

GCE



CCEA GCE AS
Exemplifying Examination
Performance

History AS2

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

AS2: Historical Conflict and Change

Grade: A Exemplar

Answer **two** questions from your chosen option.

You **must answer parts (i) and (ii)** of your chosen questions.

Quality of written communication will be assessed in **all** questions.

Option 1: Spain and Europe 1556–1598

Q1(i) Explain the economic difficulties facing Philip II in 1556. [8]

Student's response

Philip II faced many economic difficulties in 1556.

Philip II faced many economic difficulties when he inherited the Spanish Empire from his father. Charles V left Philip with an almost bankrupt country which as a result went bankrupt a total of four times. This was a huge economic difficulty for Spain as Philip started with a disadvantage.

There were also economic difficulties in Spain as Philip II had to deal with six different kingdoms within Spain and this led to economic difficulties. Each kingdom had different taxes and duties. This greatly affected trade within Spain as it was extremely expensive to move goods between the different kingdoms, this was an economic difficulty Philip faced.

Another economic difficulty Philip faced was war. Philip's father, Charles V had been involved in many wars, including with the Turks, French and the Dutch. War had an enormous effect on the Spanish economy as it was a massive financial burden. Philip continued to fight the wars, even though they were a huge burden on the economy.

Philip also faced many economic difficulties through trade and agriculture. The wool trade was very popular in Spain however, demand fell due to competition and the Dutch revolt. This caused a major economic problem. The final economic problem caused by agriculture was that there was a growing population in Spain and not enough grain was being grown. This led to death and starvation as the Spanish economy was unable to cope with the demand for grain. They eventually started shipping in grain as the situation was so severe. This shows the economic problems Philip II faced in Spain in 1556.

In conclusion, I believe that Philip II faced many economic problems in 1556. Unfortunately for Philip, many of the problems he faced were inherited.

Examiner's comments

The response considers the position when Philip II inherited the kingdom from his father Charles V. The candidate identified the weak financial position with Spain almost bankrupt.

In the second paragraph the candidate considers the differences in Spain's six kingdoms. The candidate identifies taxes and duties and how this makes the movement of goods expensive. The impact of war with the Turks and French is also considered. Philip II's continuation of war in 1556 is shown to continue the financial burden on Spain.

The candidate considers trade and in particular the wool trade. An error is made by moving past the period and considering the Dutch revolt in 1566. Agricultural weakness is considered with a growing population and limited grain supplies.

The response consistently stays on question and considers a range of factors. This is a top Level 4 answer. (8)

Q1(ii) “Spain had a strong economy in the period 1556–1598.” How far would you accept this verdict? [22]

Student's response

As Philip became king the economy was weak and despite improvements to the economy by 1598 the economy became strong.

The problems with agriculture highlight the issues in the economy. Only a third of land in Spain was available for tillage due to rocky and hilly terrain. This resulted in food shortages. Much grain had to be imported to sustain the population, displaying weakness as the country could not sustain its own population.

Agriculture was profitable for Spain. Much was acquired through wool which was traded through the Netherlands providing much employment and profit. The most profitable part of Spain was Andalusia, which produced grapes, oranges, oil and silk. As silk was only here and China, it proved very desirable and contributed greatly to the economy.

Industry had many positives which allowed it to contribute to the strong economy of Spain. There was a large supply of raw materials in Spain such as copper, iron and wool. This sustained the industry. In addition, Spain had the monopoly over trade with the Americas as it was the main trader. This allowed for exportation of the bullion which contributed greatly to the economy, creating a stronger economy.

Also, the trading platform of Spain had great potential, with a large array of resources to support a strong economy. With Philip's large fleet and additional fleet from Portugal, trade could be conducted more, with increased transport.

The strength of the economy can also be seen through the fact that Spanish nobles had money to potentially invest in the economy.

Philip was able to increase his revenue from 3.1 million ducats in 1556 to 4.07 billion by 1598.

However on the other hand the economy could be viewed as particularly weak during this period. The problems with agriculture highlight the issues of the economy in Spain. With only 1/3 of the land available for tillage due to mountainous terrain, the country suffered great agrarian issues. In 1556 the population was 6.5 million and this continued to rise throughout Philip's reign. This increased the demand for food and coupled with poor harvests forced the country to import grain. As this was required for bread a staple part of the diet it highlights the weakness of the economy.

A weak economy can be seen through the failures of industry in the period. Whilst the production of wool led to great profit, its decline throughout the 1500's impacted the economy. Due to foreign competition, for example the English and the Dutch revolt in 1569, the sale of wool declined from 250,000 sacks in 1570 where it was previously over 40,000. This weakened the economy greatly as it was too dependent on the wool. After the collapse of the wool market the economy lost part of its sources of revenue, weakening it greatly.

The impacts of war also weakened the economy through its impacts on trade. War with the Turks prevented eastern trade, war with the French and English threatened trade with the Netherlands and the Dutch revolt stopped this completely. This hindered trade, thus the economy suffered.

Due to the consular system, Spain was divided into 6 regions including Aragon, Granada and Navarre. These regions often operated as 6 autonomous units which lead to a weak economy. There were poor communications between the areas. With high road tolls and high import duties this dissuaded people from internal trade. Thus the economy did not benefit from it and the economy was weak.

A large majority of the goods exported were primary products such as wool, grapes and silver bullion. However if these products had been developed into secondary goods, then Spain's industrial platform may not have been so fundamentally flawed. This would have increased employment and provided more money. These factors would have led to a stronger economy.

In addition, by making Juras so attractive with high returns, Philip encouraged nobles to invest in these. This tied up any spare money without investing it. If it was invested in the economy it may have strengthened the economy.

To conclude, although Philip increased his revenue, this was largely due to inflation and thus it cannot prove a strong economy. If more investment was placed on the communication links, there was less dept created and Juras were not as profitable the economy may have been stronger between 1556 and 1598.

Examiner's comments

The response shows strong knowledge, substantiated judgements and is comprehensive in its coverage of the various elements of the Spanish economy. The candidate deals with the question in two parts, strengths and then weaknesses.

The answer begins by dealing with the importance of the wool trade and this is linked to the Netherlands. The candidate also highlights variation across Spain considering the productivity of Andalucía.

In the next paragraph there is a consideration of industrial production and in particular raw materials. There is an understanding of the importance of trade and the central position of the Americas and bullion. The answer highlights the improvement in this position with Philip II's coronation as King of Portugal. The candidate shows understanding by supporting the strength of the economy by showing the growth in Philip II's revenue during the period.

The second half of the answer deals with the weaknesses of the Spanish economy. The candidate identifies agricultural weakness with only a third of land under tillage and this is linked to the importation of grain. The connectivity of the economy is highlighted by showing rising population, food shortages and higher inflation.

Industrial weakness is considered and linked to the decline of the wool trade and the Dutch revolt. The candidate considers the impact of war on trade and of internal variations of tariff and communication as factors which weakened the Spanish economy. A dependence on primary production rather than development into secondary production is also used to show weakness. The candidate links this to a lack of investment by the nobility.

The response covers a range of elements in the economy and is connected to the question throughout. Although there are areas which could be expanded the answer is of a very high standard, reaching a high Level 4 mark, 21 marks.

Q2(i) Explain Philip II's relationship with the Papacy. [8]

Student's response

Philip II had a very varied relationship with the papacy. The relationship between the popes were often strained as, although Philip was 'the sword of Catholicism', he didn't always put the interests of the church first and this greatly annoyed the popes.

The Papacy expected Philip to protect Catholicism however, sometimes Philip was more interested in dynasty than the interests of the church. As the pope was also a prince, the papacy's relationship with Philip was strained. Philip tried to expand his territory into Italy.

Philip had huge control over religion in Spain as he got 50% of church income and he was able to block an appeal to Rome. Philip also ignored the Papacy which a strain in their relationship, as Philip often ignored Papal Bulls, including one banning bull fighting.

The Papacy also disliked Philip as Pope Paul IV sided with the French king over Philip. This is significant as France is a natural enemy of Spain due to the Hapsburg Valois dynastic war.

Although the relationship between the Papacy and Philip II was often strained, both Philip and the Papacy worked together when they needed to. The papacy paid Philip Cruzada in order to defend their land from the Turks. This shows that there is an element of trust within the relationship between the two. This money paid for a religious crusade against the Turks, which benefitted both Philip and the Papacy.

The battle of Lepanto shows another example when the two worked together, as yet again they were trying to defeat the Turks.

To conclude, I believe the relationship between the Papacy and Philip II varied greatly. There were huge disagreements due to the operation of Jesuits in Spain, as they reported to the Papacy and not to Philip. However, the relationship was good at times when both came together for a common cause as shown at the battle of Lepanto.

Examiner's comments

The candidate begins by considering the varied relationship between the Pope and Philip II. Philip II is identified as the 'sword of Catholicism' yet he did not always put church interests first.

The second paragraph begins by highlighting Phillip II's dynastic aim. The candidate identified the dual role of Popes as both prince and churchman and how clashes could occur over Italian lands.

The next paragraph considers Philip II's control over the Catholic Church in Spain. The candidate considers revenue, appeal to Rome and the ignoring of Papal bulls. Further clashes were highlighted by Pope Paul IV's support of the French.

The candidate also considers the positive relationship between the Papacy and Philip. Philip II's taking of the *Cruzada* linked him to the Papacy and the campaign against the Turks. The answer shows the mutual benefit of a good relationship and uses the battle of Lepanto as evidence of this. The answer concludes by highlighting the variation in the relationship. Clashes over the Jesuits are compared to alliances like the Holy League. This is a strong answer covering the variety in this relationship. Both strengths and weaknesses are considered and supported by good examples. A top Level 4 answer, 8 marks.

Q2(ii) “Philip II’s religious policy in Spain between 1556 and 1598 enjoyed more successes than failures.” How far would you agree with this verdict? [22]

Student’s response

Philip II’s religious policy in Spain between 1556 and 1598 enjoyed more successes than failures. I agree with this statement to an extent.

Philip II tried to improve religion within Spain and he did this through many ways. The Council of Trent was formed in order to defend the church against the reformation. There were disagreements between the Papacy and Philip as Philip wanted to focus on doctrine and the pope wanted to defend Catholicism. Philip highly supported the Council of Trent as he sent two hundred theologians to the final meeting.

Through the Council of Trent, the tridentine decrees was produced in order to strengthen the church in Europe. However, Philip used it to revolutionise the Spanish church.

The tridentine decrees included giving more power to bishops which strengthened Philip II’s religious policy in Spain and made it successful. There were also many other policies, including a stricter policy on priests which meant they had to preach weekly, wear a uniform and teach Sunday school. This was also a success of Philips religious policy and it helped reduce pluralism and absenteeism among priests. Philip also introduced twenty new seminaries in order to educate priests on correct doctrine which was very successful. There were also policies regarding morality which was a major issue in Spain as sexual misconduct was a big problem and these policies were very successful in reducing this. The tridentine decrees were a very important part of Philip’s religious policy and it was successful as it introduced clearer doctrine and improved church literacy rates. There were also failures however, as literacy rates remained low in some areas and sexual misconduct continued due to ignorance.

Jesuits were a very prominent part of Philips religious policy and made it very successful. Philip II allowed the Jesuits into Spain in order to promote and encourage Catholicism, this was very successful, although there were failings in this policy for Philip, as the Jesuits reported to the Papacy and not to him. This was a major problem for Philip as he wanted to have complete control of his empire.

Another of Philips religious policies which was successful in Spain was the Inquisition. The inquisition was very successful in Spain as it arrested and prosecuted 278 people in the first years from 1556 and 77 people were killed. After this only a further 6 people were killed for being Protestants. This shows that the

inquisition was extremely successful in stopping Protestants in England which was incredibly important for Philip as he was known as 'the sword of Catholicism'.

The inquisition dealt with many other groups of people, including Moriscos and Convertos. 90% of the inquisitions cases were Moriscos however, this was reduced to 10% when 100,000 were deported following the Moriscos revolt. The inquisition failed to convert all Moriscos and they appeared as a threat to Philip as he believed Moriscos were the 5th Columnists. This shows how the religious policy had failings.

There were also religious policy failings in the Netherlands as Protestantism spread rapidly.

In conclusion, I believe Philip II's religious policy in Spain between 1556 – 1598 enjoyed more successes than failures as Philip maintained a strong hold on the church and he made many religious changes through his tridentine decrees in order to improve religion within the country. Although Philip II had several failings in religion, I believe it was widely successful. The inquisition killed 55 witches in Spain however, this was very low compared to any other European country and I believe this showed the religious policy worked.

Examiner's comments

The answer begins by agreeing with the statement and considering Philip II's attempts to improve religion in Spain. The candidate considers the Council of Trent, Philip's support for it and variations in his aims to that of the Papacy.

In the second paragraph there is a consideration of how the Tridentine Decrees were used in Spain. The candidate identifies how the church was strengthened by: giving more power to Bishops, stricter policy towards priests, including wearing uniform, weekly preaching and the establishment of Sunday schools. These points are clearly linked to success with a reduction of pluralism and absenteeism. The candidate points to more seminaries leading to raised literacy among priests and better understanding of doctrine.

The candidate considers the part played by the Jesuits in the success of Philip II's religious policy. The answer identifies their importance but also Philip's distrust of them as they reported to the Pope. The candidate is aware of Philip's desire to control the Church in Spain.

In the fourth paragraph the answer considers the success of the Inquisition particularly in dealing with the *Moriscos*. The candidate considers how 90% of cases were concerned with *Moriscos* but how this reduced to 10% after their deportation. Failure to convert all *Moriscos* is identified as a failing of Philip II's religious policy.

In conclusion the candidate highlights the question well. The answer does lean towards the successes of the policy but does cover some failings. There are some lapses and omissions but the answer just manages to reach Level 4, 18 marks.

Q3(i) Explain why Philip II's policy towards Portugal between 1579 and 1583 was successful. [8]

QUESTION NOT SELECTED BY EXAMINER

Q3(ii) "The most important reason for the outbreak of war between England and Spain in 1585 was the decline of France." To what extent would you accept this statement? [22]

QUESTION NOT SELECTED BY EXAMINER

Answer **two** questions from your chosen option.

You **must answer parts (i) and (ii)** of your chosen questions.

Quality of written communication will be assessed in **all** questions.

Option 2: The Ascendancy of France in Europe 1660–1714

Q1(i) Explain the results of the War of Devolution of 1667–1668. [8]

Student's response

The War of Devolution from 1667 to 1668 came about due to the death of Philip IV and leaving his throne to his unhealthy son Carlos II. Louis felt that this was an opportunity for French expansionism, and to strengthen his vulnerable north eastern frontier by claiming the Spanish throne. To gain the throne Louis issued a manifesto arguing that by claiming the Spanish throne it wasn't for French ambition or glory but to protect the rights of his wife and the patrimony of his son. However the manifesto was rejected and as a result Louis invaded the Spanish Netherlands in 1667. Louis' aims in the War of Devolution was to achieve glory for France as well as succeeding in his important policy of expansionism. The peace treaty for the war was made at Aix-la-Chapelle in 1668. The treaty made Louis return Franche-Comte, but he gained territory in the Spanish Netherlands, for example Lille and Oudenarde. Louis in the War of Devolution demonstrated the military power of France and achieved his glory and strengthening his vulnerable north-eastern frontier by expansionism. One of Louis' commanders Voubin, fortified the seized towns after the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle to create a buffer zone for France. However the war had its consequences as the relationship between Louis and William of Orange broke down after joining it. This was as a result of William joining the Triple Alliance against Louis along with England and Sweden in an attempt to halt French expansionism. Louis felt betrayed as he supported the Dutch in the eighty years war and labelled the Dutch as 'maggots' in response to their betrayal. As a result this contributed to the Dutch war.

Examiner's comments

This response acknowledges that Louis was fulfilling his desire for expansionism, 'Gloire' and the strengthening of his vulnerable north-eastern frontier. The Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle compelled Louis to return Franche-Comte but retain key territories in the Spanish Netherlands including Lille and Oudenarde, many of which were fortified by Vauban. The answer notes that he had demonstrated the growing might of his army yet had damaged his relationship with the Dutch. It outlines how Louis felt betrayed by William of Orange and draws a link with the subsequent Dutch War.

The response was assessed as Level 4, 8 marks.

Q1(ii) “The actions of Louis XIV were to blame for the outbreak of the Nine Years’ War.” How far would you accept this judgement? [22]

Student’s response

I believe that the verdict that, “The actions of Louis XIV were to blame for the outbreak of the Nine Years’ War”, is partly true due to his actions in the run up to the war, expansionism, Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, Clash with the Papacy and the Cologne Dispute. However there were some events which contributed to the outbreak of the Nine Years’ War that were out of his control.

Louis’ policy of expansionism caused great opposition from other countries in Europe. The War of Devolution with Spain was a long term reason for the Nine Years’ War to break out. This is because in 1667 Louis ordered for his army to invade the Spanish Netherlands as his claim to the Spanish throne was rejected. Furthermore in 1672 the Dutch war saw French aggression as France invaded Holland due to their betrayal in joining the triple alliance against him. After the Dutch war in the treaty of Nymegen, Louis achieved expansionism as he gained French land and towns in Flanders for example Are and Ypres.

However Louis gave up his most northerly conquests to play along with the treaty. Moreover simply the lack of valid justification for going to war and the atrocities committed during the war created new enemies for Louis. This is evident in the Reunions when Croissy, Louis’ legal expert, believed territories dependent on French towns in the past should be French too.

The Reunion were made possible as there was a power vacuum in Europe after the Dutch War. Louis achieved his aim of strengthening his north-eastern frontier for example Flanders. Although it was viewed negatively as it was believed to be exploiting the treaties of Munster and Nymegen, Louis argued that the Reunions were for defensive reasons. However Louis’ army in 1681 invaded the Protestant free city of Strasbourg. Moreover the actions of William revocation of the Edict of Nantes has that Louis was responsible for the outbreak of the Nine Years’ war. The Edict of Nantes protected French Huguenots with Protestant religious and political freedom. However Louis in 1685 revoked the Freedom. As a result great opposition was shown towards Louis as French Huguenots faced direct persecution and 250,000 left France bringing with the anti Louis propaganda. A number of the Huguenots that left were soldiers and sailors and brought with them technological secrets for example the bomb ketch. The Revocation of the Edict of Nantes was significant as it gave Protestant countries a religious reason to oppose Louis.

Louis’ clash with the Papacy also highlighted that he was to blame for causing the Nine Years’ War. Louis’ ambassador to Rome refused to root out criminals under Louis’ orders. This resulted in the Pope excommunicating the ambassador and also threatened to do the same to Louis.

Louis again caused great opposition by seizing the Papal state of Avignon in response. This led the Pope to back the Grand Alliance, formed in 1688, to oppose Louis. This particular event was significant as it gave Catholic countries a reason to oppose Louis for example Spain and the Holy Roman Empire.

Similarly to the clash with the Papacy Louis caused Catholic countries to oppose after the Cologne dispute. Louis was desperate to obtain Cologne as it would spread his influence in Europe and would be advantageous for trade as it was beside the river Rhine. After the Archbishop of Cologne's death Louis encouraged the promotion of Van Furstenberg while Leopold put forward the young Joseph Clement as a candidate. Louis sent Chamby to argue the case for Van Furstenberg however it was rejected and Clement was promoted. Louis in response threatened to invade Rome which was the trigger factor for the Nine Years' War but invaded Philipsburg instead in 1688.

On the other hand some events causing the Nine Years' War were out of Louis' control for example the formation of the League of Augsburg in 1686 and the Grand Alliance in 1688. The League of Augsburg was made up of Austria, Spain, Sweden and the German Princes and was initially a defensive alliance. Eventually due to Louis' aggressive behaviour in 1688 the offensive Grand Alliance was formed to oppose Louis' expansionism and seize back territory. Furthermore the action of William of Orange caused the Nine Years' War also as the Glorious Revolution in England brought England and Holland into the Grand Alliance and therefore into the Nine Years' War.

In conclusion although I believe Louis had a major role in the outbreak of the Nine Years' War, I do not believe he was solely to blame as some factors were out of his control.

Examiner's comments

This response offers a well informed and sustained assessment of the proposition. It presents a concise, focused introduction outlining the main issues to be raised throughout the essay and making a reasoned judgement.

The first paragraph explains confidently the crucial importance of Louis XIV's expansionism, providing extensive, relevant supporting evidence. Arguably this paragraph has excessive explanation and evidence resulting in less time for the candidate to explore issues raised later in the essay. The third paragraph focuses on the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes and explains how this action by Louis directly affected the outbreak of war. The response then presents a confident explanation of Louis XIV's clash with the Papacy and the Cologne dispute.

The essay is balance by a good analysis of some factors outside the control of Louis XIV, noting the uniting of his enemies in the League of Augsburg. It also notes the role of William of Orange. There is perhaps room for a fuller explanation of these 'other factors' and the response could have also addressed the role of Leopold.

Overall, this is a confident analysis of the role of Louis XIV with sustained focus on the proposition. Knowledge is deployed in an accurate and selective manner to support very well developed and sustained analytical judgements.

The response was assessed as a Level 4, 21 marks.

Q2(i) Explain the reasons for Louis XIV's acceptance of Carlos II's will. [8]

Student's response

In 1700 Carlos II died leaving the Spanish throne to Louis' grandson Philip of Anjou on the condition that he renounces his inheritance to the French throne. Louis as a result was met with a number of reasons for accepting Carlos' will.

If Louis rejected the will, it would be passed onto the Austrian Hapsburgs. This did not suit Louis as it would create Austrian hegemony in Europe. Furthermore the will offered strategic, financial and territorial military gains. More importantly it would have turned a long term rival into an ally and would as a result secure his vulnerable southern border. In addition to this accepting the will would fortify his north-eastern frontier as a Bourbon on the Spanish throne would have control over the Spanish Netherlands. The will simply would have given Louis everything he had fought for.

On the other hand Louis' top advisor Madame de Maintenon argued that the will was the best deal on the table. This is because the second partition treaty only offered France's Dauphin more territory in Italy, while Arch Duke Charles became the Elector of Bavaria. More importantly war was inevitable if Louis accepted the second partition treaty as Leopold didn't agree to the terms as he feared French expansionism and didn't want Arch Duke Charles to break off his inheritance to the Austrian Empire.

On the other hand war wasn't inevitable if he accepted the will as England and Holland had already backed Philip of Anjou to become the next king of Spain. Furthermore overall it made more sense to Louis if forced to go to war it would be to defend Bourbon control over the Spanish Empire.

Examiner's comments

This response addresses the majority of the points outlined in the mark scheme. It begins by noting that if Louis rejected the Will, then the terms were to be offered to Austria increasing its power and influence in Europe. The response then outlines some of the likely benefits to France, most notably that Spain would now be an ally rather than an enemy. France would see its vulnerable north-eastern frontier protected by this alliance with Spain.

The response then explains the limitations of the Partition Treaty and the likely opposition of Leopold to either option. There is some lapse in focus on the question in the latter part of the response. This response was assessed as a Level 4, 7 marks.

Q2(ii) “Louis XIV’s recognition of James II’s son as the true king of England was the most important cause of the War of the Spanish Succession.” How far would you agree with this verdict? [22]

Student’s response

One factor which caused the War of the Spanish succession was Louis XIV recognition of James II’s son as the true king of England. The will required that the Spanish Empire be left to Philip of Anjou, Louis’s grandson, on the terms that he renounce his claim to the French throne. If Louis rejected the will would pass on to Leopold’s second son. It can be perceived as the most important cause in the contribution to war as it is what triggered the Grand Alliance to finally take action.

Louis XIV’s recognition of James III as the true king of England can be seen as the most important factor as it clearly went against the truce of Ryswyck. At the death bed of James, Louis stated that his son was the rightful king of England, not William. This was likely a sentimental gesture in connection with his belief in Divine Right yet caused massive opposition from the English. Going against the Truce the English were worried of another Jacobite invasion and this lead to war as the English were prepared to do anything they could to protect their Protestant faith against the Catholic absolute aims of Louis. It was perceived with great fear and hostility from the English and was the factor which lead the Grand Alliance to finally take action against Louis, thus proving the main cause in the War of the Spanish succession.

A factor which contributed to the War of the Spanish succession but was not the most important was Louis’ acceptance of the will and subsequent rejection of the partition treaty. This caused his opponents England and the Holy Roman Empire to fear Louis’ actions as they did not want to see France as the strongest power. This caused war as countries such as the Holy Roman Empire would do whatever it took to prevent a Bourbon hegemony in Europe. However, Louis felt he had to accept the will as rejecting it would lead to it being transferred to Austria and would mean Louis would be helping Leopold create an Austrian hegemony, thus, while it was not the most important cause of war it still contributed.

A further act which caused the war of the Spanish succession was Louis’ reaffirmation of his grandson’s right to the throne. This clearly went against the terms of the will. It was an attempt by Louis to ensure the Bourbon dynasty if all his heirs were to die apart from Philip yet failed to make this clear to other countries. This caused war as Louis was going against the terms of the will and caused his enemies to fear Bourbon dominance in Europe as they feared it would lead to the joining of the two thrones, henceforth proving a cause in the outbreak of the war if not the most important cause.

Another cause was Louis' seizure of the Dutch barrier fortresses in the name of his grandson. This looked like a military alliance between the two countries and looked like a sign of things to come, causing war as it led the Dutch to fear a similar sequence of events to follow that had happened in the Dutch war and showed countries that Louis was prepared to take military action, proving a cause in the outbreak of war.

Similarly, a cause of the outbreak of the war of the Spanish Succession was the Trade Monopoly Louis seemed to be developing. The Spanish had offered the French the right to trade in the Spanish Empire, an example being when the Spanish granted the Asiento to the French Guinea Company. This caused war as it made other countries fear the prospect of a French trade monopoly and the idea of an alliance between the French and Spanish, demonstrating to be a cause of the war if not the most important reason.

Moreover, another cause of the war of the Spanish succession was the formation of the Grand Alliance. The English, Dutch and the Holy Roman Empire decided to form the Grand Alliance due to the acts performed by Louis with the aim to prevent French expansionism, a trade monopoly and an alliance between the French and Spanish. This was a cause of war as it united countries in the fight against Louis while providing them with the numbers and ability to go to war successfully while also pursuing their own aims such as Leopold's design for Italy and the English and Dutch aims of gaining Spanish colonies. Thus, demonstrating a cause of the war, if not proving to be the main reason.

In conclusion, while it was a combination of factors that caused the War of the Spanish succession, Louis' recognition of James II's son as the king of England was the main cause as it motivated the Grand Alliance to finally take action against Louis due to English fear of a Catholic invasion.

A final cause for the War of the Spanish succession was that of Leopold. Leopold himself was a warmonger and believed the Spanish Empire was rightfully his. This caused war as he had a strong desire for Austrian supremacy as well as a long standing hatred of the Bourbon dynasty and was prepared to go to extreme lengths to prevent Louis obtaining the throne and to secure it instead for his son's inheritance.

Examiner's comments

This response presents an accurate and comprehensive analysis. The proposition is confidently addressed and the answer retains a clear focus throughout.

After a concise, focused introduction the response focuses on the proposition and analyses the importance of Louis recognising James II's son as heir with confidence. Supporting evidence is judicious and relevant. The second paragraph explains the reasons for Louis XIV accepting the Will and how this contributed directly to the outbreak of war. The following paragraph addresses the importance of Louis asserting Philip's continued right to the French throne and outlines how this impacted the enemies of France. The response goes on to explain the importance of the seizing of the Dutch barrier fortresses and the establishment of a trade partnership between France and Spain. Both these factors are well developed and connected to the question. The answer then presents a confident analysis of the impact of the re-formation of the Grand Alliance and the role of Leopold in causing the conflict.

The response concludes with a short, focused summary of the main argument of the essay.

This is a very well written answer with sustained focus on the question. A wide range of factors are addressed, with each confidently explained and supported by appropriate evidence. The response was assessed as a Level 4, 22 marks.

Q3(i) Explain the consequences of the Battle of Blenheim of 1704. [8]

QUESTION NOT SELECTED BY EXAMINER

Q3(ii) “The terms of the peace treaties at the end of the War of the Spanish Succession benefited England more than any other country.” To what extent would you agree with this statement? [22]

QUESTION NOT SELECTED BY EXAMINER

Answer **two** questions from your chosen option.

You **must answer parts (i) and (ii)** of your chosen questions.

Quality of written communication will be assessed in **all** questions.

Option 3: Ireland 1823–1867

Q1(i) Explain the effects of the Lichfield House Compact for the Whigs. [8]

Student's response

The Lichfield House Compact had a number of effects for the Whigs.

Firstly, they had used their agreement with the Irish party to get Peel and the Tories out of power in 1835. This was a success, as the Whigs managed to sustain a government from 1835 to 1841. Secondly, the Whigs aimed at gaining a majority in the Commons by using the Irish party, in order to get important legislation through parliament. This was also a success, especially during the economic depression of 1835. Thirdly, the Whigs agreed to the Lichfield House Compact in order to 'pacify Ireland' and therefore, they would have the time to concentrate on passing important reforms in England. The Whig government managed to pass a number of reforms, such as the abolition of slavery, factory legislation and a government grant for education.

However, the Whigs also experienced some negative effects from the Lichfield House Compact. Firstly, Peel and the Conservatives criticised the Whigs harshly for their agreement with the Irish. They commonly called the Irish party the 'Irish tail' to the Whigs, and made it seem like O'Connell was controlling the party. Therefore, Whig support drained away between 1835 and 1841, and the Tories eventually got back into power in 1841. Secondly, the legislation they passed for Ireland was limited and disappointing. The Poor Law was ineffective, the Tithes Act led to landlords increasing rent and the Municipal Corporations Act was not as extensive as in England. As a result, the Whigs failed to show Ireland the benefits on the union, and Irish disappointment turned into agrarian unrest. It led to the revival of the push for repeal of the union.

Therefore, in conclusion, the Whigs experienced lots of positive and negative effects from the Lichfield House Compact.

Examiner's comments

Appropriately for an 8-mark question, the candidate wastes no time in identifying the most fundamental effect of the Lichfield House Compact (LHC) for the Whig party in the 1830s, namely the ousting of Peel's Tory government and its replacement by a Whig administration. The candidate further notes that the Whigs were able to sustain this government until 1841.

The answer notes the dual benefit that the Whigs gain from the LHC in terms of being in a position, with O'Connellite support in the House of Commons to pursue a programme of legislation and, linked to this, restore some degree of peace to Ireland. The candidate then adds some useful detail in relation to the reforms that were passed, although some of these were in fact passed before the LHC came into operation.

The candidate provides balance by arguing that the LHC had negative as well as positive effects for the Whig party, for example the criticism it faced for giving O'Connell so much power and influence, with Peel and the Tories used to good effect. As a consequence, in the candidate's words, "Whig support drained away between 1835 and 1841".

The answer then digresses to an extent in examining the flaws in the legislation passed for Ireland, though it concludes this passage with the relevant point that O'Connell's disappointment with the fruits of the LHC led him to revive his campaign for repeal of the Union – something neither the Whigs nor the Tories wanted.

Overall, the clarity and focus of the answer merit a Level 4 mark, but it falls short of full marks because there remained scope for more detail on the negative impact of the Lichfield House Compact on the Whigs, such as the loss of seats in the 1837 election.

The response was assessed as Level 4, 7 marks.

Q1(ii) “Small victories but big disappointments.” How far would you accept this verdict on the political career of Daniel O’Connell in the period 1823–1845? [22]

Student’s response

I disagree with the verdict that O’Connell only had “small victories” and “big disappointments” in his career from 1823 to 1845. O’Connell did have some small victories, such as the reforms he gained from the Lichfield House Compact, which were very limited. However, he also made some huge victories, such as the passing of Catholic Emancipation in 1829, and the granting of reforms from Peel’s government. The failure to achieve the Repeal of the Union before his death in 1847 is often seen as O’Connell’s biggest failure. However, historians dispute whether O’Connell’s aims were for repeal, or using the repeal issue to get Irish reforms.

Between 1823 and 1840, O’Connell made some small victories in his career. He made an agreement with the Whigs in 1835, in an attempt to oust Peel from parliament, gain Irish reforms and test the union. It was a success in the narrow sense that Peel was out of power until 1841. O’Connell also gained reforms for Ireland. The Tithe Rent Act of 1838 reduced the tithe by 25%, changed the way in which the tithe was collected, and wrote off arrears that accumulated since 1834. However, it levied the charge on landlords, so rents increased, leading to agrarian violence. The Poor Law Act extended the English system to Ireland. However, Rees said, “it was an English solution to an Irish problem.” It collapsed during the famine. The Municipal Corporations Act did allow O’Connell to become Mayor of Dublin in 1841, but the powers given to councils were not as extensive as in England. Drummond’s reforms were very successful as it opened judiciary and castle positions to Catholics, encouraged Catholics to join the police force, and curbed the power of the Orange Order. However, the reforms were short lived, as they ended when Drummond left Ireland. O’Connell also lost touch with his Irish roots, as he often had to compromise for the Whigs. He basically abandoned his campaign for repeal. Therefore, O’Connell’s success in gaining the Lichfield House Compact was a limited and small victory.

The granting of Catholic Emancipation in 1829 can be seen as a massive victory for O’Connell. He managed to “harness the Catholic masses”, according to Rees, by turning the Catholic Association into a mass constitutional movement in 1823. In 1824, “in a master stroke of policy”, according to Adleman, he introduced the Catholic rent, which raised £20,000 within the first year. This enabled him to create propaganda and earn support, as the money often funded the church. He was a great orator, and spoke with two voices. To his fellow countrymen he spoke of the great injustice felt among Catholics, and in Britain he used the policy of “Brinkmanship” to frighten parliament into granting emancipation. He managed to put so much pressure on parliament that Wellington and Peel made a U-turn on the issue and granted it. The fact that O’Connell managed to get emancipation from an ultra Tory government is a huge victory. Catholic Emancipation had some limitations,

such as the franchise rose to £10 householders, so the electorate was cut to ?? its original size. However, Catholic Emancipation was a major success with few limitations.

The Irish reforms O'Connell got from Peel is another huge victory. The Maynooth Act increased the state grant to the Catholic Priest college, and pleased many Irish catholics. The Queen's colleges established in Queens, Dublin and Galway also inspired non sectarian further education. It was amazing that O'Connell got such reforms from an ultra tory "Orange Peel". However, O'Connell did not agree with the colleges act, as the church did not like having its authority challenged, and O'Connell sided with them. However, Peel's Irish reforms are a major success of O'Connell's career.

The failure to gain repeal before his death in 1847 is often seen as O'Connell's biggest failure. However, Garham, Adleman and Rees all dispute this. Rees said that O'Connell used the Repeal issue "as a lever to squeeze Irish reforms from an often unenthusiastic government." Between 1835 and 1841 O'Connell basically abandoned the repeal issue, and concentrated on his reforms for Ireland. During this time, he lost touch with his Irish roots, and was called the "Irish tail" to the Whig party. Rees also suggests that during his time as Mayor of Dublin in 1841, he left the repeal issue and concentrated on his career. Therefore, was repeal his main objective? Also, he was vague when he spoke about the repeal issue. He never discussed the actual terms it would bring. MacDonagh said, "O'Connell used Repeal as a rallying cry... a hoped for bargaining counter." Adleman said that after 1845 "O'Connell's record was one of failure." This was due to his impotence during the famine. Therefore, although the failure to gain repeal is seen as his major failure, was repeal really his ultimate goal?

In conclusion, O'Connell had some minor successes, such as the Lichfield House Compact, and some major successes, such as the passing of Catholic Emancipation and the granting of Peel's Irish reforms. Although the failure to achieve repeal before his death in 1847 is seen as O'Connell's major disaster, it is not clear if it was his real goal. Therefore, I would argue that O'Connell's career had major successes and limited disappointments.

Examiner's comments

The candidate opens the answer by challenging the proposition. While acknowledging the reforms gained from the Lichfield House Compact may have been modest, the achievement of Catholic Emancipation and, interestingly, Peel's Irish reforms of the 1840s must be considered "huge victories". The candidate further argues that the conventional view of the Repeal campaign as O'Connell's "biggest failure" depends on whether the campaign aimed at Repeal or only a strategy to gain other reforms. This is a bold introduction, and indicates that not only does the candidate have a clear understanding of the question, but is to approach the subject with a degree of sophistication.

The second paragraph considers in some detail the "small victories" that emerged from the Lichfield House Compact with the Whigs in 1835. The three principle pieces of legislation together with the reforms of Thomas Drummond are analysed succinctly and convincingly, maintaining a good focus on the question.

The next paragraph takes issue with the proposition in relation to O'Connell's achievement of Catholic Emancipation, which it categorises as a "massive victory". As with Lichfield House Compact in the preceding paragraph, the candidate presents a detailed analysis of the issue at hand, in this case the Emancipation campaign, including the tactics used and the favourable political circumstances of the time.

The candidate continues the thrust of this argument in the next paragraph, which deals with the Repeal campaign of the 1840s, and in which another "huge victory" is accredited to O'Connell in terms of the reforms forthcoming from Peel's Conservative government. This is an unconventional argument, but it demonstrates a commendable ability to "think outside the box" on the part of the candidate. The point is further developed by suggesting that O'Connell's drive for Repeal may in fact been a subterfuge to gain more reforms for Ireland, such as the Maynooth Grant. Therefore, while the candidate does not deny that the Repeal campaign was a failure, that judgement is qualified by posing the question as to whether "repeal was really his [O'Connell's] ultimate goal".

The candidate concludes with a brief summation of his thesis, but by this point a top Level 4 mark is quite secure. A combination of range, depth and clarity and conviction, with the added ingredient of imaginative analysis, more than merits the full marks that this answer is awarded.

The response was assessed as Level 4, 22 marks.

Q2(i) Explain the problems facing Irish agriculture in the period 1824–1845. [8]

Student's response

There were lots of problems facing Irish agriculture before the famine between 1824 and 1845.

Firstly, as the population had expanded, there was more pressure on the land. In 1787 the population was 5 million, but by 1845 it was 8 million. This led to the subdivision of land. In 1845 23% of holdings was less than 1 acre in size. Secondly, as most of the land in Ireland was owned by 10,000 Absentee Protestant Landlords, who often lived beyond their means, rent was high to pay for their lavish lives. As a result land was often shared by families, and subdivided among sons. In 1845 135,000 families lived on land of less than an acre. Thirdly, no real agricultural improvements were made to land, as when it was landlords would often push up the rent. Fourthly, over dependence on the potato meant if anything happened to it millions would starve. One third of all cultivated land had potatoes, and they fed three million people. Fifthly, eviction was high, and farmers had no real security or rights.

Therefore there were many problems with Irish agriculture between 1824 and 1845.

Examiner's comments

In a short opening paragraph, the candidate acknowledges that Irish agriculture faced a range of problems in the period in question. In the second paragraph, which forms the main body of the answer, the most fundamental of these problems is identified, namely overpopulation, with illustrative detail provided. The candidate notes that this problem can be linked to another critical issue, that of the subdivision of land.

Absentee landlords are mentioned, as is the problem of high rents associated with those landowners who, in the candidate's words, "lived beyond their means". The candidate then returns briefly to the issue of subdivision to give some statistical detail, before proceeding to the lack of agricultural improvement and overdependence on the potato, for which illustrative detail is again presented. The second last paragraph focuses on the particular problems faced by the west of Ireland, such as poor soil, lack of industry and the pervasive effects of earlier famines. The concluding paragraph makes two additional points, concerning the collection of tithes, which had the effect of further increasing rents, and the impact of the Poor Law Act, which had abolished outdoor relief, making life even more difficult for the cottier class.

This is a very well informed answer, with a good range of valid points. It falls short of attaining full marks as there could be some improvement to its organisation, but it is nonetheless a comfortable Level 4 response.

The response was assessed as Level 4, 7 marks.

Q2(ii) How important were the economic, social and political effects of the Famine on Ireland in the period up to 1867? [22]

Student's response

There was a range of consequences of the famine in Ireland up to 1867. Economically, land ownership sizes increased, produce increased and landlords decreased. Socially, the population decreased, living standards increased and the population of Irish speakers decreased. Politically, the death of O'Connell led to the rise of more extremist nationalists, and politics becoming a less urgent issue.

The famine had a range of economic effects on Ireland up to 1867. The cottier class almost died out, as a result subdivision of land and small farms decreased. By 1870 50% of land was greater than 15 acres, compared to 1845 when 23% of holdings were less than 1 acre. As a consequence, farms increased in size and more produce was made. By 1867 Ireland had over four million cattle. However, the percentage of cultivated land containing potatoes still increased, as they were a good food supply. Landlords suffered from the famine, and 10% went completely bankrupt. The Encumbered Estates Act allowed to resale of their land, which also helped to increase the number of farms in Ireland. Therefore the famine had economic effects on Ireland.

The social impact of the famine on Ireland was massive. One million people died and one million people emigrated. Ireland's population continued to decline until 1970. As many of the dead or emigrated were from the cottier class, the Irish language decreased. In 1845 50% of the population could speak Gaelic, but 10 years later this decreased to 24%. Many of those who emigrated had to learn English to fit in their new country. Living standards also began to increase. The number of one roomed accommodation decreased, and the number of larger farms increased. Social trends were also altered. Late marriage and later pregnancies became the norm, and land tended to be given to one son, with the others expected to emigrate or move to industrialised parts of Ireland, such as Ulster and Lagan Valley. Therefore there was a lot of social impact on Ireland from the famine.

There was also a lot of political effects of the famine on Ireland. The death of O'Connell in 1867 led to more extremist nationalists such as Mitchel taking the political stage. He was so infuriated by the harshness of the famine and the lack of British intervention, that he accused Britain of "Genocide." A very anti British feeling was aroused in Ireland. However, politics was not as big an issue as it was before the famine. People were more concerned by the tithe and land issue, and therefore

politics took a step back. The political effects of the famine were quite important, as it led to the rise of the Fenian movement. However, economic and social effects were more immediate.

In conclusion, there were many economic, social and political effects of the famine. Economically, land size increased, land lord power decreased and exports increased. Politically, more extreme nationalists took to the political stage, but many people cared about the tithe and land issue more than politics. Arguably, the famine had the greatest social impact on Ireland. The population decreased drastically, emigration increased, the Irish language almost died out, and living standards increased. Therefore, although the famine had economic and political effects, it was the social effects that were of most importance.

Sixthly, farming was hard, especially on the west coast where the soil was shallow and rocky. Famine had already hit in 1817 and 1822, so people were still feeling the effects. Seventhly, income relied on selling produce, as small household industry, such as woollen or linen weaving had died due to the industrialisation of urban areas such as Dublin and Belfast.

Finally, as the tithe act levied it onto the landlord, tenants rates increased, making it almost impossible to live. As the Poor Act abolished outdoor relief, life for tenant farmers and cottiers was really dire.

Examiner's comments

Question 2(ii) asks a candidate how important were the economic, social and political effects of the Famine on Ireland in the period up to 1867, and the first thing to notice about this answer is that it is structured according to the framework of the question. This makes good sense from the candidate's point of view, but it also gives the answer an in-built coherence that is easy for the reader to navigate.

In the introductory paragraph the candidate gives a brief illustration of the effects of the Famine in all three categories listed by the question, demonstrating an ability to select and deploy relevant evidence.

The second paragraph of the answer is focused on the first of the three areas for consideration, that is the effects on the economy. Arguably the most dramatic of these effects is dealt with at the outset, noting the almost total disappearance of the cottier class, and the resultant increase in farm sizes and agricultural productivity. Relevant statistical detail is employed in this aspect of the study, as it is with reference to the impact on the landlord class, noting, for example, the Encumbered Estates Act.

In the third paragraph the candidate proceeds to consider the social effects of the Famine, and as with the preceding paragraph on the economy, the most dramatic

effect is dealt with first: the death toll and high levels of emigration. The decline in the number of Irish speakers is also linked to the decline of the cottier class, referred to earlier in the economic context. This analysis also notes what might be considered positive social effects of the Famine, including better living standards and larger farms.

The next paragraph deals with the political consequences of the Famine, most significantly the rise of a new militant brand of nationalism, characterised by the likes of Mitchel, but with more focus now on the land issue than before. The emergence of the Fenian movement is referred to, but there is perhaps some scope for further development in this part of the answer. For example, there is no reference to the Young Ireland movement or their abortive rebellion in 1848.

In a relatively long concluding paragraph, the candidate draws out some of the most important effects in terms of the economy, society and politics, but there is significant overlap here with the content of the introduction.

This is a solid Level 4 answer in terms of structure, clarity and the blend of “headline” points and illustrative detail. It falls short only in terms of the range of its analysis of the impact on politics, scoring in total 20 out of a maximum of 22 marks.

The response was assessed as Level 4, 20 marks.

Q3(i) Explain the reasons for the outbreak of the Fenian Rising of 1867. [8]

QUESTION NOT SELECTED BY EXAMINER

Q3(ii) “A lack of international support explains the failure of the Fenian Rising of 1867.” How far would you agree with this statement? [22]

QUESTION NOT SELECTED BY EXAMINER

Answer **two** questions from your chosen option.

You **must answer parts (i) and (ii)** of your chosen questions.

Quality of written communication will be assessed in **all** questions.

Option 4: France 1815–1870

Q1(i) Explain the aims of the Charter of Liberties. [8]

Student's response

The Charter of Liberties was put in place to be a compromise between the gains of the revolution and the need for stability.

The terms of civil liberties and a form of democracy was meant to give the liberals what they wanted. Also allowing those who had gained land in the revolution to keep it was an effort to win support for the new regime. Though to stabilise the State there needed to be some form of compromise and allowance to pacify the right wing. This meant restoring the king and ensuring he could rule without the parliament was key to gaining support for the Charter from the right wing. The king could rule by ordinances in an emergency and this meant he could pass laws without needing to put them through the chamber.

The Charter also aimed to stop France from ever being as powerful as it had been under Napoleon I. The great powers ensured this by installing the Parliament which meant he could not rule by his own will like Napoleon had. They also imposed a higher war indemnity and an army of occupation, to help reduce French dominion. The cordon sanitaire also ensured France would not expand like she had under Napoleon.

The Charter also aimed to restore law and order to France this would appease the aristocracy who had mostly fled after 1789 and would only return once they had been assured that mob rule under a republic would not happen again.

The Charter also aimed to offer a stable situation for Louis XVIII to rule over as if society was not stabilised first another revolution would be imminent, which was something none of the other European powers wanted.

Examiner's comments

This response notes, at the outset, the need for post-war stability and for compromise between the needs of a restored monarchy and the gains of the revolutionary period. It goes on to give examples of how these were achieved, taking varied examples from the Charter. Focus on the "aims," as specified in the question, is maintained throughout.

The references to the peace treaties, at the end of the second paragraph, digresses from the question. They are not penalised *per se*, but nor are they credited.

This response was assessed as a Level 4.

Q1(ii) "Charles X rather than Louis XVIII was responsible for the Bourbons' failure to keep their throne." To what extent would you agree with this judgement on the restored monarchy in France during the period 1815–1830? [22]

Student's response

Louis XVIII had established a fairly stable regime despite him appearing weak after the Hundred Days where he fled to Belgium. His reign had offered a liberal movement from 1816 as a backlash against the harsh repression of the white terror in 1815. This liberal movement had seen widespread support though there was a narrow franchise this meant whenever liberal matters were brought in. For example Decazus would also be quite loyal to the monarchy.

Louis XVIII also accepted the Charter though he believed it was only a gift to his people. This meant he was willing to work within the Charter's laws and this meant that overall the State was stable.

Though after the murder of Duc de Berry in 1820 the liberal interlude came to an end and was replaced with a period of ultra rule. This Ultra royalist movement was lead by the Comted' Artois who was an ardent Émigré royalist. Though the government was headed initially by Richilieu who was forced to resign by the chamber as he had little support and was seen as too liberal.

This Ultra revival came after 1820 when the age for both voting and being a candidate was lowered. Richilieu had hoped this would bring in a wave of young radical royalists though this he got just not with him in charge. He was replaced by Villiele who was more extreme though even this would not have toppled Louis as he was still alarmed by the ultra resurgence and wanted to change it there was little he could do due to ailing health.

By 1824 his health deteriorated and he died though he was not overthrown by revolution had he not died all the right wing became even stronger he may have been toppled by a liberal uprising.

Charles X however was not conciliatory like Louis and faced opposition from all sides.

He worked within the Charter to some extent but considered it as limiting his God given power which in his mind should not be controlled by a piece of paper and why he desired its removal.

He destabilised the State with controversial policies such as allowing the church to have full State protection, though under the Charter religious freedom was overlooked. He also allowed the church to take over the role of education and allowed the Jesuits to return to practising which both had not existed under Louis XVIII's regime.

He also allowed for new religious organisations which were extremely royalist and Catholic to spring up such as Les Chevalliers de Foi of which both Villiele and Polignac were members.

He also attempted to rule in the Chamber without a majority though in 1828 Villiele had to resign and he was replaced by the moderate who did not last until 1830 when the king dismissed him and opted to try and form a government under Polignac who had only a minority in the Chamber.

In an attempt to gain more support he passed the ordinances of St Cloud which only challenged the liberals and angered them. His lack of care in this situation led to his abdication in early August 1830.

Neither monarch's foreign policy inspired the French people who were hoping to regain prestige after being humiliated by the Vienna Settlement in 1814.

Overall I agree with the statement as though Louis XVIII could have further revolution and destabilisation in the State he would have handled the situation and been a conciliatory monarch people hoped for unlike Charles X who only wanted his own way and would not take no for an answer.

Examiner's comments

This response offers a well-informed assessment of the proposition. In general it supports the proposition, and is finely nuanced, noting, in particular, Louis XVIII's occasional failures to cement the régime by his inability to control outside forces. The first paragraph contains a balanced account of the opening years of the Restoration, referring to the Hundred Days and White Terror as well as Louis' liberal leanings. The next paragraph continues the theme of stability, summarising the principles which underlay the Charter.

The third paragraph notes the change of direction in Louis' reign after the murder of the Duc de Berri, and the reactionary influence brought to bear on the king by the Ultras, while the fourth paragraph continues this theme, analysing the progress of the shift to the right. There is an error here, with apparent conflation of the electoral changes of 1815 and the Law of the Double Vote in 1820. The fifth paragraph argues well that Louis XVIII died in office: despite his concessions to the right after 1820, they were not enough to bring about his overthrow.

The response goes on to compare Louis with Charles X, who antagonised those "from all sides", but moderates this view by noting that although Charles abhorred the Charter, he worked within it. The response offers good supporting evidence for the proposition, beginning with the clerical policies, which offended liberals and "destabilised the state." The penultimate paragraph focuses on the king's insistence on his prerogative of appointing his own ministers, regardless of election results, noting that the attempt to secure a majority for Polignac, using the Ordinances of St Cloud, led to the overthrow of the Bourbon monarchy. The concluding paragraph briefly compares the two reigns, concluding that Charles was unwilling to listen, and was, therefore, implicitly responsible for the Bourbons' failure to keep their throne.

The financial reforms which straddled both reigns might have been used in evidence, as well as Charles' well-meaning efforts to draw a line under the émigré compensation problem.

This response was assessed as mid-Level 4.

Q2(i) Explain the development of the French economy between 1830 and 1848.
[8]

QUESTION NOT SELECTED BY EXAMINER

Q2(ii) To what extent was Louis Philippe's relationship with the press responsible for his downfall in 1848? [22]

QUESTION NOT SELECTED BY EXAMINER

Q3(i) Explain why some groups were dissatisfied with the Second Republic between 1848 and 1852. [8]

Student's response

Those who owned property were dissatisfied with the 2nd republic as it had set up public work schemes which hurt their pockets the most but also these people were frightened after the violence of the July days when the work schemes closed. These schemes were also inefficient and though they provided employment for some it was not enough leaving the peasants and urban working class who relied on alms dissatisfaction.

Bonapartists also were dissatisfied with the republic as though Louis Napoleon was president he was still subject to what the government told him to do and he also had to act within the constitution.

Many Bonapartists and normal French men desired for a return to the glory days of Napoleon II and desired the prestige France had longed for since 1814. They felt that if another option such as an empire was to arise then they could regain la gloire that they dreamed of.

Monarchists both Orleanists who wanted a regency for Louis Philippe's grandson and Legitimists, who hoped for a return of the Bourbon monarchy, were dissatisfied with the Republic as for many of them they associated a Republic with mob rule and the guillotines of 1789.

Some republicans who wanted more radical change were dissatisfied. They felt that the republic did not go far enough.

Examiner's comments

This response acknowledges the dissatisfaction with the Second Republic of the monarchists, both Legitimist and Orleanist, together with supporters of Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, anxious for a more glorious foreign policy. It also notes those who associated a republic with mob rule and the Terror. Red Republicans are mentioned, seeking even more radical economic reforms, as well as the property-owners who opposed work creation schemes and the violence which surrounded their abandonment. Finally, the unemployed, after the National Workshops closed, were obviously dissatisfied.

This comprehensive response was assessed as Level 4.

Q3(ii) “The Emperor’s domestic policy was a failure, when measured against his aims.” How far would you agree with this judgement on Napoleon III between 1852 and 1870? [22]

Student’s response

Napoleon III’s aims in 1852 were to continue the legacy of Napoleon I but to rewrite some of it to fit more with a mid 19th century French mind. He also wanted to revise the 1815 settlement and maintain good diplomatic relations with the other European powers.

He wanted to make France a prosperous nation again and restore a sense of stability to the State with a strong government and leader at the helm. He also wanted to reassure the public that law and order would be maintained under his leadership. He also wanted to do what was best for France and listen to what the people wanted.

Initially throughout the 1850s Napoleon III kept tight control over his subjects and his empire would be called authoritarian.

After the Coup d’etat’s in 1851 and 52 which brought him the imperial crown he arrested hundreds of thousands of political opponents and 10,000 of them were exiled. He also appeased the church and allowed them to have a central role in his regime. This was also one of his aims which was to help end anti-clericalism in France.

He also showed genuine care for the peasants during a cholera epidemic which brought him only more support. In some parts this mass support was false as elections for new deputies were often rigged which could be seen as a weakness.

He attempted to cross boundaries and win support by increasing salaries for church, army and government officials which would ensure a strong conservative root of support.

This first period restored the stability and strong government he had desired. It also established faith from the upper classes that he would retain law and order for them.

From 1860 onwards he slowly introduced liberal reforms such as removing censorship and giving the Chamber full parliamentary status. This culminated in him inviting Olivier a former republican to form a government. These reforms may not have been what was best for France but it was what he wanted, this is seen because only one of his advisors supported his introduction of reforms was Dec du Moriey his

closest ally. Though this could have been his long term goal, to have a liberal empire instead of an authoritarian one.

His economic policies had the aim of increasing prosperity for the people, he created 3 new banks such as Credit Mobilier which aimed to boost the economy. This worked initially but Credit Mobilier collapsed in 1867 meaning thousands of small savers lost their money.

He encourages overseas investment and signed a free trade deal with other European states most notably Britain. Though industrialisation overall remained the same under Louis Philippe except in some key industries like coal.

Railways did spread but only expanded internal trade and it's hard to say if these made much impact. He also wanted to renew the urban environment but this still left unhealthy conditions for the poor and did not positively impact the economy significantly.

Overall his domestic policy was fairly successful at meeting his aims though towards 1870 the policies and decisions he made seemed to not hit their mark with his aims. His domestic policy though it seemed to not be wholly successful it was still popular and the French people still had faith in Napoleon III seen in the results of the plebiscite in 1870 which asked if the public were in favour of the liberal reforms. 7.3 million to 1.5 million voted in favour. This plebiscite was also based on universal male suffrage which gives a good indication that Napoleon III was popular with most of the French public.

His aims were set very high however I don't agree that his domestic policy was a total failure compared to his aims. Some of his aims were met with policies and he provided stability in the most volatile state in Europe and he did what he felt was best for the public and he held regular plebiscites so he would have a good idea what the public actually wanted. He was still popular in 1870 which would say that he met his aims in domestic policy. He was destroyed by foreign policy not his domestic policy, like Napoleon I.

Examiner's comments

This response ranges across Napoleon's domestic policy and how far it succeeded in meeting his aims. Some perceptive points are made, although on occasion more supporting evidence would have helped.

The opening paragraph could be more specific in spelling out Napoleon III's domestic aims, and digresses into foreign policy.

The second paragraph does address "aims," specifically for the economy, law and order, and the initial need for authoritarian government. Examples of this tough approach are offered in the third paragraph, as is his support for the church and for the peasantry, both in their turn bolstering support for the régime. Ballot rigging is also mentioned. The fourth paragraph continues to show how Napoleon III worked to build up support by referring to increased salaries for military officers and government officials. The fifth sums up these processes and decisions, by which the Emperor had, by 1860, succeeded in strengthening his position.

The sixth paragraph of this response describes Napoleon III's so-called "liberal Empire" phase, offering good examples, such as the appointment of the republican Ollivier as Prime Minister. It makes the astute point that the Emperor had to struggle to overcome opposition from his own advisers to pass the liberal reforms, only the Duc de Morny offering his wholehearted support.

The next two paragraphs turn to economic matters, namely the creation of the *Credit Mobilier*, free trade treaties, the spread of the railway system and urban regeneration. These are recognised as mixed blessings, and France's lagging industry is noted. Haussmann's redevelopment of Paris and other cities could have been further developed to show both support for and criticism of the proposition.

In the last section the response seeks to draw conclusions, noting that right to the end of his reign plebiscites suggested continued support for Napoleon's regime and utilising good detailed evidence. The last paragraph is somewhat general and could have been improved by the use of specific examples.

The response was assessed as a low Level 4.

Answer **two** questions from your chosen option.

You **must answer parts (i) and (ii)** of your chosen questions.

Quality of written communication will be assessed in **all** questions.

Option 5: Russia 1914–1941

Q1(i) Explain how Tsar Nicholas II's mistakes during the First World War led to his downfall the Revolution of February 1917. [8]

Student's response

The Tsar Nicholas made a number of mistakes which led to his downfall in February 1917.

The first mistake was his decision to go to war, this was bad as there were a number of domestic issues going on in Russia at the time. There were financial, political and social problems. For starters the economy in Russia wasn't strong enough even though they were technically in the black. Also there were no reforms taking place in Russia at the time. Also below the Tsar Nicholas was an autocrat, if anything went wrong he would be personally blamed. His decision to go to war was very similar to his decision a few years prior to go to war with Japan, this was an attempt to divert attention away from domestic problems in Russia.

Another mistake made by the Tsar was his decision to become Commander and Chief. This was a bad decision as he had no prior military experience, so when he took over from his generals it led to more defeats. A famous defeat was when they lost one million men in the Battle of Gallipoli. These defeats led to the Tsar losing his first pillar of support which was the army. The army felt very alienated by the Tsar.

Another mistake made by the Tsar was his decision to leave the Tsarina in charge at home. This was bad due to the fact that she was German therefore the Russian people thought that she was a spy, also because she was a woman she had no prior experience running a country. Also the Tsar failed to deal with Grigor Rasputin's influence over the Tsarina. He was a monk who claimed he could heal the Tsar's son, this caused the Tsar to lose his second pillar of support which was the church. He lost the church as Rasputin claimed to be a monk however he had a very active sex life and he was constantly drunk and out late. Also because Rasputin started swaying the Tsarina towards different policies this caused the Tsar to lose his final pillar which was the Aristocracy, they were angry that Rasputin was making major decisions for Russia without their consent.

The Tsar Nicholas was also inferior to the previous Tsars as he had no real dominance, he couldn't lead by strong personality, this hindered his ability to govern Russia, also he wasn't a very confident speaker.

The final nail in the coffin for the Tsar was his decision to suspend the third Duma.

Examiner's comments

This is a very high level and well-developed response. It clearly acknowledges the individual mistakes made by the Tsar during the War and links them very well to how they caused his downfall in the Revolution of February 1917.

This response acknowledges the Tsar's mistakes of going to war in an unprepared state, his decision to go to the front as Commander-in-Chief and how he was subsequently blamed for the defeats that followed. Also included are the mistakes of leaving the government at home in the hands of the Tsarina, and of suspending the Duma. What is particularly impressive in this response is the way the Tsar's decisions are linked to the alienation of his support bases of the Army and the Aristocracy.

The response is long overall and it is entirely possible to achieve a mark of 8 without this much detail. The point on the Duma towards the end of the response is stated rather than developed, but there is more than enough material in the answer overall to merit a mark of 8.

This response was assessed as a Level 4, 8 marks.

Q1(ii) “The leadership of Lenin and Trotsky was the most important reason for the success of the Bolsheviks in the Revolution of October 1917.” How far would you agree with this verdict? [22]

Student's response

Some historians argue that Lenin and Trotsky's leadership was a focal point in the reason of this success in the October Revolution but there were undoubtedly other factors which I will explore in this question.

Lenin offered one thing that the Bolsheviks needed – leadership. He organised and gave the army a solid aim and goal which will help them in their success. When returning from exile in 1917, Lenin published his April theses which had many features such as bringing land reforms, calling an election and most importantly – ending the war. This April theses from Lenin showed how in touch with the public the Bolsheviks were which will have undoubtedly aid them in the October Revolution. The Russian people wanted one thing, to end the war and this is what the Bolsheviks offered and allowed their support to accumulate rapidly and help them win the Revolution. Lenin also called for a staged Revolution from the Central Planning Committee and in this, he was able to appear strong after defeating opponents Zinoviev and Kamanev – thus allowing them to build support and help win the October Revolution.

Lenin was also extremely talented in exploiting the mistakes of the provisional government under Bolshevik slogans such as ‘peace, bread, land.’ Marking what the Provisional Government didn't give the public whilst highlighting that the Bolsheviks could give them what they wanted. Lenin also offered the idea of ‘non cooperation’ which means the Bolsheviks couldn't be associated with the mistakes of the Tsar such as the defeat in Tannenburg.

Trotsky was also a key member in the reason for the success of the Bolsheviks in the October revolution. Some historians say that Trotsky was the man that put Lenin's plans into action, and he was. Trotsky was already extremely popular due to the 1905 revolution and his great speechmaking skills made it almost impossible for the public to not believe what he was saying.

Trotsky, a red guard, had trained the Bolsheviks and gave Lenin a timeframe as to when they would be strong enough to win the Revolution, thus meaning that Trotsky only let them fight when they were strong enough, which is undoubtedly another reason for the success of the Bolsheviks. Trotsky was also chairman of the Petrograd Soviet and because of the Military Revolutionary Committee (MNC) he was able to take over petrol stations and police stations for supplies, etc. The advantage of Trotsky being in this position meant that he was able to infiltrate the Provisional Government and bring them down from the inside, make them appear

weak and further exploit their mistakes alongside Lenin which is another important reason for the success of the Bolsheviks in the October Revolution.

However, other than Trotsky and Lenin, the Bolsheviks had other strength. Every Bolshevik was loyal, due to their strong leadership and ideological beliefs and were all able to cleverly read and manoeuvre different situations. The Bolsheviks were also able to use propaganda against opponents without the help of Lenin and Trotsky.

Moreover, the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky solely would not have been enough in the reasoning for the success of the Bolsheviks in the Revolution of October 1917. The Provisional Government made many mistakes which contributed to the success of the Bolsheviks. The Provisional Government decided to continue the war when in power which was their most detrimental mistake. This decision aggravated the Russian people and truly highlighted just how out of touch the Provisional Government were. The Provisional Government had no legitimacy or even power as they were not elected or even liked by the Russian public. Stemming from this the Provisional Government lacked support and authority unlike the Bolsheviks.

The Provisional Government didn't benefit from the dual power sharing system with the Petrograd soviet, as no two parties wanted to divide their power. The Soviet order No1 stated the army should only obey the Provisional Government if it didn't go against their decrees which in turn left the Provisional Government powerless. The Provisional Government failed to introduce Land Decrees and to call a constituent assembly which was seen by the public as their attempt to prolong their time in power rather than actually governing.

The July days was another Provisional Government struggle as even though sailors rebelled in Kronstadt and the Provisional Government could suppress the attack, they couldn't deal with the attack from the left: The Kornlov Coup. In essence, Kornilov had been instructed to settle unrest in Petrograd but Kerensky ordered his arrest and to his surprise, needed the Red Armies help. Kerensky supplied the Red army with weaponry which would undoubtedly be used against them in this October Revolution.

In conclusion, I agree only to a certain extent that the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky was the most important reason for the success in the October Revolution as the Bolsheviks as mentioned, had many other strengths and I strongly argue that the mistakes and weaknesses of the Provisional Government helped the Bolshevik immensely and was an important reason for the success of the Bolsheviks in the Revolution of October 1917.

Examiner's comments

This response offers a comprehensive and sustained assessment of the proposition and of other relevant factors. The introduction shows that there are several factors to consider. The response then moves on to give a comprehensive explanation of the leadership roles of both Lenin and Trotsky.

Starting with Lenin, there is a recognition of how popular his anti-war stance was, and how he had been agitating within the Bolshevik party for a staged revolution. The response goes on to discuss how Lenin was able to exploit the mistakes made by the Provisional Government. This is a strong assessment overall, although perhaps more could have been made of the importance of the April Theses in building support and the significance of the 'Peace, Bread and Land' promise.

The response then moves on to discuss Trotsky and this is a particularly strong section of the answer. Trotsky's role as the instigator of Lenin's plans is discussed, as are his roles in training the Red Guard and as Chairman of the Petrograd Soviet. This section of the answer is concise, but comprehensive nonetheless.

There is then a brief explanation of some general strengths of the Bolsheviks beyond the proposition. It is relevant, but could maybe have been developed.

The final section of the response then explains in a very comprehensive way how the weaknesses and mistakes of the Provisional Government also helped the Bolsheviks into power. A very impressive range of mistakes and weaknesses is considered, including the decision to continue the war, the failure to deal with the land issue, the weakness caused by power-sharing, their lack of legitimacy and their failure in dealing with the July Days. This is the most impressive section of the answer. The conclusion is both relevant and well supported by the argument maintained all through the response.

This response was assessed as a Level 4, 20 marks.

Q2(i) Explain how the Bolsheviks' strengths led to their victory in the Russian Civil War between 1918 and 1921. [8]

Student's response

The Bolsheviks had a number of strengths which led to their victory in the Civil War between 1918 – 1921.

The role Lenin had was a big strength, his appointment of Trotsky as Commissar for war was a great decision. This is because Trotsky was an inspirational leader, he excelled at planning and organising and his strategic brilliance is just what the Bolsheviks needed to win the war. Trotsky also instilled fierce discipline into his red army which was brutally effective. Trotsky also trained the red army, and raised their numbers up to 5 million strong. He was very smart and pragmatic. With his employment of ex – Tsarist officers to train the army, and his kidnapping of their families to ensure their loyalty was very pragmatic. Trotsky was a very inspiring character for his troops during the war as he travelled in an armoured train from front line to front line trying to motivate his troops.

Lenin during the war realised that Trotsky should run most of their campaign as he knew this was what Trotsky excelled at. That's why Lenin acted as more of a supporting role. However behind the scenes he worked furiously on his economic policy of war communism which kept the workers working and the red army fed and fighting. Lenin also used the Cheka to good effect to eliminate opposition to the Bolsheviks. It is said that the Cheka carried out 250,000 executions during the war. Lenin also used propaganda to good use to manipulate the whites and highlight to the Russian people that the Whites were basically puppets of the Capitalist super powers, this lost the Whites vital support.

The Bolsheviks also had a number of general strengths during the war, as they controlled the centres of production, transportation and the communication networks. They tried to operate out of the major cities in Russia as they knew this would help their progress in winning the war.

As you can see there are a number of Bolshevik strengths which helped them win the Civil War between 1918 and 1921.

Examiner's comments

This is a very high-quality response, including not only an impressive selection of relative points, but also showing a high level of organisation.

This response begins with the relevant and commendable point about how Lenin had the wisdom to appoint Trotsky as Commissar for War. The answer then goes on to develop numerous strengths that Trotsky brought to the Bolsheviks and their efforts in the Civil War. These points show a clear understanding of Trotsky's importance as both a strategist and a leader.

The response then goes on to discuss Lenin's importance and the strengths that he contributed, including his support of Trotsky, his organisation of the economy through the policy of War Communism and his ruthless use of the Cheka.

Particularly impressive is the way in which the response finishes, by identifying some general strengths of the Bolsheviks such as their overall strategy of maintaining control of the industrial centres and cities.

This response was assessed as a Level 4, 8 marks.

Q2(ii) “The New Economic Policy (NEP) was the only successful economic policy introduced by the Bolsheviks between 1917 and 1924.” To what extent would you accept this assessment? [22]

Student's response

During the period of 1917 – 1924 there were several economic policies that were all partially successful however there was one in particular that had the most successes for Russia.

The New Economic Policy was introduced just after the Bolsheviks won the Civil War in 1921. It was introduced to try and rebuild the economy which had been damaged due to the Civil War. It was also introduced to try and win back lost support. From their last economic policy the NEP had more aspects of capitalism than communism. Lenin understood that in order to reach their Communist goals they would have to accept some aspects of Capitalism in order to do this.

Another reason why their policy was introduced was because of the Tambov rising and the Kronstadt mutiny which highlighted how unpopular the last policy was, as the sailor in Kronstadt had been one of the Bolsheviks biggest support bases. The NEP saw private ownership for small businesses re-introduced. It also saw the end of grain requisitioning. Also a new tax was introduced on grain which encouraged lazy farmers to become more productive, this in turn helped re-flate the economy. This policy was quite successful as it saw industrial and agricultural production rise, there was increased support from the peasant and middle classes and the economy was starting to return to pre civil war levels. However there were also some failures of the NEP. For starters it led to a split in the Bolshevik party due to the fact that the policy was an ideological retreat, also Lenin was the only person who properly understood the policy with frustrated other party members.

In 1917, there was the introduction of the Economic Policy of State Capitalism. It had the transitional idea of slowly moving Russia towards a socialist style economy. It was a gradual evolution of the economy that was encouraged by a German Socialist revolution. It consisted of the Land and Workers decree. The policy was a success as it brought more support due to the popularity of the two decrees. However the drawback of this policy is that it led to divisions within the Bolshevik party. This policy had to stop early due to the outbreak of the civil war, therefore it cannot be properly judged on its effectiveness.

Due to the outbreak of the civil war, the economic policy War Communism was introduced. It was brought in to help Russia and the Bolsheviks prepare for a civil war. This policy saw the introduction of the Supreme Council of the National Economy, it also saw the introduction of grain requisitioning squads, this led to peasants trying to hoard grain which resulted in Lenin taking everything the peasants

produced which in turn resulted in widespread famine. Also this policy banned private ownership. This policy had one key success as it fulfilled its main aim of ensuring victory of the civil war. However there were a number of distinct failures such as due to grain requisitioning it led to a famine which caused the death of 7 million Russians. It completely destroyed the economy, they also lost vital support of the middle classes and peasants. A big failure which resulted in the change of economic policies from war communism to the new economic policy was the Tambov rising and Kronstadt mutiny, this highlighted to Lenin how extreme their loss of support was.

In conclusion, I believe that all the policies were successful to a degree, state capitalism led to increased support due to the Land and Workers decrees. War Communism and the NEP led to a rise of industrial and agricultural production.

For these reasons I would have to disagree with the original statement that the new economic policy was the only successful economic policy introduced by the Bolsheviks as each policy was successful to a degree. I do believe that the new economic policy was successful however the others were also successful to a degree.

Examiner's comments

This is a very good response overall. There is a concerted effort made to deal with all three economic policies between 1917 and 1924.

The treatment of the NEP starts off well, giving an explanation of the aims of the policy which is crucial to fully address the issue of success later on. The response then moves on to outline some of the key features of the policy and referring to the Tambov Rising and Kronstadt Mutiny as reasons why it was introduced. This point could have perhaps been better integrated into the answer. There is then a dedicated section on how successful the policy was, focusing on both successes and failures where the question is being fully addressed.

The response then moves on to the policy of State Capitalism and gives some features of the policy but these could have been developed. At this point there is a tentative comment on the success of the policy but only in the context of why it had to be changed. This section of the answer could have been more substantial.

The response then finally turns to consider the policy of War Communism and, as with the NEP earlier in the answer, deals much more effectively with both the aims and features of this policy before moving on to attempt a concise yet accurate assessment of the success of the policy.

The concluding paragraph links directly back to the question with a summative comment on each of the three policies before presenting relevant overall concluding remarks. Overall, this response is a comprehensive assessment of the three economic policies and of the success of these policies that forms the proposition.

This response was assessed as a Level 4, 18 marks.

Q3(i) Explain the impact of Stalin's policy of collectivisation on the Soviet Union up to 1941. [8]

QUESTION NOT SELECTED BY EXAMINER

Q3(ii) "Stalin's use of the arts and the media was the most important means by which he maintained control of the Soviet Union up to 1941." To what extent do you agree with this statement? [22]

QUESTION NOT SELECTED BY EXAMINER

Answer **two** questions from your chosen option.

You **must answer parts (i) and (ii)** of your chosen questions.

Quality of written communication will be assessed in **all** questions.

Option 6: Italy's Quest for Great Power Status 1871–1943

Q1(i) Explain why Italy joined the Triple Alliance in 1882. [8]

QUESTION NOT SELECTED BY EXAMINER

Q1(ii) To what extent was Giolitti successful in his attempts to overcome the internal divisions in Italy up to 1914? [22]

QUESTION NOT SELECTED BY EXAMINER

Q2(i) Explain the economic problems facing Italy between 1919 and 1922. [8]

Student's response

There were various economic problems that Italy faced between 1919 and 1922. The war had cost them 148 billion lire and this was twice the level of spending of the period 1861 – 1913, more was spent in 3 years than in 52 years and this would have a devastating economic effect. Also the national debt rose from 16 billion lire in 1914 to 85 billion lire by 1918, this was as a result of taking loans from the UK and USA to sustain their war effort and this debt would cause economic pressure throughout the 1919 – 22 period. Unemployment also rose in Italy to 2 million by 1919 and this was partly due to de-mobilisation of the armed forces. 2.5 million soldiers were released from the army and many struggled to find employment in the aftermath of the First World War.

There was a shift from wartime production to peacetime production. This meant that many businesses became bankrupt and this led to mass unemployment also as these firms relied on the orders they were receiving during war time.

Biennio Rosso of 1919 – 20 caused inflation by pressures as the socialists pressed for higher wages and striked to ensure this. Strikes did not help economy as they resulted in loss of production. The Fedeterral agricultural Labour Union forced farmers to take on workers even if they were not able to afford them and this did not help their economic situation.

Inflation rose in this time, take the price index as a '100 baseline' for 1913, this rose to 413 by 1918 and to 591 by 1920. This meant prices have increased significantly, which means wages must also increase and this creates inflation. It must be noted self – employed people found it difficult at this time as they were 'non – unionised' and could not press anyone for better wages. Finally the economic problems of the south persist in this time, the problem of the 'North – South divide' is never really confronted.

Examiner's comments

This response covers most of the points outlined in the mark scheme. It is a very commendable response demonstrating a clear and accurate awareness of the economic problems facing Italy between 1919 and 1922. The response discusses the cost of World War One, Italy's national debt, loans from the UK and USA, rising unemployment, demobilisation of the armed forces, the change from wartime to peacetime production, *Biennio Rosso*, rising inflation and the North-South divide.

The detailed use of knowledge is impressive, with accurate figures included for the cost of war, debt, unemployment and inflation. The response is also well-written with each point well explained.

This response was assessed as a Level 4, 8 marks.

Q2(ii) “Mussolini’s reaction to the Matteotti crisis was the most important factor in his consolidation of power in Italy by 1926.” How far do you agree with this statement? [22]

Student’s response

Some could argue that Mussolini’s reaction to the Matteotti crisis was the most important factor in his consolidation of power in Italy by 1926. I agree that this was a pivotal moment in Mussolini’s consolidation of power but it was a combination of actions by Mussolini that led to his consolidation of power.

In June 1924, Giacomo Matteotti, a PSI parliamentary deputy who was an outspoken critic of both Fascism and Mussolini was murdered. The people implicated with the murder had links to Fascism and Mussolini. Mussolini remained prime minister of Italy despite this huge scandal. This highlights his political position of power and the ineffectiveness of his political opponents. Also this ‘crisis’ led to the Aventine Secession of June 1924 which allowed Mussolini to further consolidate his power. This was due to the political opponents of fascism such as the PSI, PPI and communists leaving the Italian parliament to set up a rival legislature in protest of Matteotti’s murder and Mussolini remaining in power. In effect all this did was strengthen Fascism as the official parliament of Italy was now completely dominated by Fascists and their supporters. This is a major stepping stone in the consolidation of Mussolini’s power as this effectively creates a totalitarian state where Mussolini would have utmost authority and opposition would not exist in parliament.

There are many other things that led to Mussolini’s consolidation of power that must also be noted. Emergency powers were granted to Mussolini in November 1922, these were to last for one year and would help him combat political, social and economic issues facing Italy. This was passed 368 votes to 26 and this would constitute his first step in consolidation of power.

In December 1922 Mussolini set up the Grand Fascist Council which he would use to play senior fascists against each other in order to show he is in control. In January 1923 Mussolini set up the MUSN which was a militia funded by the state in which members were recruited from Fascist squads. This would consolidate and institutionalise the links between Fascism and the State.

By February 1923 Mussolini had absorbed all nationalists into the fascist movement. This allowed him to have complete dominance over the political right very early on in his consolidation of power.

The Acerbo Law of July 1923 is crucial, this was passed with 303 votes to 40 votes and stated the largest party (providing they won at least 25% of the vote) would automatically gain two-thirds of the seats in parliament. Due to Mussolini and the Fascist party gaining the most support in the April 1924 election this meant the

fascist party gained 374 seats and their opponents gained 180 seats in parliament. Their success is due to the Acerbo Law, intimidation, weaknesses of liberal Italy and people fearing socialism. This majority of seats in parliament would allow Mussolini to create a dynamic, strong and purposeful government.

On the 5th of January 1925 Mussolini made a speech to parliament stating he aims to create dictatorship as he realises he has survived the 'Matteotti Crisis' and is more powerful than ever. In December 1925 Mussolini pushes forward 'Legge Facistissime' which are laws that would help him in his aim to create a dictatorship. Due to these laws all political opposition was banned, the press was censored, the civil service was purged and elected mayors were replaced by Fascist Podestas.

The final two steps in Mussolini's consolidation of power were him being granted the right to issue personal decrees in January 1926 (he issued 2,000 in this month alone) and the establishment of OVRA, the Secret Police Force in December 1926. These policemen would clamp down and use violence towards those who opposed Fascism. Mussolini's consolidation of power is complete.

In conclusion, I believe that Mussolini being able to survive the 'Matteotti Crisis' is very important as he would not have been able to take further action to consolidate his power in the aftermath if this was not the case. The Matteotti Crisis and Auentine secession of 1924 brought Italy closer to dictatorship and enabled the next steps in creating dictatorship to take place. It must be noted that all steps in Mussolini's consolidation of power were important and if he had not taken steps to consolidate his power before June 1924 he may not have survived the Matteotti crisis.

Examiner's comments

This response offers a comprehensive and sustained assessment of the proposition. The answer begins with a concise opening paragraph which gives us an overview of the candidate's argument that Mussolini's consolidation of power was due to a combination of factors. The second paragraph presents a well-developed analysis of the proposition and explains how the Matteotti crisis contributed to Mussolini's consolidation of power by 1926. The ineffectiveness of Mussolini's political opponents is discussed which leads to analysis of the impact of the Aventine Secession.

In the third paragraph the response begins to examine the importance of other factors in Mussolini's consolidation of power. The granting of Emergency Powers to Mussolini in 1922 is discussed although there is a numerical error. In paragraph four the response analyses the importance of the creation of the Fascist Grand Council and the Fascist Militia, with the absorption of all nationalists into the fascist movement being discussed in the following paragraph.

Paragraph six outlines the significance of the Acerbo Law with Mussolini's creation of a dynamic and strong government accurately discussed. In paragraph seven the response analyses both Mussolini's speech of January 1925 and the *Legge Fascistissime* and their significance in his consolidation of power by 1926. The eighth paragraph describes Mussolini gaining the right to issue personal decrees in January 1926 and the establishment of the OVRA in December 1926 as the final two steps in Mussolini's consolidation of power. The final paragraph presents a strong conclusion which discusses the importance of the Matteotti Crisis in Mussolini's consolidation of power while also demonstrating skill in analysing and making substantial judgements when discussing the importance of the steps taken by Mussolini prior to June 1924.

Overall, this response is a comprehensive assessment of the proposition and other relevant factors. Although there are a few numerical errors these do not detract from the response with knowledge mostly being deployed in an accurate and selective manner to support very well developed and sustained analytical judgements.

This response was assessed as a Level 4, 22 marks.

Q3(i) Explain the aims of Mussolini's foreign policy from 1922 to 1929. [8]

Student's response

There were many aims for Mussolini's foreign policy from 1922 to 1929.

Mussolini wished Italy could have great power status like its past allies Britain and France. It tried to gain this through being the 'referee at the Locarno Pact' 1925 where Belgium, Germany and France consolidated and ensured their 'western borders'.

Mussolini wished to gain imperial glory for Italy and desired to create a large empire that would mimic the greatness of Ancient Rome, he wished to avenge the 1896 battle of Adowa (where Italy was humiliated in a crushing defeat) by taking over the whole of Abyssinia. He wished to complete his eastern African Empire of Eritrea and Italian Somaliland. He also wished to further strengthen his control over Libya which was won in 1911.

Mussolini desired greater control over the Mediterranean Sea, which was described as 'Mare Nostrum' which translates to 'our sea'. The Italians resented the control of Gibraltar and the Suez Canal in this sea by the British and wanted to challenge this control. Mussolini hoped to gain naval bases in this sea.

Mussolini also wished to increase his influence over the Balkans. Albania was a weak and backward country and Mussolini made it a 'protectorate' of Italy in 1926 under the puppet ruler Zog the First. Mussolini also wanted influence over Yugoslavia as he hoped he could sponsor terrorists in 1927-29 to put pressure on the government so it may fall apart. This was wanted as Mussolini aimed to avenge the 1919 Peace Settlement as Italy received a 'mutilated victory'. He would avenge this by gaining lands from Yugoslavia that they were not granted such as Dalmatia.

The final aim of Mussolini's foreign policy from 1922 to 1929 was to spread fascism and create more support for fascism in his home country, Italy. He hoped settlers in Africa from Italy could spread fascist ideas and he could support, protect and install fascist regimes. He hoped to make Italians into bellicose people by having many successes in his foreign policy that would increase support.

Examiner's comments

This response explains most of the main points in the mark scheme within the context of the 1920s. The response begins by discussing Mussolini's desire for Italy to attain great power status and presents his role at the Locarno Pact in 1925 as explanatory evidence. It goes on to explain Mussolini's desire for Italy to create an overseas empire, to avenge the defeat at the Battle of Adowa, to gain greater control over the Mediterranean Sea and the Balkans and presents the establishment of a protectorate over Albania in 1926 as further evidence. The response concludes by explaining the desire to avenge the 'Mutilated Victory' in the Treaty of Versailles in 1919 and the desire to spread fascism.

This response demonstrates a clear and accurate awareness of the aims of Mussolini's foreign policy from 1922 to 1929 and is commendable for addressing and explaining the key aims within the context of the 1920s.

This response was assessed as a Level 4, 8 marks.

Q3(ii) “The weaknesses of the Italian military were the main reason for the Italian defeat in the Second World War.” To what extent do you agree with this statement? [22]

Student's response

Italy were defeated in WW2 for a variety of reasons. Therefore it can be said their defeat was multi-causal. Whilst the weakness of the Italian military was deemed as an important factor, there are other important factors to consider. Such as Mussolini's own mishaps regarding war, their relationship with Germany, Social Political and Economic problems and the poor tactics used by the army.

It is undoubtable that the Italian Military was weak throughout the duration of WW2 and therefore, in my opinion it can be deemed as one of the main reasons for the Italian defeat and collapse of the fascist regime. The Italian military did not have effective training meaning they were ill-prepared for the war in comparison to their allies. The Italian military were also weak due to their lack of adequate and modern resources. They only had 1500 tanks and were using rifles from 1891. In addition, they were not well prepared in that in 1939, they only had 5 months of fuel supply which was not efficient enough for the war. The Italian army also did not have any air-force carriers or modern guns which were not compatible to fight alongside German army against the allies. One-third of their equipment was lost in a transit across the Mediterranean and as a result, they further lacked resources. The army lacked tanks, the navy lacked air-force carriers and battleships lacked drivers. The Italian Army lacked resources as a result of being “bled white” by the Abyssinian and intervention in the Spanish Civil War.

*In addition to the lack of resources the military weakness can further be argued as the main reason for the failure in WW2 as they lacked clear tactics. The military weakness was aided by the fact that they failed to attack Malta and Gibraltar which were key naval bases to success as Malta was a British naval base and Gibraltar was their entrance into the Mediterranean to gain dominance. Poor tactics also included the decision to send 300 airforce to fight a British war which could have been used much more effectively in the Mediterranean Sea. In addition, their lack of air force defenders led to the ship *Littonio* being sunk and also, three defence ships were sunk by the British base at Cape of Matapan. Italy also failed to take German tanks which made their troops tired in the long trek across Egypt. The Italian army also lacked espionage and so were not aware of the military might or aims of the allies making them even less prepared, leading to the failure in World War two. Italian army also felt that bombing Greece was enough in 1940, however, again, their weakness in tactics, lack of resources and training led this to be insufficient. For these reasons, the military was portrayed as weak and unprepared and as they were the one's fighting the war, it led to a fatal flaw in their sufficiency of World War two and as a result can be argued as the main reason in Italy's failure of World War two.*

However, other reasons can also be taken into consideration, such as Mussolini himself, Germany's influence and social economic and political issues.

Mussolini's health was failing as he got a stomach ulcer in February 1940. Mussolini has no expertise and used his own initiative over actual military expertise. His propaganda did not reflect what was occurring at war, giving people false hope. Mussolini did not expect war when he signed the pact of Steele on May 1939 and so was not prepared for a war. Bondanno stated Mussolini was "not respected or admired by anyone" and therefore his lack of respect led to military weakness as they would not obey his orders. In addition economically state subsidies back in Italy were being used for construction work and therefore led to a lack of armament production, leading to a further lack of resources. There was no minister of war or Government intervention in war production meaning money could be spent wherever with no focus on war. Mussolini also headed himself Minister of war, head of the navy, army and airforce with no experience. He was running a war he had no idea on.

German influence can also be examined as Germany led Italy into a war in which they lost tanks. In addition, during the war years Germany took 350 000 labour workers off Italy and as a result they had less workers to provide ammunition. Italy became known to have corrupt leadership politically and socially, 1000 people were participating in Northern riots so countries did not want to be ruled by them. Italy's success in World War two became dependent on Germany and if Germany collapsed Italy would go down with them.

In conclusion, although failure of World War two was multi-casual, the Italian Military's weakness can be deemed as the main reason in my opinion for their defeat. Italy was not prepared for war physically, with no training and no armed forces resources and so it can be concluded, that against the major allies such as Britain and France it was inevitable their military weakness would lead to their collapse following the war as they could not compete with the other allies.

Examiner's comments

This response offers a well informed and sustained assessment of the proposition. There is a good opening paragraph which sets the scene for the response and identifies a multi-causal argument for the Italian defeat in the Second World War.

The second paragraph begins to address the weaknesses of the Italian military, identifying it as one of the main reasons for the Italian defeat. Ineffective training of the Italian military in comparison to the Allies and a lack of adequate and modern resources are given as reasons for its weakness. Further detail is provided on the limitations of the Italian military with tanks, rifles, fuel shortages and a lack of aircraft carriers discussed with the cost of both the Abyssinian campaign and the involvement in the Spanish Civil War offered as an explanation for the limitations.

Paragraph three focuses on the weakness the tactics of the Italian military. The response refers to tactical errors involving Malta and Gibraltar then goes on to discuss the decision to send aircraft to fight in the Battle of Britain and the weak Italian air defenses in the Mediterranean. A lack of espionage and weaknesses in the Italian tactics when they attacked Greece are offered as further evidence of Italian tactical weaknesses.

The fourth paragraph introduces other factors for the Italian defeat in the Second World War such as Mussolini, German influence, and social, economic and political issues. Paragraph five begins to develop the significance of these factors in greater depth, discussing Mussolini's failing health, his lack of military expertise, his reliance on propaganda and his poor preparations for the war. The response then outlines economic factors leading to limited arms production and a lack of resources and concludes by discussing Mussolini's role as Commander-in-Chief and his lack of expertise in running the Italian war effort.

Paragraph six briefly discusses the impact of German influence on Italy and also social and political reasons for the Italian defeat in the Second World War, although this would need to be addressed in greater depth. The final paragraph summarises the candidate's line of reasoning with military weaknesses identified as the major factor for the Italian defeat in the Second World War. Overall, this response is a comprehensive assessment of the proposition and other relevant factors. Knowledge was deployed accurately to support well developed and sustained analytical judgements.

This response was assessed as a Level 4, 20 marks.



INVESTORS
IN PEOPLE

