Question 1.

Q1 Either

Q1a Analyse the measures taken by the Duke of Northumberland to solve the economic and social problems England faced between 1550 and 1553. [10]

Student's response

The Duke of Northumberland inherited a dire financial situation, succeeding the Duke of Somerset, with royal debts at £300,000 in ISSO, mainly caused by the consequences of war with Scotland and France, debasement and inflation. The government met in 1551 and settled on a three-fold plan to end debasement, be free from debt and match spending to royal income. William Cecil and Walter Mildway were appointed to recognise the Crown's funds and spending, and were able to reduce crown expenditure successfully. By 1553, debts were only £180,000, a significant amount lower than they had been previously. To do this, it was necessary to continue the role of Crown and chantry lands totalling at £100,000 and £110,000 approximately. It was also necessary to continue with one last debasement until 1551, earning around £500,000. Parliamentary taxes brought in about £300,000 and the clawing back of debts owed to the Crown gained around £16,000. The Crown owed significantly to the Antwerp markets, and Thomas Graham was employed to settle the debts, crossing the channel 40 times and negotiating at 12% interest.

Northumberland ending the wars with France and Scotland, reducing expenditure massively. He also stopped garrisoning along the border with Scotland which proved very costly. At the Treaty of Boulogne, Northumberland negotiated the return of Boulogne to the French in return for £133,333. However, French influence in Scotland remained a threat. Debasement had negative consequences in regard to inflation and trade abroad so it was ended in 1551, although the proper amount of precious metal wasn't put into coins until Elizabeth's reign, so he was telling people to lower prices without giving them a concrete reason to do so.

Somerset's enclosure policies had been a failure, raising the hopes of the poor and fears of the rich. The tax on sheep was removed and existing legislation was enforced. Harvest failures meant rising prices, so Northumberland controlled grain stocks to control the amount of food available. One of his greatest achievements was lowering the price of basic food ships to make them affordable. He also repealed the unpopular Vagrancy Act but kept poor relief provision in the poor Act 1582.

Overall, his policies were successful in reducing crown debt and resolving many of the social problems in England, although debasement and the collapse of the Antwerp market remained problems.

Examiner's comments

(9 marks, Level 4)

A good indication that this is going to be a Level 4 answer is that the candidate does not simply launch into an account of the Duke of Northumberland's policies, but puts the overall topic in the context of the "dire financial situation" that he inherited from his predecessor, the Duke of Somerset. This not only serves as an introduction to the answer, but also puts Northumberland's achievements in context by establishing the scale of the task that he faced in addressing England's social and economic problems.

The candidate then proceeds, with great clarity and measured prose, to analyse the policies adopted to remedy the situation. Detail is complemented by a fluent and lucid delivery to explain, for example, how the debt of the Crown was reduced – by the sale of Crown and chantry lands, for which figures are given. We see both the big picture – the appointment of Cecil and Mildmay to "reorganise the Crown's funds and spending" – and the illustrative detail – such as Thomas Graham's assignment to deal with Antwerp financiers, "crossing the Channel 40 times" and obtaining a more manageable rate of interest. This is an example of precision that does not overwhelm but rather help to enlighten the reader.

In the second main paragraph of the answer – addressing the costly wars with France and Scotland and the problem of debasement of the coinage – the candidate provides not only a cogent analysis of this aspect of the topic, but also demonstrates balance in doing so, as a Level 4 answer should. While the candidate notes that debasement was ended in 1551, he/she also observes that it was not until the reign of Elizabeth I that the precious-metal content of English money was restored to its proper level. This is sophisticated handling of the subject matter.

In the third paragraph, agricultural and social policies are considered, and we can see by this stage how well organised the answer is, devoting a paragraph to each of the major features of Northumberland's strategy. Again, we are provided with detail, such as the repeal of the Sheep Act and the Vagrancy Act, but also get the broad vision of Northumberland's desire to help those who were most vulnerable, particularly in terms of ensuring a secure and affordable supply of food.

The conclusion might have had more substance, though it is still balanced and written with assurance.

Overall, the answer is well organised, setting the context of the challenge facing Northumberland at the outset, and then proceeding to provide a coherent and convincing analysis of his policies, with good illustrative detail. The prevailing impression at the conclusion is that this is a candidate comfortable with the subject and able to express their knowledge and judgement in a lucid and fluent argument.

Or

Q1b Analyse the impact of Mary I's attempts to restore Roman Catholicism in England between 1553 and 1558. [10]

QUESTION NOT SELECTED BY EXAMINER

Q2 Read Source 1, Interpretation A and Interpretation B and answer the questions which follow:

Causes of the English Reformation

Source 1

Extract from Simon Fish's *A Supplication for the Beggars*. This pamphlet, which took the form of a petition from the poor to Henry VIII, was written in 1529. Fish was a Protestant reformer.

The clergy are not the shepherds, but ravenous wolves going about in sheep's clothing, devouring their flock. They do no work, yet own more than a third of the country. The best manors, lands and territories are theirs. Besides this, they take a tenth of everyone's wages, a tenth of the wool, milk, honey, wax, cheese and butter that is produced, and even every tenth egg from poor widows. And what do these greedy, idle, holy thieves do with all this produce they take from the people? Nothing, but take all rule, power, authority and obedience from you, your Highness, and give it to themselves and their Papal Head.

Interpretation A

Extract from G. R. Elton, *England under the Tudors*, published in 1977.

Until Henry VIII fixed his desire upon Anne Boleyn, and Pope Clement VII found himself a prisoner of Charles V, there was nothing to disturb the harmony between the King and the Pope. Until their alliance was broken, all the underlying anti-Catholic feelings in England which Henry VIII was to exploit remained under the surface. This illustrates the importance of the divorce issue in the English Reformation. It did not alone cause the Reformation and did not even play any large part in bringing about a movement which rested on English national feelings and the scandal of a corrupt Church. However, without the divorce there would have been no Reformation in England because the power of the Crown would have been against it. It is, then, easy enough to see why Henry's war on the Pope was accepted so readily by his people.

Interpretation B

Extract from K. Randell, *Henry VIII and the Reformation in England*, published in 2005.

At the same time as Henry VIII was increasing his control over the Church in England, he was also taking steps to reduce the power of the Pope within his domain. His motives for doing so were mixed and often confused. For much of the time his intention appears to have been to exert pressure on Rome in the hope of persuading the Pope to reach a favourable decision over the divorce. However, there was a second strand to the policy. Henry was convinced that his aim should be to re-establish his territories as a "sovereign empire" within which no other ruler could exercise any control. Much of the force of the argument underpinning this policy lay in the word "re-establish". Those who urged the King in this direction believed that England's rulers had enjoyed sole power in their kingdoms until sometime in the early Middle Ages, when the Pope had unjustifiably established a variety of legal and financial claims to these kingdoms because of his headship of the Catholic Church.

Q2a Study Source 1. How useful is Source 1 as evidence for an historian studying the causes of the English Reformation? You must use contextual knowledge in your answer. [20]

Student's response

Source 1 by Simon Fish is very useful a historian studying the causes of the English Reformation.

The source is a pamphlet written by Simon Fish, who was a common lawyer and Protestant reformer in pre-reformation England. As a protestant reformer, not only was he criticising the clergy and the state of the church, he was also criticising the central Catholic Church doctrines. The source was written in 1529, before the reformation had taken place but when changes were starting to happen such as Reformation parliament meeting to gain a divorce for Henry's marriage to Anne.

In the extract from 'A Supplication for the Beggars', Fish presents a scathing attack on the clergy and points out their abuses and the corruption within the Church. In the source, he accuses them of "doing no work, but owning more than a third of the country". The increasing anti-clericalism in Pre-Reformation England often accused the clergy as being lazy and uneducating, and wanting to climb the ladders of the ecclesiastical hierarchy rather than serve God. Over 113 of landed property was also in Monastic hands. Fish also accuses them of taking a tenth of everyone's wages, "a tenth of wool, milk, honey, wax, cheese and butter that is produced." One of the main criticisms of the clergy was their wealth. Monasteries gained a lot of money through donations and indulgences, pilgrimages and through money for the prayers of dead relatives so that prayers would be said for them and their souls would pass through purgatory more quickly. Many clergy were accused of being greedy and certainly protestants thought prayers for the dead were unnecessary and it was corrupt to take money from the people. Humanist also disliked the amount of money taken from the people for prayer and indulgences. Fish continues by saying all the clergy do nothing but "take all rule, power, authority and obedience from you, your highness, and give it to themselves and their papal head." Most Protestants believed in Erastian – churches where the king was the head of the church and most disliked the papacy; Lutheranism had spread so well in Germany due to anti-papal feeling. Whilst anti-papalism was hard to detect in England, at this time the Pope was refusing to give Henry the divorce he needed from Catherine of Aragon, which he thought was against God's law.

The source is in the form of a pamphlet and as a petition to Henry, the tone is scathing and harsh, as are the words which also have an exaggerated tone. As a reformer, he wanted to convince Henry to change England to a Protestant country and reveal the corruption and abuses within the existing Catholic Church. Henry was also power hungry adding in that the clergy were taking power from him and

give it to the papacy was trying to please Henry and persuade and convince him that the abuses of the English Catholic Church needed to be swept away.

However, there are limitations with the source. It is only an extract, and therefore gives us only one viewpoint and part of the picture. It was written by a reformer, and thus could be bias about the extent of the abuses of the clergy, especially because most Protestants were radical at this time. It also only mention the corruptions within the church, and when assessing the causes of the Reformation, an historian must remember there were many other reasons for the Reformation, such as Henry's desire for a male heir, his love for Anne, political stability and power.

The source is useful in giving us the viewpoint of the Protestants and those who were anti-clerical, and talks about religious reasons and touches on power for causing the Reformation, but there were other reasons and an historian would have to refer to other sources.

Examiner's comments

(18 marks, Level 4)

The answer immediately addresses the authorship of the source, noting Simon Fish's Protestant credentials, and also identifies the significance of the date, 1529, in terms of the matter of the royal divorce.

The answer then begins to consider the content of the source, and in particular focusing on the great controversy of corruption in the Church. The candidate quotes effectively from the source to support the evaluation, for example deploying Fish's accusing the clergy of "doing no work, but owning more than a third of the country". Contextual knowledge is used to develop this point, with the candidate noting the "increasing anti-clericalism in pre-Reformation England". The contextual analysis continues with observations about the extent of land owned by the wealth the Church generated through pilgrimages, the sale of indulgences, the saying of prayers for the dead, and other practices, all of which become targets for reformers such as Fish. However, the candidate also notes that criticism of Church corruption is not confined to the would-be Protestant reformers but also extends to humanists, which is an insightful observation.

The contextual analysis then moves on to the specific issue of the papacy, and draws an interesting distinction between the advances made by Lutheranism in Germany due to "anti-papal feeling" and the more muted criticism of the Pope in England. However, the candidate hints that this is about to change because "the Pope was refusing to give Henry the divorce he needed from Catherine of Aragon".

The subsequent paragraph deals expeditiously with the mode and tone of the source, implicitly suggesting a limitation in this respect because of its "scathing and harsh" posture. The motive is identified as an attempt to persuade the King that "the abuses of the English Catholic Church needed to be swept away". Again, contextual

knowledge is used to suggest that Fish's prospects of achieving his goal are enhanced by the fact that Henry is "power hungry" and therefore likely to be receptive to the message of this pamphlet.

The next paragraph deals with limitations, but the first point raised here – that the source is limited by the fact that it is an extract – is not a convincing one. The analysis is on safer ground when it draws attention to the fact that Fish's source provides quite a narrow view of the causes of the Reformation, omitting other key factors such as "Henry's desire for a male heir [and] his love for Anne [Boleyn]".

This is a comfortable Level 4 answer, particularly in its use of contextual analysis. The treatment of limitations is perhaps something of a shortcoming, while the matter of the audience is not specifically addressed. Overall, however, this is a good source evaluation.

Q2b Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B. Historians have different views about particular issues. Using both interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of the causes of the English Reformation do you find more convincing? [30]

Student's response

Interpretations A and B offer very different views on the causes of the English reformation. Elton, in interpretation 1 holds the traditional views that reformation, although stimulated partly by divorce occurred largely due to rise in anticlericalism and hostility to the church. Interpretation 2, from Randell holds the more revisionist view that the reformation occurred due to divorce and more importantly want for power from Henry. I will agree Randells interpretation is more convincing.

Elton states that Henrys want for divorce was not the only cause, even not even play any large part rather it was the 'anticatholic feelings in England' which Henry was able to exploit which caused it. Elton believes the movement rested on English national feelings which did not cause any issues until the break down of King-Pope relation. This feeling alluded to would be the movements emerging in England in pre-reformation and also the 30's. Things such as Humanism had been circulating in intellectual circles and held the interest of many upper clergy such as Wolsey. Another large belief which attacked church practices were the anticlerical rise, historians such as Smith delievering this ideology as being a driving force. Anticlericalism attacked and brought 'scandal of a corrupt church'. Some historians holding the view that the churches, riddled with corruption collapsed easily in the face of the criticism of the laity. Elton believes that as 'the power of the crown' was now not against attack of papal authority and catholic church, these ideas were able to thrive. Heretical groups such as Lutherans were arguably a part of this, with key members such as Latimer and Cranmer being appointed to council due to compliance as a way to grant Henrys annulment. These ideas were able to be exercised.

However their are weakness with this interpretation. This 'national' feeling of anticlericalism and antipapalism is now diregarded by many historians as a large force, Haigh referring to them as 'historical illusions'. Many were content with the church as shown through attendance and offerings. As well as this many remained catholic as reinforced by quick restoration in Marys reign. The 1535 visitations which was used in parliament to show corruption of church now being viewed as an innacurate representation of conditions. As well as this the church was largely erastian, although nationalism, which Elton suggest for being reason was in Europe a cause, this was not widely felt in England. Elton states that there was nothing to disturb harmony between King and Pope "wheras Randell states the King was taking steps to reduce the power of the pope" from early on. Where Elton states the divorce played little part, Randell stresses that the reform was caused largely due to putting 'pressure on Rome in hope of persuading the pope' to grant divorce.

Randell's interpretation, has more strength. Randell convincingly argues the divorce was influential on Reformation. Reformation parliament having no clear aim was put in place to generally persuade Pope on divorce by pressure as Randell suggests. Randell shows that due to the Popes rejection of annulment Henry had to transfer power to do so over to England shaping the reformation. Randell however argues there was another motivating this being reestablish territories as a 'Sovereign Empire' to 'exercise control. Henry after the collective Satis copiosa, was established as head of church of England and Wales by the Satis copiosa in 1521. Papal authority was reduced by a series of legislations between 1534 and 1533 including 1533 Act of Restraints to appeal to Rome and the 1534 Treason and Supremacy Act. The king as Randell suggests viewed English monarchs as having the right and, "enjoyed sole power in their kingdoms". This power was seen as jeprodised by Papal jurisdiction and places like monastries, which were therefore dissolved in 1536 and 1539. Where monks had obedience to Pope and another houses. Randell also mentions a 'variety of legal and financial aims'. The church had an enormous wealth which became clear in visitations such as the 1535 Valor Ecclesiastasis and Henry and councillors such as Cromwell, who by this time was vice-gerent in spirituals coveted his wealth. Henry was able to gain this wealth through key legislation such as the 2 Acts of Annates in 1534, which cut payments to Rome and moved taxes to the crown and the act to stop St. Peters pence as well as act of fruits and tenths. As we as this the dissolutions of the monastries, which covered 1/3 of English land and had an income of £160,000 per annum was extraordinarily useful for Henry in funding foreign wars and gaining independence from grants.

The divorce was secured by 1534 with the succession Act, which was effectively enforced, the following Acts and changes to the church reinforces Randell's interpretation that the reformation was due to there being a "second" strand to the policy. This is also shown as the reformation Parliaments first actions were the usurption of clerical power through the 1532 submission of the clergy and supplication for ordinaries, following Eltons interpretation that the corruption of the church was the main interest in reform.

Despite Eltons interpretation of a reformation from beneath having some weight within historian views is now less than Randell's view of 'reformation from above'. Many historians now suggest apathy towards religious views amongst the laity and reformation as being driven by Henry. The full want for a break with Rome as initially divorce but in light of a want for authority and power. As shown through Henry's actions. Randell's interpretation is therefore much more convincing.

Examiner's comments

(28 marks, Level 4)

The candidate begins by summarising the two interpretations, identifying the position of Elton on the causes of the English Reformation as that of a traditionalist while Randell's emphasis on the royal divorce and Henry VIII's desire to expand his power mark him as a revisionist. The candidate opts for the latter interpretation as the more convincing at the outset.

In the second paragraph, the candidate begins a detailed analysis of Interpretation A, and makes contextual points relating to the influence of Humanism and anti-clericalism on the emergence of the Reformation. Good use is made of quotation in this part of the answer, such as Elton's reference to the "scandal of a corrupt Church", and there is further contextual development with reference to the rise of prominent reformers such as Latimer and Cranmer.

The third paragraph begins to challenge Elton's interpretation, initially noting that the argument in favour of anti-clericalism and anti-papalism as the driving forces of the Reformation is one that is now dismissed by many historians such as Christopher Haigh. The candidate cites the evidence of church attendance and offerings as proof of the flaws in the thesis proposed by Interpretation A. It is also noted that the two interpretations differ fundamentally on the relationship between the King and the Pope, and on the significance of the royal divorce, while the candidate draws on contextual knowledge to argue that Elton's point about the arousal of nationalist feelings in England is actually more applicable to the development of the Reformation on the continent.

In the next paragraph, the candidate analyses and supports the case made by Randell in Interpretation B. This historian's emphasis on the importance of the royal divorce is backed up by the candidate drawing on contextual knowledge to argue that the purpose of the Reformation Parliament was to put pressure on Rome to make the necessary concessions in this area. Randell's other main point, concerning the King's desire to expand his power is illustrated in some detail by the candidate in terms of the programme of legislation put in place very quickly to replace the power and authority of the papacy by that of the Crown. The candidate also uses the reference in Interpretation B to the "financial claims" of the Pope in England to argue that finance was a significant motivating factor in Henry's break with Rome, reflected in a number of Acts of Parliament such as the Act of Fruits and Tenths.

In closing, the candidate reiterates support for Interpretation B over Interpretation A, neatly summarising the respective arguments as the idea of a "reformation from above" carrying more weight than the idea of a reformation from below.

This is a solid Level 4, with a good interchange of interpretation content and contextual analysis. It does not reach the top of the level because the presentation is cumbersome in places.

Option 2: England 1603–1649

Answer Question 1(a) or 1(b) and Question 2.

Quality of written communication will be assessed in Question 1.

Q1 Either

Q1a Analyse the reasons for the breakdown in the relationship between Charles and Parliament in the period 1625–1629. [10]

QUESTION NOT SELECTED BY EXAMINER

Or

Q1b Analyse the reasons for the execution of Charles I in January 1649. [10]

Student's response

The main contributing reason to the execution of Charles I in January 1649 revolved around Charles himself, parliament and the radicalisation of the army.

Charles' attitude was a largely contributing factor to the reasons for the execution of Charles. He was not a good communicator and felt he had no reason to justify his actions. Although he had been defeated in the Civil War he still viewed himself as indispensable and failed to negotiate meaningfully in the Newcastle Propositions and Heads of Proposals alike. Whilst he believed there could be no settlement without a King, his actions simply caused his appointments to lose patients with him. His causing of the second Civil War also played a role in his execution. When Charles broke out of armed custody on 11th December 1647 and signed an alliance with the Scots in the engagement – secretly agreeing to introduce a Presbyterian Church system to England this was the last straw for many contemporaries. It allowed more radical opponents to convince parliament to pass the vote of no addresses. When this subsequently fell through in 1638, it was crucial, therefore in convincing the army to seek the trial and execution of the King.

Major factions in parliament also played a large role in Charles' execution. Divided between political presbyterians political independants, the political presbyterians anxious to disband the army and would have been content to see Charles return with few conditions imposed on him, whereas the independants wished to keep the army intact (such as Cromwell). This disagreement ultimately led to the radicalisation of the army and furthermore the trial and execution of Charles I in January 1649.

Finally, the political and religious radicalisation of the army sealed Charles I's fate. The most important political radicalisation outside Parliament were the Leveller's whose position made the search for a settlement more difficult. In events such as the Putney Debates, Levellers stood against Cromwell and Ireton, fighting for ideas such as all men over the ages of 21 being allowed to vote and challenging conscription. This caused chaos and divided the army, Cromwell believed it's breakdown would lead to 'anarchy'. Religious radicalisation among independents sects. Fifth Monarchists and Ranters and muggletonians had the same effect. They all had different beliefs on how to practice faith yet were united in the view that Charles was going against God in his actions and it was their duty to hold him accountable, ultimately leading to the trial and executions of Charles I in 1649.

Ultimately, it was Charles himself who temporarily united Parliament and the army that there could be no settlement with the King, leading to his own execution.

Examiner's comments

(9 out of 10 Marks Awarded)

This is a well organised analysis of the reasons for Charles I's execution in January 1649. Rather than present a chronological narrative, the candidate has chosen to examine different factors in turn, explaining the significance of each.

The first paragraph presents a coherent and well developed explanation of Charles I's contribution to the crisis of 1649. His personal weaknesses are explained, as is his role in triggering a Second Civil War. The impact of Charles I's mistakes is outlined and the response is supported with precise, relevant evidence.

The second paragraph examines the role of parliament in bringing about the execution of the king. The significance of parliamentary factions is explained clearly, as is parliament's role in radicalizing the New Model Army. The answer makes no reference the purge of parliament by Colonel Pride, but the analysis is sound.

The final paragraph explains the central role of the New Model Army in the king's execution. The candidate refers to the impact of religious radicals on the army and demonstrates a clear awareness of radical political ideas among the rank and file.

Overall, this response is impressive. Although there are some gaps in knowledge, the analysis presented by the candidate is well structured, coherent and convincing. Accordingly, a top level 4 mark was awarded.

Q2(a) Read Source 1, Interpretation A and Interpretation B and answer the questions which follow:

The Religious Policies of James I 1603–1625

Source 1

Extract from a speech by James I to the House of Commons, 22 March 1604. He is outlining his religious policies.

When I came to England, I found one religion publicly allowed and supported by law – the religion of the Church of England. This is the faith that I myself profess. But I also found another sort of religion – a secret group lurking within the bowels of this nation, namely the Catholic religion. I acknowledge the Roman Church to be our mother church, but it is full of impurities and corruption. Let Catholics, however, be assured that I am a friend to them, provided they are loyal subjects. In addition, I have found Puritans. They are not so different from me in terms of their religious beliefs, but they are confused in their attitude towards the Church of England. Those who are dissatisfied with the Church's structure and leadership cannot be tolerated in a well governed kingdom.

Interpretation A

Extract from M. Parry, *Stuart Britain and the Crisis of Monarchy, 1603–1702*, published in 2015.

James I summoned a conference in 1604 at Hampton Court. While the king rejected most Puritan proposals, he did agree to commission a new translation of the Bible. He also, however, had Archbishop Bancroft issue new Canons in 1604 and required all clergy to swear to them. The vast majority, including most Puritans, decided to conform. James was thus able to include moderate Puritan opinion within the national church. By appointing George Abbot as Archbishop of Canterbury in 1611, the Church of England was led by a man sympathetic to many Puritan concerns and, while some remained dissatisfied, they were largely quiet for the rest of James's reign. James I consciously sought to balance the competing factions within the English Church. At James's death, a workable compromise between Puritans and Arminians seemed to have been reached. James's Catholic subjects soon saw their hopes for an improvement in their position dashed, although James was reluctant to antagonise his Catholic subjects and showed a willingness to relax the laws against recusants.

Interpretation B

Extract from D. H. Wilson, *James VI and I*, published in 1956.

Through the Hampton Court Conference, James I did great harm. He first encouraged the Puritans and then treated them with scorn. Afterwards, he set the Church on a path towards hard and narrow intolerance of Puritans. There was no consistent policy in James's appointment of bishops and men were chosen for diverse and contradictory reasons. In 1611, George Abbot was only chosen to please a royal favourite, not the Puritans. James harmed the Church in other ways. He tried to control what was preached from the pulpit by requiring his bishops to monitor the sermons of the clergy. James was more enlightened in dealing with Catholics, with whom he had much sympathy. Yet in practice, his policy towards them was a failure as it was inconsistent and English hatred of Catholics grew rapidly.

Q2a Study Source 1. How useful is Source 1 as evidence for an historian studying attitudes towards religion in the reign of James I? You must use contextual knowledge in your answer. [20]

Student's response

Firstly, James acknowledges 'the Roman Church to be our mother church, but it is full of impurities and corruptions'. This is useful as it shows the high regard with which he views the Roman Catholic Church, showing he isn't totally against Catholicism. He also recognised the Pope as 'the universal vicar of the whole church, with spiritual authority over all; highlighting his positive views towards Catholicism. Also, he claims to Catholics that he is 'a friend to them, provided they are loyal subjects' showing how James has no contempt for Catholics, as long as they remain loyal to their King. This can be seen when James distinguished between lay and ordained Catholics, especially hating Jesuits and even told all priests and Jesuits to leave England in 1604 as they were unloyal, while leaving lay Catholics unmolested. He showed his commitment to loyal subjects by enclosing an Oath of Allegiance in the 1606 Act allowing Catholics to swear loyalty to the King. Another point of note is that James sees Puritans as confused in their attitude towards the Church of England, showing how James feels he has some differing attitudes to Puritans. This clash in ideals came to the forefront in the Hampton Court Conference when he thought he heard a Puritan delegate suggest the abolition of episcopacy, leading to James' famous outburst "No Bishop, No King!" This showed how James was against Puritans wanting the abolition of episcopacy, while he also refused to give in demands for having the wearing of the surplice and bowing of the name of Jesus removed, which were presented at the 1603 Millenary Petition. Finally, the source comments James' view that those who are dissatisfied with the church's structure and leadership cannot be tolerated in a well governed kingdom; illustrating how James felt opposition to his religious policies was not welcome. This was especially true in the aftermath of the Gunpowder Plot, an act of desperation by a band of catholic radicals who were against Spain's decision of peace with England in 1604. This led to James publishing the 1606 Act, with many tight restrictions such

as Roman Catholics being forbidden to hold public office, James being allowed to confiscate 2/3 of any catholic land and the tightening up of recusancy laws, showing how James didn't welcome opposition.

In terms of the provenance of the source, the author is James I which is useful as it gives a first hand account of James' attitudes towards religion. This is reflected in James carrying out policies such as the promotion of Catholics such as the Earl of Northampton to senior positions at court, and the appointment of Archbishop Abbott who proved hospitable to Puritans satisfying both religions. Also, the date of the source is 22 March 1604 which is useful as it is a contemporary source from James' reign and therefore will reflect his religious views at the beginning of his reign. However, the date has its limitations as it doesn't consider the next 21 years of James' reign, which included many badly received policies such as the 1618 Book of Sports which angered Puritans along with the banning of preaching on controversial subjects such as predestination. It also doesn't include the failure of the Spanish Match, which led to the tightening up of Anti-Catholic persecution in the lead up to war. The audience of this source is the House of Commons, which has its limitations in usefulness as James may not reflect his true attitude towards religion publicly to the House of Commons, as opposed to a private audience allowing James to be full and frank in his views. Furthermore, the motive of this source is to inform England and Puritans and Catholics in particular of his religious stance, showing how people of these religions are viewed and how they should act. This is useful as it highlights James' intentions in religious policy which were often pursued, such as the Enforcement of conformity whereby canons were produced in order to make sure everyone signed up to the letter of the law as laid down in the Prayer Book and 39 Articles. This showed how James was aiming to find out who was loyal and unloyal to him, therefore making this source useful as it showed James intentions of doing this. Finally, the tone of this source is one of reassurance that if you are loyal to James, you will not be persecuted like those who challenged the King. This has its limitations in usefulness as some of James' policies went on to anger everyone, not just those who weren't loyal. This can be seen in the Oath of Allegiance in 1606 along with the 1604 Hampton Court Conference where many of the terms of both left Catholics and Puritans respectively feeling aggrieved.

Overall, this source is useful in highlighting James' attitude towards religion as it highlights many of James' attitudes towards Catholics and Puritans, which were followed up by many of the reforms made by the King in his reign.

Examiner's comments

(18 out of 20 Marks Awarded)

The answer begins with a detailed analysis of the source's content. The candidate has selected a number of details contained in the source and explains their significance. In every case, this explanation is supported with relevant and precise contextual knowledge. For example, the candidate highlights James I's reference to the Catholic Church as 'our mother Church', and argues that this is of interest to an historian. The answer then expands on this by comparing the king's remark with another statement, which the candidate has drawn from his own knowledge. The answer also provides further context by referencing the penal laws of 1606 as evidence of James I's moderation. Although there are some lapses in clarity, the evaluation of content is sound and the points made are valid.

In the second section, the answer evaluates the source in terms of its provenance. The significance of authorship, date of composition, intended audience and the author's motive are all considered, and the tone of the language also receives attention. In every case, the points made by the candidate are well developed. For example, rather than simply state that the source was produced in 1604, the answer clearly explains the relevance of this. Once again, contextual knowledge is used to support the evaluation. A further strength of this answer is that the limitations of the source are clearly identified and explained.

In summary, while there are some minor flaws in this response, it was awarded a high Level 4 mark. The answer was well organised, the evaluation of the source was balanced and the contextual knowledge was relevant, accurate and precise.

Q2b Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B. Historians have different views about particular issues. Using both interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of the success of James I's religious policies in the period 1603–1625 do you find more convincing? [30]

Student's response

Interpretation A and B give us two very different opinions on the success of James' religious policies in England in the period 1603-1625. Parry in interpretation A argues that James' religious policies were successful in balancing opposing views whereas Wilson in Interpretation B argues that James' policies were a failure in consistency and treatment of Puritans. I will argue that Parry in Interpretation A poses a more convincing argument.

There is no doubt that Wilson in Interpretation B is correct in stating that James had a "narrow intolerance of puritans". James viewed Puritans with suspicion as he did not want to see a Presbyterian system formed in England as had been done in Scotland. It is correct that the Hampton Court Conference was a failure for Puritans and James had perhaps "treated them with scorn". The Puritans had failed to achieve any of their requests to James such as the removal of bishops and aspects of the church seen as 'popish ceremonies', with James dismissing them of trivial, even at one point outbursting in anger, "No bishop, no King". This does demonstrate some truth in Wilson's interpretation of the success of James' religious policies. Wilson also is correct in identifying that James "had much sympathy for Catholics" and that this had encouraged "English hatred of Catholics". James did not share the same prejudices towards Catholics as his contemporaries had done, evidenced through his lowering of recusancy fines in 1603 and even when they were increased again in 1604, his reluctance to collect them. It can also be evidenced through the presence of the Howard family at court, he valued their opinion and they had considerable influence at court before 1618. Which therefore demonstrates truth in Wilson's interpretation. It is also true that the Spanish match, trying to marry off Charles to the Spanish infanta increased fear of Catholicism, making Wilson somewhat convincing. However, although there is truth in Wilson's claim that the Hampton Court conference was a failure, with James having "treated [Puritans] with scorn", Parry in interpretation A also recognises that James "rejected most Puritan proposals". It is Parry's recognition of the commission of a "new translation of the Bible" that makes Interpretation A more convincing as he recognises that the Hampton Court conference had some compromise. Parry has also shown his acknowledgement of the appointing of Archbishop of Canterbury being George Abbott, a man sympathetic to many Puritans" (Parry). I therefore find Parry in Interpretation A more convincing as he recognises concessions had been made to please Puritans as well as Catholics.

Parry in Interpretation A is convincing in showing the success through the issuing of the canons in 1604. Parry recognises that "most Puritans, decided to confirm". We know this to be true as only 1% of puritan preachers decided to resign their livings and refuse to accept the canons. Parry also states that James tried to "balance the

competing factions". This is true as evidenced through and recognised by Parry, the appointment of Richard Bancroft in 1604 and then "appointing George Abbot" in 1611 as Archbishop of Canterbury. This is clear in evidencing appeasing both sides of Catholic and Puritans in the early years of his reign. Therefore making Interpretation A more convincing. Parry furthermore acknowledges James' relaxed "laws against recusancy fines" and therefore accurately and convincingly argues that James was successful in appeasing both Catholics and Protestants. Whilst James may have increased recusancy fines in 1604 back to their normal level, he remained relaxed concerning enforcing them. This underlines his willingness to compromise in order to please the Puritans as well as continuing to sympathise with his Catholic subjects, therefore making Interpretation A more convincing. Much alike this, Parry in Interpretation A underlines how a "compromise between Puritans and Arminians seemed to have been reached". It is in fact true that Arminians caused fear among Puritans as they shared James' sympathetic view towards Catholics, and it is well known that they believed in absolute obedience to the King, however, many puritans, although unhappy with some policies such as the Spanish Match 1613 and the Book of Sports in 1618, were happy to remain "largely quiet" (Parry) during James' reign and accepted his policies. Therefore, Parry is convincing in his interpretation. In conclusion, I believe Parry in Interpretation A is more convincing as while Wilson in Interpretation B is correct that James has more sympathy to Catholic subjects. Parry acknowledges that both sides and James' religious policies were therefore successful in the period 1603–1625.

* It is also evidenced through Elizabeth's marriage to the protestant Frederick of the Palatinate, which showed James' commitment to the protestant cause. This was 'evened out' by James' Spanish match for Charles.

Examiner's comments

(24 out of 30 Marks Awarded)

The answer begins with a clear, concise summary of both interpretations. From the outset, the candidate shows that they have formed an accurate understanding of the viewpoints expressed. In addition, Interpretation A is clearly indicated as being, in the candidate's opinion, a more convincing interpretation.

The next section of the response focuses on Interpretation B. Although the candidate has already indicated that he/she found this interpretation less convincing, the response clearly shows those areas where the candidate and the extract are in agreement. Wilson's analysis of James I's treatment of Puritans and Catholics is discussed, and in both cases, the candidate uses good contextual knowledge to justify his/her agreement with Wilson's interpretation. The evidence used by the candidate is relevant and appropriate and the level of detail quite adequate.

The response moves on to discuss Interpretation A. The two interpretations are compared and the response briefly draws out the contrast in how both historians have interpreted the Hampton Court Conference. Once again, the response deploys contextual knowledge to justify a preference for Interpretation A.

In the final section, the answer explores M Parry's interpretation of James I's religious policies. The analysis of Parry's arguments is focused and is well supported with contextual knowledge. Rather than simply provide a narrative, the candidate has shown, with precision, those areas of Parry's analysis that are convincing. Although the response does not identify any weaknesses in Parry's approach, it was deemed worthy of Level 4.

Option 3: Britain in the Age of Reform 1830–1880

Answer Question 1(a) or 1(b) and Question 2.

Quality of written communication will be assessed in Question 1.

Q1 Either

Q1a Analyse the influence of the Utilitarians and Evangelicals on the reform programme of Grey and Melbourne between 1833 and 1840. [10]

Student's response

The Utilitarians and evangelicals had a great impact over the whig government 1833-40's reform programme. Evangelicals and humanitarians such as William Wilberforce had campaigned for years for the abolition of slavery, which was passed in 1833, stating that slaves would do a 7 year apprenticeship before being freed to ease the economics of places like the West Indies out of slavery, and that former owners would be paid £20 million between them in compensation. Another piece of legislation pushed by evangelicals was the 1833 Factory Act spearheaded by Althorp and Lord Ashley, two of the most prominent evangelicals of the time. It limited the working hours of children 9-13 to 8 hours and allocated 2 hours of education for them, but was only enforced by 4 inspectors nationwide and only applied to textile factories. One of the biggest pieces of legislation was the 1834 Poor Law Amendment Act which was heavily influenced and driven by utilitarians like Edwin Chadwick. Utilitarians, who sought to make the government more efficient, wanted to save money on poor relief spending, which was succesful as spending was £8 million in 1830 down to an average of £4.5 million between 1835 and 1839. Unfortunately this came at the cost of the poor, who suffered in workhouses because of it. The 1835 Municipal Corporations Act was also driven by utilitarians so they saw the corporation exclusive local government so inefficient due to inaction of the Majors and councillors. This Act introduced 3 elected councillors, with an election replacing one on a yearly basis as well as a treasurer to audit the town. The births, death and marriages Act made the evangelical Factory Act easier to enforce and made census' more efficient as it required births, deaths and marriages to be registered. The government education grants of £20 000 and later £30000 gave schools funding to improve equipment and higher staff, or take on more students from an evangelical view.

Other utilitarians influenced legislation introduced under Melbourne and Grey include the 1840 Penny Post, which made communication easier and helped business grow as a stamp only costed 1p and the introduction of the Limited Liability Corporation that gave shareholders a safety net and caused railway business to boom.

In conclusion both Evangelicals and Utilitarians had a heavy influence on the governments of Grey and Melbourne as can be seen by legislation passed under them.

Examiner's comments

(10 marks, Level 4)

This is an excellent answer, based on a good knowledge and understanding of the subject matter. The answer also very successfully blends an overview of the subject with a judicious selection of detail.

The candidate chooses broadly to follow a chronological approach in addressing the influence of the Utilitarians and Evangelicals, which serves to give the answer a coherent framework and one that the reader can easily relate to. The answer therefore opens with arguably the most important and certainly the most memorable Whig reform between 1833 and 1840, namely the abolition of slavery, providing illustrative detail on the legislation and on the great campaigner who had fought so long to achieve this reform: William Wilberforce. Consideration of the Evangelical or humanitarian contribution to reform also encompasses the Factory Act of the same year, and again the candidate provides precise and accurate detail and again the names of the principal sponsors, Althorp and Ashley.

A positive feature of this answer is its balance, and this is demonstrated in the middle section where the focus switches to the Utilitarians and their signal achievements in the 1834 Poor Law Amendment Act and the 1835 Municipal Corporations Act. The candidate again provides a succinct analysis of these pieces of legislation and the prominent part played by Edwin Chadwick as one of the leading exponents of Utilitarianism. Here and throughout the answer the candidate is not simply rhyming off learned facts, but showing an awareness of how these reforms actually operated and what they meant.

By this point in the answer, the candidate has already secured a Level 4 mark because of the conviction of the analysis and the range and detail of the material presented. But what takes this answer to the top of Level 4 is the extension of the range of the answer in its final third to convince the reader that this period was indeed one of the most significant in British history in terms of both the scale and the landmark nature of the reforms passed by the governments of Grey and Melbourne. For example, in this closing section of the answer we have reference to and explanation of reforms such as the Marriages Act, the grants for education and the introduction of the Penny Post in 1840. This is very impressive.

In addition to the qualities already referred to, this answer has a natural flow and an unflagging momentum that sweeps the reader along, providing a superb insight into the period and a sense that this is not just a subject that the candidate has a thorough knowledge of, but one that they actually enjoy writing about. The outcome of full marks is thoroughly deserved. Not every 10-mark answer may be as good, but the qualities displayed in this answer means that success is guaranteed.

Or

Q1b Analyse how the Conservative government of Benjamin Disraeli addressed the economic and social problems of Britain between 1874 and 1880. [10]

QUESTION NOT SELECTED BY EXAMINER

Q2 Read Source 1, Interpretation A and Interpretation B and answer the questions which follow:

The Failure of the Chartists

Source 1

Extract from William Lovett's *The Life and Struggles of William Lovett*, published in 1876. Lovett is reflecting on the failure of the Chartist movement.

I regard Feargus O'Connor as the chief troublemaker of our movement. Through his great claims, and by trickery and dishonesty, he gained the support of the working classes to establish a paper called the *Northern Star* to advance workers' principles. By his personal conduct and his destructive influence on the paper, he deeply harmed democracy from the first moment he opened his mouth as its professional spokesman. He soon changed the paper into an instrument for destroying everything intellectual and moral in our movement. By his constant appeals to the selfishness, vanity and most evil feelings of man, he created a spirit of hatred and intolerance previously unknown among Chartists.

Interpretation A

Extract from Sir E. L. Woodward, *The Age of Reform 1815–1870*, published in 1962.

Chartism deserved better leaders than O'Connor, O'Brien, Jones and all the lesser agitators. Lovett realised the weakness of any movement among the working classes and those suffering as a result of industrial change. These men had neither the time nor the education to develop a political strategy and a convincing background of theory. Their political philosophy, such as it was, came mainly from their reading of the Bible. Chartists were divided by personal rivalries and disagreements about the measures they would introduce after achieving political power. Many of them rejected industrialisation and machinery and thought in terms of a nation of small landowners. Others, like Lovett, followed Robert Owen in believing that the new inventions might solve the problems of poverty.

Interpretation B

Extract from M. Scott-Baumann, *Years of Expansion: British History 1815–1914*, published in 2002.

The issue of violence did not divide the Chartists as much as some historians have suggested. Most Chartists asserted the right to arm in self-defence and William Lovett, the champion of “moral force” methods, was even prepared to go to prison in 1839 on this issue. Nevertheless Chartism remained a predominantly peaceful, constitutional movement. Its failure has also been explained by “hunger politics” – the reaction to hunger by an illiterate working class that was manipulated by the Chartist leadership, particularly O'Connor. But this image of an unthinking and uneducated movement is inconsistent with what we know of the Chartists' commitment to self-improvement and education. In fact, it was the Chartist desire for radical political change, rather than O'Connor's fiery speeches, that frightened the political establishment. Chartist failure was therefore a reflection of the strength of its opponents rather than its own weakness. The rejection of each Chartist petition and the readiness to deploy the army and police to defend the political status quo reflected this fact.

Q2a Study Source 1. How useful is Source 1 as evidence for an historian studying the failure of the Chartists? You must use contextual knowledge in your answer. [20]

Student's response

Source 1 is extremely useful for a historian studying the failure of the Chartist movement. The date is useful as it is from 1876, 28 years after the last petition had failed and the movement collapsed, allowing for the use of hindsight, but also contemporary enough that primary evidence is still there. The author is William Lovett, which shows the source's usefulness as he was the leader of constitutional chartism under his London Working Man's Association and later LSO, which both advocated peaceful methods of obtaining the 6 points. Lovett co-wrote the charter with Francis Place in 1838, so he can be said to be one of the Fathers of the movement. He is writing this in his own book, his memoirs, so it is useful for a historian as it records his thoughts on why the chartish failed, but also provides a primary source for historians to study. The main reason he cites as the failure of the movement is the leadership of Fergus O'Connor, with Lovett regarding him as "the chief troublemaker of [his] movement". From my own knowledge I know that O'Connor founded the Northern Star, a Chartist propoganda newspaper that was popular in the North, which Lovett refers to as having a "destructive influence" that harmed democracy directly, and that it soon became "an instrument for destroying everything intellectual and moral in our movement". Lovett is refering to O'Connors willingness to use force in order to achieve the aims of the chartists and used violent rhetoric to eventually take over the movement after the collapse of Lovetts CSU following the 1842 petition, hence turning Lovetts previously moral movement into one not aversed to using force, Lovett stating that "he created a spirit of hatred and intolerance previously unknown among chartists". The tone of the source is one of spite for O'Connor, showing his hatred for him and that the rivalry between the 2 is quite personal. Lovetts motive is to try and expose O'Connor as the reason why the Chartist movement failed and how he lost control of it, addressing the readers of his book. Although the source is extremely useful it does have limitations. It solely pins the blame on O'Connor and his newspaper, but doesn't mention the preparedness of the British government to put down any rising, such as that in Newport, using heavy weapons and railway lines to travel quickly or that Chartism was only strong in times of recession such as before all 3 petitions, and had no support in or out of parliament at those times – JR Stephens says that the movement was based around a "Bread and cheese question", only strong when times where hard. O'Connor only takes blame for his newspaper allowing him to take control of the movement, the source does not mention that his violent rhetoric chased off even radical MPs in parliament and that his 1848 petition, containing only 1.9 million genuine signatures out of 5.1 million, discredited the movement entirely. Furthermore, there is no mention made of the governments arrest of himself and other leaders after the first petition failed that crippled the movement or his own role in failing to counter O'Connor's ideas and having his CSU collapse after the second petition.

In conclusion, source 1 is extremely useful for a historian studying the chartists as it shows the thoughts of O'Lovett, a founder of the movement, as to why it failed, but

does not come without its limitations such as failing to mention other reasons for the movements failures like the role of the government and that chartism was only popular in periods depression.

Examiner's comments

(18 marks, Level 4)

This candidate wastes no time in making pertinent points about the extract from the autobiography of William Lovett that is the subject of this analysis. Both the date and the author are identified as points of value, but these are not empty claims in that the candidate utilises contextual knowledge to substantiate this analysis. For example, in relation to the date, the candidate notes that this is 28 years after the last great Chartist petition, giving Lovett the benefit of hindsight, but yet close enough to the heyday of Chartism to have the quality of contemporary evidence.

Many might be content to identify Lovett as the leader of constitutional Chartism as the candidate in fact does but here the candidate goes further, and again uses contextual knowledge. The candidate points out that Lovett was in fact one of the founders of the movement, through his involvement with the London Working Men's Association, and actually co-wrote the Charter with Francis Place. This is not only impressive contextual knowledge, an element required for an answer to attain the upper reaches of Level 4, but it is contextual knowledge that is expertly integrated into the analysis of the source so that focus on the matter at hand is not lost.

The mode is dealt with competently and then the answer begins to consider the content of the source in detail. In considering the main theme pursued by Lovett, the candidate again makes good use of contextual knowledge, pointing out Feargus O'Connor's readiness to use violent rhetoric and his eventual usurpation of Lovett after the failure of the 1842 Chartist petition. This seamless integration of contextual knowledge helps to explain the both the tone and the motive of the source, which the candidate then goes on to analyse.

Having presented a convincing and fluent case in relation to the strengths of the source, the candidate then proceeds to consider possible limitations, and immediately identifies what is arguably the principal flaw in Lovett's argument: that it is too narrowly, indeed exclusively, focused on the demerits of Feargus O'Connor. Using relevant contextual knowledge, the candidate argues that there were other reasons for the failure of Chartism, such as the resolve and resources of the governments of this period and the fact that Chartism lost its popular appeal when the economy was strong. However, the point made about O'Connor and the 1848 petition actually supports the argument made by Lovett and therefore does not really count as a limitation.

The candidate presents a brief résumé to conclude the answer, noting its innate strengths and also its limitation in terms of failing to present a wider range of factors for the failure of Chartism.

This is a high Level 4 answer based on its convincing analysis of the strengths of this source, especially commendable for its use of contextual knowledge to develop analysis of the cardinal features of Lovett's extract. Limitations are considered, but not with the same conviction as the strengths of the source, which is why it does not obtain full marks. Nonetheless, this is a solid answer.

Q2b Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B. Historians have different views about particular issues. Using both interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of the reasons for the failure of the Chartists do you find more convincing? [30]

Student's response

Both interpretation A and B look at the issue of why the Chartists failed, but they differ in their assumptions as why they did. A looks at the leaders and the political weakness of them, whereas B doesn't blame the Chartists for their failure, rather their opponents.

I am going to argue that B is the more convincing as I believe it to contain more accurate information. The phrase that they 'assured the right to arm in self-defence' is there as the movement used mainly law abiding methods, for example they used 3 petitions in 1839, 1842 and 1848, each gathering millions of votes, however Parliament rejected them by a large majority. In the New Port Rising of 1839 a Chartist demonstration in the South Valley in Wales degenerated into violence and the conspirators were shot at. The government responded by transporting figures away to foreign countries for life and they imprisoned leading figures (William and Lovett) as rightly said in the source.

I also find the source convincing as it references 'hunger politics' as the group was divided and weak because it was supported at different times and for different reasons and the factory workers and domestic outworkers only supported the charter when they were struggling economically, 'I defy you to agitate a fellow with a full stomach' – Cobett. While this partly caused the demise of the movement I find the source convincing as it counteracts this view by presenting the movement as educated as they did have some innovative ideas including 'self-improvement and education.' They desired Parliament to be transformed, hoping it would better the working classes' lives, such as the payment of MPs and abolition of the property qualification to create a more diverse social background into Westminster. They saw education as a means of elevating the lot of the poor, and bringing about political inclusion.

I also find B more convincing regarding why the Chartists failed as it states that it occurred due to the 'strength of its opponents,' by which they mean the government. Despite peaceful methods Parliament rejected the first petition (1.2 million votes) which a majority of 235 to 46, and the second (3 mill) with a majority of 287 to 49. The 3rd petition was to include on open air rally in London, but it was banned and only a handful of Chartists were allowed to present the petition to Parliament. The

Chartists had also resented the Whigs, feeling that they were as bad as the Tories, due to their harsh reaction reaction to the swing riots and the introduction of the unpopular workhouse. Again the government prevented this educated, professional pressure group from gaining their aims, as they held firm and refused to make concessions. The government believed that the reforms of the 1830s had gone far enough, the movement failed because 'it was confronted with a self-confident system, reinforced by the settlement of 1832' (James).

Although I find B the most convincing of the two interpretations it does not come without its limitations for example 'violence did not divide the Chartists' can not be dismissed. The divisions in what tactics the movement should use was a crucial factor to the failure, as it incorporated the division within the leadership of the movement itself, between Lovett and O'Connor. Also the sources dismissal over 'hunger politics' is questionable, as it did have a major impact on the movement as Briggs states 'Chartism was the creed of hard times, when these hard times disappeared, so too did much of the appeal of the Charter.'

I find A the most unconvincing of the two interpretations, as I believe it contains inaccurate information as it blames the leaders of the movement and refers to them as neither having 'the time nor the education' to bring success to the movement. The leaders, although divided were devoted to the Charters six points, O'Connor gained a national reputation, Lovett saw education as a means of development and also Fergus O'Connor was credited with the idea of developing the land plan, in an attempt to ease the unemployment situation and give settlers self-respect and freedom. Therefore I find this attack on the leaders an utterly unacceptable perception.

Also I find A unconvincing as it presents the failure as them being divided in the measures of what to introduce. This is inaccurate information as they clearly defined the 6 points of the Charter, and they say a reemergence of old radical aims present in England from the 1780s. The aims were not new and they clearly understood their aims. Gash claims the campaign in 1812 was very similar to the Chartists campaign.

I also find it unconvincing that their failure came from their influence from the Bible. Moral arguments are drawn from the bible but the intelligence of their aims and the relevance of their desires to the period (1830s – 40s) shouldn't be dismissed.

Although I find A the most unconvincing regarding the failures I agree with the credible points, such as the Chartists were divided by personal rivalries as they were not a homogenous group.

I also agree that many of them rejected industrialisation as the land plan was based on the idea that a family would be given a 4 acre plot and they would pay £1.5s for each acre and the Chartists would buy shares for £1.6s.

I agree that B is the most convincing regarding the failures of the Chartists as it presents the Chartists as a professional group, with clear aims, but was merely unable to succeed given those in power, as they were faced down by the army and police, for example in the Plug Plots, and these in authority continually won because their strict punishment toward industrial unrest. We also see the dedication of its leaders, who were educated and forward-thinking in their aims. I believe A to be the most unconvincing as it blames the leaders of the movement for their failures, and contrasting (to B) sees them as uneducated in their development towards a more democratic age, when really the main factor was their inability to overcome those in charge and gain a parliamentary foothold (the working class were excluded from politics until 1867). It is also unconvincing as it presents their aims as confused and incoherent.

Examiner's comments

(28 marks, Level 4)

The candidate begins by summarising the two interpretations, identifying the position of Woodward as emphasising the shortcomings of the Chartist leadership, while Scott-Baumann argues that failure of the Chartists was primarily due to the reaction and response of their political opponents.

In the second paragraph, the candidate selects Interpretation B as the argument which he/she finds more convincing, and then begins a detailed analysis of Scott-Baumann's case. Contextual knowledge is deployed in relation to the point made in this interpretation about the Chartists having "asserted the right to arm in self-defence", with the candidate noting that the failure of the petitions to Parliament in 1839, 1842 and 1848 was followed by the so-called Newport Rising of 1839 where there were violent clashes between the Chartists and the forces of the state. The contextual analysis is very well integrated with consideration of the content of Interpretation B, as for example with reference to the ostensibly non-violent champion William Lovett who was imprisoned as a result of the disturbances at Newport.

The answer for a short time loses some conviction by elaboration on the reference to "hunger politics", which Scott-Baumann only mentions in order to refute as a true characteristic of Chartism. It is again on course when it develops Interpretation B's reference to the importance of "self-improvement and education" by pointing to relevant aspects of the People's Charter and the overriding goal of a more inclusive political system that would benefit the poor.

In the next paragraph, the candidate considers Scott-Baumann's point about the reaction of the political establishment and provides good contextual detail about the rejection of the Chartist petitions and makes an interesting point about the Chartists making no distinction between the Whigs and Tories. This argument is developed with reference to the introduction of the workhouse and the general establishment view that political reform had gone far enough.

The answer, however, does take issue with Scott-Bauman on a number of issues, notably the extent to which violence *did* divide the Chartists and how hunger politics *did* have an impact on the movement's popularity.

From here the candidate moves to a dismantling of the core argument of Interpretation A, that an inadequate leadership explains the failure of Chartism. The answer cites Lovett's promotion of education, O'Connor's land plan and the Six Points of the Charter itself as evidence of a leadership that was both innovative and ready to draw on the ideas of Britain's radical past, with an interesting reference to Norman Gash. The candidate also mounts a good argument against Woodward's point about the influence of the Bible on Chartism. At the same time the candidate recognises the validity of Woodward's points about leadership divisions and a lack of unity in the movement as a whole.

The summative paragraph does not simply repeat the arguments already deployed, but brings in some new material, such as the reference to the Plug Plots, demonstrating that an answer does not necessarily have to conclude in a low key.

Overall, this answer is a good example of balanced analysis and a well conceived structure, moving from a detailed analysis of the strengths of the selected interpretation, an acknowledgement of weaknesses, and then a refutation and deconstruction of the opposing interpretation, while not overlooking its merits. In all, an answer that full merits maximum marks.

Option 4: Italy and Germany 1815–1871

Answer Question 1(a) or 1(b) and Question 2.

Quality of written communication will be assessed in Question 1.

Q1 Either

Q1a Analyse the reasons for the growth of nationalist and liberal ideas in the German states in the period 1815–1848. [10]

QUESTION NOT SELECTED BY EXAMINER

Or

Q1b Analyse why Prussia defeated Austria in the Austro-Prussian War of 1866. [10]

Student's response

Prussia defeated Austria in the Austro-Prussian War of 1866 because of favourable international situations, Austria was isolated. Austria did not ally with Prussia in the 1854 Crimean War and Prussia at the Convention of Alvensleben moved troops to the borders of Prussia to prevent any Polish refugees from entering Prussia as there was a Prussian Revolt against the repressive regime of the Tsar. Napoleon III underestimated the power of Prussia at the 1865 Biarritz meeting and secured an alliance with Austria to remain neutral in a war between Austria and Prussia. Austria refused an offer from Italy to buy Venetia so Italy and Prussia secured an alliance. This was crucial as the involvement of Italy in this war meant Austria had the fight a war on two fronts, 150,000 out of Austria's troops were fighting against Italy. This allowed Prussia to easily defeat Austria in Sadowa on 3rd July 1866. Britain didn't see any harm in Prussian expansion.

Also the superiority of the economy and army was instrumental in the defeat of Austria. The 1860 Army Bill increased the Prussian Army from 50,000 to 110,000 men and introduced 39 new infantry and 10 new cavalry regiments as well as relegating the middle-class militia to a home guard. The expansive railways of Prussia was crucial and by 1866, the army was able to be deployed in an arc of 950km meaning they were able to encircle and defeat Austria. The Zollverein created a wealth generation increasing the number of jobs and crucially taxation in Germany which was used to reform the army. The fact Prussia refused to allow

Austria to become part of the Zollverein and dismissed von Bruck's proposal of a Zollunion between Austria and the Zollverein meant Austria did not share the same economic prosperity.

The military excellence of Von Roon and Moltke was superior to the Austrian military leaders. The Prussian army focused on mobility whereas the Austrians were too focused on close formations which caused them to be encircled and defeated.

Also the fact that the Austrians army was multi-ethnic and had different aims means they had less unity than the virtually all German Prussian army.

Prussia was able to defeat Austria in the 1866 Austro-Prussian war because they were better equipped, their Dreyse needle-loading rifles were five times faster, more accurate and fired farther than the Austrian breech-loading Lorenz rifles. This caused Austria to have 45,000 casualties at the Battle of Konniagratz compared to Prussia's 9000.

For these reasons, Prussia was able to defeat Austria in the Austro-Prussian war of 1866.

Examiner's comments

This response consistently demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. Points are very well developed, and remain focused on the question, with sound explanation and analysis. The material is presented clearly, coherently and legibly. The first paragraph concentrates on the wider European situation, favourable to Prussia, noting how Austria had antagonised Russia while, in contrast, Prussia offered assistance to Russia during a rising by its Polish subjects. The manner in which Bismarck secured both French neutrality and military support from Italy are cited, the response going on to link this with the strategic difficulties faced by an encircled Austria in 1866.

The second paragraph of the response considers how the Prussian army was reformed and streamlined to match and outperform its Austrian counterpart, and the superiority of a railway system which enabled speedier mobilisation for the Prussians is seen as a crucial factor in its victory. Comparable statistics for the Austrian army might have been offered to accentuate the contrast, but the point of Prussian superiority on and in the approach to the battlefield is well made. The background to this superiority is identified as economic, and linked with the prosperity which accrued to Prussia from the Zollverein, an economic union from which Austria was excluded, widening the gap between the two economies and their military capabilities.

The third, fourth and fifth paragraphs deal with military issues. The leadership of von Roon and von Moltke is rightly underlined as a key factor, as well as the difference in tactics which were crucial in the Battle of Sadowa. The "multi-ethnic" nature of the Imperial army is seen as a weakness, while finally there is good detailed description of each side's firepower and the resultant casualty figures.

Overall this response is characterised by depth of evidence and good analysis. It was assessed as a high Level 4.

- Q2** Read Source 1, Interpretation A and Interpretation B and answer the questions which follow:

The Causes of the Unification of Italy

Source 1

Extract from a letter from Marquis Villamarina, Piedmont's ambassador in Paris, to Camillo di Cavour, Prime Minister of Piedmont-Sardinia, 6 February 1858.

Allow me to give you a word for word account of what Emperor Napoleon III said to me today: "If England refuses to accept France's valid demands, Anglo-French relations will get worse until we are on the brink of hostilities. If this happens, how would Piedmont respond???? There are two possibilities: you are either with me or against me. Piedmont's real support lies in France and in order to be with me, it is essential that you do as I ask. What real advantage would an alliance with England offer you???? It would not be of much use if England persists in keeping the Vienna Settlement intact. If Piedmont supports England, France would feel obliged, against its will, to seek Austria's support. If this happened, I would have to give up what I had dreamed of with such passion. Even I, who have always wanted Italy's happiness and independence, would then be forced to ally with a government which has always aroused my deepest disgust."

Interpretation A

Extract from Martin Clark, *The Italian Risorgimento*, published in 1998.

By September 1870 Italian unification was complete. It was an astonishing achievement made possible by the gifts of two men of genius, Cavour and Garibaldi. Cavour's skilful diplomacy secured the Franco-Piedmontese alliance and the war of 1859 against Austria, in which Piedmont captured Lombardy. It was Garibaldi's genius and determination that won the south in 1860. With his immense courage, Garibaldi attracted tens of thousands of volunteers to fight for "Italy". Moreover, these volunteer amateurs gained far more spectacular victories than King Victor Emmanuel II's professional Piedmontese army ever managed to achieve. Indeed, the Piedmontese army conquered only Lombardy, Umbria and the Marches, whereas Garibaldi and his "Thousand" became a legend throughout the world.

Interpretation B

Extract from M.S. Anderson, The Ascendancy of Europe: Aspects of European History 1815–1914, published in 1972.

Napoleon III made an essential contribution to Italian unification by his defeat of the Austrian army in the short war fought in Lombardy in 1859. Although he made peace with the Habsburgs prematurely in the eyes of Italian nationalists, he had achieved the essential change in the existing situation in Lombardy because its one effective defender, the Austrian army, had after a few weeks fighting been eliminated from the picture over most of the peninsula. The way had been opened for the overthrow of the flimsy regimes which ruled the different Italian states and whose Austrian support had been snatched from them. In Tuscany, Parma and Modena the rulers were driven out with ease in the spring of 1859. By the end of the year Napoleon III had decided to allow the union of these states with Piedmont, in return for the compensation of France with Savoy and Nice. The isolation of Austria and the ideals of Napoleon III had given Italian nationalists the freedom of action they had never achieved in 1848.

Q2a Study Source 1. How useful is Source 1 as evidence for an historian studying the attitude of Napoleon III to the expansion of Piedmont in Northern Italy? You must use contextual knowledge in your answer. [20]

Student's response

A major strength of Source 1 for studying the attitude of Napoleon III to the expansion of Piedmont in Northern Italy is the content of the Source. It states how Napoleon III is asking how Piedmont will respond if 'England refuses to accept France's valid demands' causing Anglo-French relations to be on the brink of hostilities'. Villamarina states how Piedmont will either be with or against France and how 'Piedmont's real support lies in France'. The source states the little advantages of an alliance with England, England is isolated from the rest of Europe and had little interest in the unification of the Italian states or Piedmont expansion, but how England 'persists in keeping the Vienna Settlement intact'. The Vienna Settlement allowed Austria to annex Lombardy and Venetia from the Italians. It states how if Piedmont supported England, they would 'seek Austrian Support'. However, Napoleon III says how he 'always wanted Italy's happiness and independence', he was a former member of the Carbonari and the fact that Napoleon I had made actions to try and liberate the Italian states, Napoleon III perhaps felt it was his destiny to help Piedmont.

Another positive attribute of the source is the author, the fact that it is written by Villamarina, Piedmont's ambassador to Paris makes the source very useful in analysing Napoleon III's attitude to Piedmontese expansion due to the fact that he would be well educated and a government official. This status ensures his ability to assess the attitude of Napoleon III and to report it back clearly to Cavour and Piedmont.

The date is also significant as it is written in February 1858, this is after the July 1856 Paris Peace Conference in which Cavour publicised the 'Italian Question' and forged relations with Napoleon III. Also it is just before the top secret July 1858 meeting of Plombieres and only a year before the North Italian War in which Italy allied with Piedmont against Austria. This means that the source is very reflective of how Napoleon III felt leading up to these events and is therefore very useful in studying his attitude to Piedmont expansion.

The mode of the source is a letter which ensures its reliability. The fact that it is not meant for public consumption means all its content will be accurate and representative of the attitudes in France and Napoleon III himself. Also the fact it is a government official letter and that the audience is Camillo di Cavour ensures this. Cavour was very much interested in the expansion of Piedmontese control so he would be looking for feedback from his ambassadors for the opinions of other foreign leaders therefore this source is very useful in studying the attitude of Napoleon III to the expansion of Piedmont in Northern Italy. The motive is to simply inform Cavour of the attitude of Napoleon III.

The time of the source is very clear and direct but also descriptive and analytical. The fact that it is a direct quotation from Napoleon III himself ensures the accuracy and reliability of the source when assessing his attitude to Piedmont expansion.

However we cannot accept Source 1 at face value and there are some limitations to the source. The date is a limitation as it takes place before Piedmont has made any territorial gains and the benefit of hindsight means we know that Napoleon III did ally with Cavour so the source is not reflective on how his opinion changed and processed throughout Piedmont's expansion. The author can also be a limitation as if the source was written by Napoleon III, it might be more reflective of his secret opinions for Piedmontese expansion and not just what he tells the Piedmontese ambassador to Paris. This is strengthened by the fact that he is clearly trying to persuade Cavour to ally with France instead of England. Despite this, the source is useful when studying the attitude of Napoleon III to Piedmontese expansion.

Examiner's comments

This response makes a good attempt at assessing the utility of Source 1, adopting a systematic approach and adding contextual knowledge. Its one failing is that it does not mention Orsini's assassination attempt on Napoleon III a few weeks before Villmarina's letter was written.

The first paragraph addresses the content of Source 1, noting Napoleon III's concerns as to Piedmontese intentions should Anglo-French relations deteriorate to "the verge of hostilities." The response focuses on the Emperor's argument that Piedmontese interests lie in supporting and receiving support from France. Where the Source asks "What real advantage would an alliance with England offer you?", the response utilises additional knowledge, explaining the lack of interest from England in either Italian unification or Piedmontese expansion, and how the Treaty of Vienna, which Britain wished to maintain, gave Lombardy and Venetia to Austria. The response notes Napoleon's declared reluctance to ally with Austria, using contextual knowledge to explain the Emperor's former membership of the Carbonari and his sense of "destiny."

The second paragraph addresses the importance of the Source's authorship, noting the seniority of the Marquis Villafranca, the Piedmontese ambassador to France, whose job entailed reporting back accurately on his conversations with Napoleon III.

The third paragraph addresses the date of the Source, placing it in the context of Cavour's continuing campaign to win French support for the expulsion of the Austrians and the expansion of Piedmontese influence in Northern Italy, beginning during the Crimean war and culminating in the Compact of Plombières and the 1859 war. An opportunity is missed here to note that the letter comes shortly after the Italian Orsini tried to kill Napoleon, and that French relations with Britain have deteriorated because of Orsini's planning of the outrage in that country.

The fourth paragraph considers the mode and the intended audience of the Source, suggesting that the private nature of a letter to the Prime Minister of Piedmont, who was vitally concerned with France's intentions, ensures its reliability. There is also some reference to motive, which is developed in the final paragraph.

The fifth paragraph deals with tone, stressing the "direct quotation" significance of the Source, although it does not really describe the tone of persuasion underlaid by veiled threats of a possible Franco-Austrian alliance.

The final paragraph considers some possible limitations to the Source, mentioning the difficulties inherent in assessing Napoleon III's attitude towards the expansion of Piedmont from a letter written before the North Italian War, when, as the response uses contextual knowledge to point out, Napoleon began to have doubts about what he had started in Italy. The response also suggests that the letter from Villafranca is reported speech, and might be more useful if it actually came from Napoleon's pen.

This response was generally perceptive in its attempt to deal with the question, with the qualifications mentioned above, and was assessed as mid-level 4.

Q2b Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B. Historians have different views about particular issues. Using both interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of the causes of the unification of Italy do you find more convincing? [30]

Student's response

The two extracts offer two very different interpretations for the causes of the unification of Italy. On the one hand, Clark in Interpretation A emphasises the roles played by Garibaldi and his volunteer's military excellence and the role played by Cavour and his skillful diplomacy. However, Anderson in Interpretation B credits Napoleon III and his essential contribution as the main cause for Italian unification. I will argue that Clark's Interpretation A is more convincing than that of Interpretation B.

Anderson states in Interpretation B Napoleon III's 'essential contribution in 1859 North Italian War. Napoleon committed 170,000 troops, 2000 horsemen and 390 guns to the war whereas Piedmontese troops struggled and only raised 60,000 men. Also the Piedmont troops took little part in fighting so it was the French troops that gained the essential victories at the Battles of Magenta and Solferino defeating the Austrians. Despite Anderson saying how they might have 'made peace prematurely with the Habsburg Empire' this could have led to a reversal over Lombardy. Interpretation B states how Austrian defeat led to the 'overthrow of flimsy regimes' in states such as Tuscany, Parma and Modena in which 'the rulers were driven out with ease in the spring of 1859'. It also states how by the end of the year France allowed union with these states, Napoleon III supervised plebiscites in the central duchies and turned a blind eye when Piedmont annexed the Papal States. Anderson states how France allowed 'Italian nationalists, the freedom they never achieved in 1848'. This is time without France, Piedmont would have never been able to defeat Austria in 1859 and gain Lombardy and the Central Duchies.

However, Napoleon III did act as a barrier to complete Italian reunification. By 1886, all of Italy was united except the city of Rome. It wasn't until the 19th August 1870 when Napoleon III was forced to remove the French garrison from Rome for the France-Prussian war that unification was complete.

Clark in Interpretation A emphasises the stunning achievement by the genius of Cavour and Garibaldi. He emphasises Cavour's 'skillful diplomacy' which secured France-Piedmontese alliance, it was his manipulation of the Orsini assassination attempt on Napoleon III and his wife on the way home from the opera that convinced Napoleon III to agree to help his quest for Piedmontese expansion. He wrote in a letter to Napoleon III that he could not ensure to stop every radical who felt let down by Napoleon III's lack of help which forced Napoleon III to ally within which led to the July 1858 meeting at Plombieres. It was Cavour's skillful diplomacy and his grasp of Realpolitik that forced Austria to declare war on Piedmont to 'capture Lombardy. Interpretation A also states the role played by Garibaldi and his 'genious and determination that won the South in 1860'. Clark states his immense courage that he attracted volunteers, Garibaldi was a inspiring military leader and in May 1860, he

and his 1089 volunteers known as ‘The Thousand Redshirts’ sailed from Genoa to Sicily in 1860 in which they achieved a miraculous victory at the Battle of Calatafimi against 25,000 Sicilian troops with limited ammunition and weapons. This was a miraculous defeat and Clarke describes how this victory as well as Garibaldi’s victory in Naples against 100,000 men at the Battle of Volturno in September 1860, as far more spectacular victories than King Victor Emmanuel II’s professional Piedmontese army ever managed to achieve. The professional Piedmontese army was poor both the 1859 North Italian war and in the 1866 Austro-Prussian War, in the Austro-Prussian war, Garibaldi’s troop was the only victorious Italian troop against the Austrians who they fought at the Battle of Bezzocca. Clarke describes how with immense courage, Garibaldi ‘attracted tens of thousands of volunteers’ as throughout his capture of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, he gained the support of the local Sicilian and Napolitan peasants by promising land settlements and reform. Garibaldi and his “Thousands” became a legend throughout the world.

Despite Garibaldi’s tremendous capture of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, Cavour very nearly ruined it. Cavour didn’t allow Garibaldi and his volunteers to use the 12000 modern rifles but instead they had to use old flintlock guns. Cavour could have prevented Garibaldi and so it really was his ‘genious and determination that won the south in 1860.

I agree with Anderson in Interpretation B that Napoleon III was crucial and it was his ‘essential contribution’ that won the ‘short war fought in Lombardy in 1859’. However I believe that the ‘gifts of two men of genious, Cavour and Garibaldi’ and the role they played in achieving Italian unification was more significant. For these reasons, I find Clark’s Interpretation A more convincing than that put forward by Anderson in Interpretation B.

Examiner’s comments

This response contains a very good analysis of the different interpretations of the causes of Italian unification, coupled with very good understanding of the historical context. In the opening paragraph the two interpretations are summarised and contrasted, with A nominated as the more convincing.

The second paragraph looks at Interpretation B, where Anderson contends that Napoleon III’s contribution was vital to Italian unification. The response utilises contextual knowledge to compare favourably the numbers of French troops, guns etc. with the Piedmontese contribution. It goes on to assess the role of the French as essential to the key battles of the 1859 War, again showing understanding of the historical context. A comment on the “premature” peace treaty the French signed with Austria is not entirely clear. The response quotes Anderson on the domino effect which followed the Austrian defeat, with the consequent “overthrow of flimsy régimes” in the duchies. It also notes Anderson’s assertion that Napoleon III “allowed” Piedmont to unite with these duchies, as well as filling in contextual background on what was, for the Emperor, a major concession in allowing Piedmont

to take over the Papal States as well. The response compares the failure of 1848, when Piedmont fought alone, with the 1859 War, in which French help was indispensable.

The third paragraph offers a challenge to Interpretation B, pointing out that Rome remained garrisoned by French troops, basically protecting the Pope, until 1870, when Napoleon withdrew them unwillingly, suggesting he held back the complete unification of Italy until his hand was forced by a war with Prussia.

The fourth paragraph considers Interpretation B, where Anderson sees the achievement of Italian unification as primarily the result of the various efforts of Cavour and Garibaldi. The response develops Anderson's reference to Cavour's "skilful diplomacy" with contextual knowledge concerning Cavour's letter to Napoleon III in the wake of the failed Orsini assassination attempt on the Emperor's life. This letter suggested that anger over French hesitation to ally with Piedmont was uncontrollable, prompting Napoleon to agree the Treaty of Plombières and fight in the subsequent North Italian War of 1859, which expelled the Austrians from Lombardy and kickstarted the process of unification. The response ably uses the historical context to support Interpretation B. It goes on to quote Clark on Garibaldi, whose "genius and determination won the south in 1860," and refers to his inspiring qualities. It offers contextual examples of Garibaldi's courage and leadership, including the battles of Calatafimi and Volturno, supporting Clark's claim that these were greater victories than "King Victor Emmanuel II's professional armies" achieved. Again, Garibaldi's achievements are placed in a historical context with the claim that, amid the defeats of 1866, only Garibaldi achieved glory at the Battle of Bezzocca. Quoting Interpretation A on Garibaldi's recruiting prowess, the response notes his astute offers of social reform, which won him peasant recruits.

The fifth paragraph challenges interpretation A by pointing to Cavour's denial of modern rifles to Garibaldi's Thousand, but also concedes that, although it was feasible for Cavour to have stopped Garibaldi at an early stage, he did not do so, instead giving Garibaldi the chance to capture the south.

The final paragraph agrees with Interpretation A that the French made the "essential contribution" in the defeat of the Austrian Empire, but argues, implicitly, that unification, rather than merely the liberation of Lombardy, depended upon "two men of genius, Cavour and Garibaldi."

This response contains a perceptive comparison and analysis of the two interpretations, backed up by high quality understanding of the historical context, although something more might have been offered on the gaps or weaknesses in either interpretation. It was assessed as Level 4.

Option 5: Germany 1919–1945

Answer Question 1(a) or 1(b) and Question 2.

Quality of written communication will be assessed in Question 1.

Q1 Either

Q1a Analyse why the Nazis rose to power between the Wall Street Crash of October 1929 and Hitler's appointment as Chancellor on 30 January 1933. [10]

Student's response

Hitler's rise to power between October 1929 and January 1933 was due to several factors. One of those was the depression and its effects on Germany. As a result of the Wall St. Crash on the 29th October 1929 the world economy went into depression and Germany having not yet fully recovered from the Hyperinflation of 1923 was badly affected. 50000 business closed from 1929–1933 with a loss of jobs causing unemployment to rise to 6million in 1933 from 1.5million in 1929. This unemployment as well as poverty and low wages caused Germans to turn to the Nazi party who promised work and bread, as a last resort – many had grew up on Democracy.

The depression was fully exploited by Goebbles as Nazi head of propaganda from 1926 through his effective use of the media to gather support for the Nazi party. He was editor of 'Dev Agriff' the Nazi paper and used this as well as posters, films speeches and even flying Hitler over Germany to put the Nazi message across, exploiting the failures of the weimar while promoting Hitler and the Nazis as an alternative. Failures of the Weimar governments helped the Nazis to power – Bruning's government symbolised how democracy was no longer viable through his continued use of Article 48 to pass laws (which was used 66 times in 1933 compared to only 5 in 1930). To many Germans this proved that a democratic republic was no longer viable – emphasised by the poor conditions following the worldwide economic slump – and so they began looking for an alternative which many found in Hitler's strong extreme leadership, shown by the election breakthrough in 1930, when the Nazis won 107 seats in the Reichstag. Political intrigue is a final reason for the rise of Hitler and his party. Support in the elections for the Nazis had increased and by mid 1932 they were the biggest party with 230 seats in the Reichstag. However they still did not have a majority and so it was the influence of von Papen persuading Hindenburg to allow Hitler to become chancellor that brought him to power in January 1933 – they were under the impression that he could be controlled.

Examiner's comments

This response is characterised by the ability to demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and concisely. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound explanation and analysis. The material is organised with a high degree of clarity and coherence. There is a sharp focus throughout the response on why the Nazis rose to power in the period from October 1929 to January 1933.

In the first paragraph the response advocates that Hitler's rise to power was due to several factors and then argues that the effects of the depression was one of the important factors. The response carefully selects evidence to substantiate the importance of the depression economically and refers to the fact that 50 000 businesses closed down and as a consequence unemployment rose to six million in the period. The response then suggests that such economic distress made many Germans become supporters of the Nazi Party, particularly because of the Nazi promise of "Work and Bread." The link between the depression and the growth of Nazi support has been made effectively.

The second paragraph develops the link between the depression and the rise of the Nazi Party by demonstrating how the Nazis exploited the economic discontent. The response places emphasis on the role of Goebbels as the head of propaganda to make effective use of the media to increase popular support for the Nazi Party. Evidence to substantiate the importance of Nazi propaganda is concisely given with references to newspapers, films and speeches. This paragraph has implicitly revealed some of the strengths of the Nazi Party. The paragraph is completed by emphasising Hitler's use of the aeroplane to fly over Germany "*to put the Nazi message across, exploiting the failures of Weimar while promoting Hitler and the Nazis as an alternative.*" This statement has highlighted that disillusion with the Weimar Republic is another factor in an analysis of the Nazis' rise to power.

The third paragraph places emphasis on the failures of the Weimar governments. Chancellor Brüning's continued use of Article 48 to pass legislation is highlighted to illustrate the point that Weimar democracy seemed to be no longer viable especially in the circumstances of the economic slump. The response illustrates that the Nazis were becoming an alternative by highlighting their electoral breakthrough in 1930 when the Nazis won 107 seats in the Reichstag.

The final paragraph explicitly suggests that "*political intrigue is a final reason for the rise of Hitler and his party.*" The factor is placed in the context of the Nazis being the largest party in the Reichstag after the election of July 1932 when the Nazis gained 230 seats. The response emphasises that because the Nazis did not have a majority they were dependent on von Papen persuading President Hindenburg to appoint Hitler as Chancellor.

The response highlighted several factors in its analysis of why the Nazis rose to power: the economic and political consequences of the depression; the strengths of the Nazi Party including propaganda and increasing electoral support; the failure of the Weimar governments; and the role of political intrigue in ultimately enabling the Nazis to gain power. Overall this response is characterised by an appropriate selection of evidence and analytical awareness. As a result, this merited the response being assessed as a mid-Level 4.

Or

Q1b Analyse the consequences of the war for the German people in the period 1939–1945. [10]

QUESTION NOT SELECTED BY EXAMINER

Q2 Read Source 1, Interpretation A and Interpretation B and answer the questions which follow:

The Aims of Nazi Economic Policies 1933–1939

Source 1

Extract from a speech by Adolf Hitler, 1 May 1933. He is addressing a workers' rally in Berlin on Germany's Labour Day.

The German nation has a terrible economic crisis behind it. Millions in our nation want to work, but they cannot. Appalling suffering and misfortune have descended upon us and brought despondency and despair. Our task is the elimination of unemployment by a programme providing employment in the private and public sectors. By the end of this year, we will have set out to accomplish a work of greatness which will put structures and buildings back in order and thus provide work for hundreds of thousands in the private sector. We will also attempt to provide public employment opportunities on a large scale. We are starting a programme to build a new road system. This is a gigantic undertaking which will require vast sums of money. This road system, along with other public works projects, will help to decrease the unemployment rate steadily.

Interpretation A

Extract from R. J. Overy, *War and Economy in the Third Reich*, published in 1995.

In the early years of the regime economic recovery was the priority. At the core of the re-employment strategy lay programmes of state-funded investment for work creation. Most work creation funds in the period 1933–1934 were spent on civilian projects which were non-military in character. Work creation involved short-term programmes to create jobs and kick-start the economy. Road building, both ordinary roads and the new *Autobahns* (motorways), contributed to the recovery of the construction industry. Work creation was not enough on its own to drag the German economy out of depression, though it was clearly a major stimulus to industrial revival and re-employment in the critical early years of the regime. It was only by 1936 that it proved possible to accelerate rearmament.

Interpretation B

Extract from A. Tooze, *The Wages of Destruction: The Making and Breaking of the Nazi Economy*, published in 2007.

Rearmament dominated Hitler's agenda. Too often it is assumed that the first priority of the regime was to address the economic crisis. But this interpretation is one effect of giving excessive attention to work creation. The issues of work creation and unemployment were never as prominent in the agenda of Hitler's government as is commonly supposed. The most crucial economic policy decisions taken in the period 1933–1934 did not concern unemployment but rearmament. The military spending package vastly exceeded anything ever contemplated for work creation. In August 1936 Hitler's Four Year Plan memorandum revealed the priority of rearmament and stated that "the German economy must be fit for war within four years." Hitler also demanded that Germany should achieve self-sufficiency in fuel.

Q2a Study Source 1.

How useful is Source 1 as evidence for an historian studying the aims of Nazi economic policies in the period 1933–1936? You must use contextual knowledge in your answer. [20]

Student's response

This source is useful in showing that the Nazis aimed for the 'elimination of unemployment'. The source shows that the Nazis wanted to drastically reduce, if not end unemployment. This was such a key aim for the Nazis as it was a problem that had crippled the Weimar Government. So many people had voted for the Nazis because they promised 'work and bread' and now the Nazis had to deliver on it. This source also shows that the Nazis aimed to create jobs in the private sector, 'work for hundreds of thousands in the private sector'. In 1935 when the Nazis introduced conscription, 1 million men were taken off the unemployment register. However thousands of jobs were also created in industry, building the tools of war. The source also shows that the Nazis wanted 'to build a new road system' and improve the country's infrastructure. This aim also supported the aim of reducing unemployment. The Nazis aimed to create the National harbour service. This would create thousands of jobs for men doing manual labour such as digging ditches and building bridges. The men would be paid little more than pocket money. This would therefore be a cheaper way to launch a building programme. The Nazis also wanted to reduce the 'unemployment rate steadily'. They did this as unemployment was reduced from 26% to 8% in 1933–36.

The source is useful as it was written Adolf Hitler. He was obviously the leader of the Nazi Party at this time and hence would have had the best insight as to what the Nazis wanted to achieve in 1933–36. This source is from the 1st May 1933. This makes it useful as it is a primary source directly from the time period. However by 1936 the economic aims of the Nazi party had shifted towards preparing the economy for war and achieving autarky. This source is therefore less useful as it can't state whether there was a change in economic aims from 1934–36. Hitler's motive writing this speech makes it less reliable. He is addressing a worker's rally and he is therefore, likely to be convincing the workers that the Nazis are going to help them get jobs. He says he will create 'work for hundreds of thousands'. The support of the people was important to Hitler and he is obviously trying to prove that the Nazis are fulfilling their campaign promises. The audience of the source therefore makes it less useful as well. This source is a speech which makes it less useful as it is a public source so Hitler is more likely to say what he thinks people want to hear rather than what he actually aims to do. The language and tone of this source are both very persuasive. He speaks very negatively of the economy before the Nazis were in power, 'terrible economic crisis', and then speaks very positively about what the Nazis aim to do, 'accomplish a work of greatness'. It is clearly Nazi propaganda which therefore makes the source less useful.

The source also has its limitations as it is only coming from the view of one person. Hitler was not an economy expert and therefore he couldn't go into too much detail about what the Nazis aimed to do. Again the fact that it was written in 1933 is a limitation as it doesn't show how the Nazi economic aims changed in this period. This source is also limited as it contains several omissions. The source doesn't mention how the Nazis aimed to ban trade unions and replace them with the DAF. This Nazis wanted to increase productivity and bring the workers in line. They felt that the DAF would allow them to do this and they could therefore also end strikes. The source also doesn't mention that Hitler wanted to use the economy to gain support for his regime. Although they focused on it more from 1936-39, the Nazis also aimed to start preparing for war. For example they conscription in 1935.

This source is useful in showing us how Hitler wanted to reduce unemployment in the period 1933–36. However it is less useful as it is a public source and clearly a piece of propaganda, that contains several key omissions.

Examiner's comments

The response is characterised by the ability to analyse and evaluate the utility of the source within its historical context. There is a relatively systematic approach to source evaluation.

The first paragraph of the response focuses on the usefulness of the extract in terms of the value of its content integrated with appropriate evidence from the candidate's contextual knowledge. Short quotations from the extract are selected to illustrate the value of the source. At the outset of the response the candidate suggests that the source is useful in that it illustrates that the Nazis aimed for the “*elimination of unemployment.*” The candidate proceeds to clarify why this was a key aim for the Nazis from their contextual knowledge by pointing out that unemployment had been a problem for the Weimar governments and a reason why many people had voted for the Nazis. There is a constructive reference to the Nazi promise of “work and bread.” The response then develops the value of the extract by revealing that it shows that the Nazis aimed to create jobs in the private sector quoting from the source to illustrate the point with the statement “*work for hundreds of thousands in the private sector.*” From their contextual knowledge the candidate reveals other methods the Nazis used to reduce unemployment by referring to conscription and the fact that one million men were taken off the unemployment register. Valuable evidence is also selected from the source when it is stated that the Nazis wanted “*to build a new road system*” and that this would support the aim of reducing unemployment. From their contextual knowledge the candidate clarifies how the Nazis reduced unemployment by referring to the creation of the National Labour Service (RAD) and its involvement in construction. The response then refers to the aim of reducing the “*unemployment rate steadily*” from the extract and from their contextual knowledge illustrates that this was achieved as unemployment was reduced from 26% to 8% in the period 1933–1936.

The second paragraph of the response assesses the utility of the extract by evaluating the strengths and limitations of the provenance of the source in terms of author, date, motive, audience, mode and tone integrated with references to the content of the source and evidence from the candidate's contextual knowledge. It is stated that the source is useful as it was written by Hitler and as he is the leader of the Nazi party he would have the best insight as to what the Nazis wanted to achieve. It is then stated that the date of the source makes it useful as it is directly from the period. However, from their contextual knowledge the candidate points out a limitation concerning the date when they state "by 1936 the economic aims of the Nazi party had shifted towards preparing the economy for war and achieving autarky." An additional limitation of the source is discussed concerning Hitler's motive making the source "less reliable." As Hitler is addressing a workers rally he is promising them jobs to ensure their support after promises in recent election campaigns. The candidate states that "the audience of the source therefore makes it less useful as well." The candidate then implicitly refers to the mode of the source when it is stated that as the speech is a public source it is less useful as Hitler is stating what he thinks people want to hear. The response refers to the tone of the extract by referring to a negative phrase such as "*terrible economic crisis*" and a positive phrase such as "*accomplish a work of greatness*" to illustrate the persuasive language Hitler deploys. The paragraph concludes with the valid statement that the extract is "clearly Nazi propaganda which makes the source less useful."

The third paragraph of the response deals with further limitations of the source. The source is only the view of Hitler and he was not an economic expert. The source has several omissions such as the aim to ban trade unions and replace them with the DAF to control the workers.

The response is completed with a concise balanced conclusion stating the main strengths and limits of the source. The focus of the response throughout was on the issue of whether the source was useful. It merited a maximum Level 4 mark.

Q2b Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B.

Historians have different views about particular issues. Using both interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of the aims of Nazi economic policies in Germany in the period 1933–1939 do you find more convincing? [30]

Student's response

Interpretation A is convincing as it shows that in the Nazis economics aims 'economic recovery was the priority'. Interpretation B is also convincing as it claims that 'rearmament dominated Hitler's agenda' ultimately I find B more convincing as it was always Hitler's aim to rearm and use the army to restore German military pride. Even as early as 1933, rearmament was on Hitler's mind.

Interpretation A shows that a 're-employment strategy' was core to Hitler's aims. However B argues that this isn't actually the case and historians often give 'excessive attention to work creation'. Source A is right in stating that Hitler wanted to reduce unemployment. He set up the German Labour Service in an attempt to reduce unemployment and give men jobs going cheap manual labour. Source A notes this saying they were involved in 'road building'. The men were paid little more than pocket money however it made them feel like the Nazis were trying to help them. From the 1933–39 the Nazis reduced unemployment from 6 million to 300,000. While this figure looks like the Nazis were entirely focused on reducing unemployment, a huge reason for this drop was good book keeping tricks. Due to Nazi ideology both Jews and women were removed from the unemployment register. I therefore agree with B more as the Nazis were more focused on making it look like unemployment was decreasing than actually fixing the problem and creating jobs for everyone. I therefore find B more convincing.

Interpretation A claims that 'only by 1936 that it proved possible to accelerate rearmament'. B however completely disagrees with this statement as it shows the Nazis were concerned with re-armament before 1936, 'in the period 1933–34 did not concern unemployment but rearmament'. Again I think the view of B is more convincing. Hitler was obsessed with rearmament and restoring German military pride. Even before 1933, in Hitler's campaign promises, he aimed to rearm and break the Treaty of Versailles. Also the fact that conscription was announced in 1935 (which took 1 million men off the unemployment register) shows that Hitler aimed to rearm before 1936 and before the economy had completely recovered. Rearmament also came in the form of employing men in different industries where they began building the tools of war. Interpretation B is therefore more convincing as it shows that the Nazis aimed to rearm far before 1936.

Interpretation B also shows that Hitler wanted to become self sufficient in order to avoid the disaster of World War I, where Germany was naval blockaded and was cut off from practically all supplies. It states that Hitler 'demanded that Germany should achieve self sufficiency in fuel. I find B more convincing as interpretation A doesn't even mention self-sufficiency even though this was one of Hitler's core economic aims in the period 1933–39. Hitler was obsessed with the aim of becoming self-sufficient

and spend millions of marks on the projects. However the synthetic substitutes the Nazis created were far more expensive and less effective than the originals.

Interpretation A shows that Hitler wanted to 'drag the Germany economy out of depression' before he wanted to re-arm. However interpretation B disagrees with this view as it suggests that Hitler didn't preparing for war at the expense of the Germany economy, 'military spending package vastly exceeded anything ever contemplated for work creation'. I agree more with source B. By the outbreak of war in 1939, the German economy was at the point of collapse due to Hitler's aim of rearmament from 1929–39, government income had increased from 10 billion marks to 15 billion marks, however at the same time government expenditure had also increased from 12 billion marks to 30 billion marks. Some historians have gone so far to suggest one of the reason Hitler went to war was lighten the economic burden caused by rearmament. Interpretation B agrees with this as it shows that Hitler wanted to make sure that the economy was going to be ready for war 'within four 'years', no matter the consequences. Hitler's aim was so focused on preparing for war that when Schacht suggested slowing down rearmament in order to help fix the economic problems that Germany had, he immediately fell out of favour with Hitler and soon felt forced to resign. I therefore find interpretation B more convincing on this matter.

Overall I do find interpretation A very convincing as it shows that economic recovery was the priority' and this undivided the creation of jobs. However I think interpretation B is more convincing as it shows that throughout the period 1933-39, Hitler's key aim was preparing the economy for war and this did not concern unemployment out rearmament.'

Examiner's comments

The response reveals a very good **understanding** of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two extracts concerning the aims of Nazi economic policies in Germany in the period 1933–1939; a very good **analysis** of the different interpretations, selecting key points of evidence from the extracts; a good understanding of the historical context, using **relevant contextual knowledge** to support their arguments; and very good evidence in support of their **judgement** by supporting and, to a lesser extent, challenging the interpretations.

In a concise introduction the candidate reveals a good understanding of the contrasting interpretations highlighting that Interpretation A places importance on the aim of economic recovery while Interpretation B suggests that rearmament was more significant. At the outset of the response the candidate makes a judgement that Interpretation B is the more convincing. The response is then structured in four sections thematically concerning the aims of reducing unemployment, increasing rearmament, achieving autarky and preparing for war, therefore revealing a very good analysis of the two extracts and how they differ.

In the first paragraph, after the introduction, the response deals with the aim of reducing unemployment. The candidate reveals an initial understanding of how the extracts contrast. It is stated that “Interpretation A shows that a *‘re-employment strategy’* was core to Hitler’s aims.” In contrast, the candidate then states: “However B argues that this isn’t actually the case and historians often give *‘excessive attention to work creation.’*” The skilful integration of short quotations into the answer reveals that the candidate is also analysing the two interpretations. The response then acknowledges that there is some validity in the interpretation of Overy by providing good contextual knowledge in support of his argument. The candidate refers to the German Labour Service (RAD) and statistical evidence concerning the unemployment figures. However, the candidate then uses contextual knowledge to challenge Overy’s interpretation and support the interpretation by Tooze, by pointing out that “both Jews and women were removed from the unemployment register.” The candidate continues to maintain a sharp focus on the extracts and concludes the paragraph by arguing that Interpretation B is more convincing.

The next paragraph deals with the aim of rearmament. The candidate reveals a good analysis of the interpretations by again selecting short quotations as evidence from the extracts. It is stated that “Interpretation A claims that *‘only by 1936 that it proved possible to accelerate rearmament.’*” Then the candidate illustrates very effectively the different interpretations when it is stated that “B however completely disagrees with this statement as it shows that the Nazis were concerned with rearmament” and refers to a statement by Tooze concerning the importance of rearmament in the period 1933–1934. The candidate argues that Interpretation B is more convincing by selecting evidence from their contextual knowledge to explicitly support the views of Tooze and implicitly challenge the views of Overy. The references to Hitler’s aim to rearm and break the Treaty of Versailles in this respect from 1933, and to the introduction of conscription in 1935 before the economy had recovered in 1936, make a plausible argument in support of Interpretation B. The candidate maintains their sharp focus on the interpretations with a concluding sentence in this paragraph which states that “Interpretation B is therefore more convincing as it shows that the Nazis aimed to rearm far before 1936.”

The next paragraph deals with the aim of self-sufficiency (autarky). The response highlights that only Interpretation B refers to this aim when it states that Hitler *‘demanded that Germany should achieve self-sufficiency in fuel’* and gives some appropriate contextual knowledge concerning the first World War to explain why this was an important aim for Hitler. It is stated that Interpretation B is more convincing in this regard as this was “one of Hitler’s core economic aims in the period 1933–39.” From their contextual knowledge the candidate points out that the Nazis spent millions of marks on synthetic substitutes.

The next paragraph deals with the aim of economically preparing for war. The candidate contrasts the view in Interpretation A that Hitler wanted to *‘drag the German economy out of depression’* before he wanted to re-arm with the view in Interpretation B that the *‘military spending package vastly exceeded anything ever contemplated for work creation.’* The candidate states that they agree more with Interpretation B. The candidate has provided key points of evidence from the

extracts used by each historian to support their particular interpretation through the use of short quotations from the extracts. In addition, a judgement has been made. The candidate then proceeds to explain why they reached that judgement. From their contextual knowledge the candidate points out that Nazi expenditure on rearmament by 1939 was high and that it is stated in Interpretation B that '*the German economy must be fit for war within four years.*' From their contextual knowledge the candidate points out that Schacht fell out with Hitler over the pace of rearmament therefore suggesting that it was a priority to Hitler. The paragraph concludes with a substantiated judgement that Interpretation B is the more convincing.

The response ends with a clear, concise conclusion which makes a judgement about which interpretation is more convincing.

The response merited a mid-Level 4 mark. All of the contextual knowledge included in the response was directly related to the arguments contained in the interpretations, however, it could have been developed further. The response supported Interpretation B well but challenged Interpretation A to a limited extent. The response could have supported Interpretation A more by referring to work creation in civilian projects involved in reforestation, land reclamation, the housing sector and transportation. The Law to Reduce Unemployment of 1 June 1933 made available over 1 bn RM for such public works projects. Interpretation A could have been challenged more by pointing out that in 1933 Schacht introduced Mefo bills to finance rearmament. In the period 1933–1935 the Nazi regime invested 10.2 bn RM on rearmament before the introduction of the Four Year Plan in 1936. Nevertheless, this response was very well structured, selected key points from the extracts, selected appropriate contextual knowledge and maintained the focus on the interpretations throughout.



INVESTORS
IN PEOPLE

