



Rewarding Learning
ADVANCED SUBSIDIARY (AS)
General Certificate of Education
2016

History

Assessment Unit AS 1



AH111

[AH111]

FRIDAY 10 JUNE, MORNING

TIME

1 hour 30 minutes.

INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

Write your Centre Number and Candidate Number on the Answer Booklet provided.
Choose **one** option.
Answer question **1(a)** or **1(b)** and question **2** from your **chosen option**.
Indicate clearly on your Answer Booklet which option you have chosen.

INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES

The total mark for this paper is 60.
Quality of written communication will be assessed in question **1** and question **2(b)**.
This assessment unit is an historical enquiry and candidates are advised to draw on all the relevant material they have studied when answering question **2(b)**.

Option 1: England 1520–1570

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

1 Either

(a) Explain the role played by Emperor Charles V in the Royal Divorce. [12]

Or

(b) Explain the measures taken by the Duke of Somerset to solve the economic and social problems England faced between 1547 and 1550. [12]

2 Read the sources and answer the questions which follow.

Wyatt's Rebellion of 1554

Source 1

Extract from a letter from Simon Renard, the Spanish Ambassador in London, to Philip of Spain, December 1553. Renard is referring to the imminent marriage of Philip to Mary Tudor.

Source 2

Extract from a letter from Julius Terentianus to John ab Ulmis, November 1553. Terentianus was a Protestant reformer who commented on events in England, while ab Ulmis shared his Protestant beliefs.

Source 3

Extract from Ian Dawson, *The Tudor Century 1485–1603*, published in 1993.

Nationalism was not the only motive for Wyatt's Rebellion. Religion was certainly the dominant motive for some rebels, although it suited both Wyatt and the Queen to deny this. Wyatt feared that the proclamation of an anti-Catholic rising would cause opposition amongst those who might otherwise be neutral. The Queen, determined to restore Catholicism, could not believe that there was such opposition to her religion. Other rebels were involved because of purely local grievances. Some gentry had lost office and many yeomen and lower ranks protested about economic grievances. The outburst of nationalism by the rebels did not bode well for the Queen's marriage but support for them had been very limited, sufficiently limited to suggest that people would accept the Queen's religion.

© *The Tudor Century* by Ian Dawson, Nelson Thornes Ltd (1993) ISBN: 978-0174350637

- (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is it as evidence for an historian studying the reasons for Wyatt's Rebellion of 1554? [13]
- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess the extent to which hostility towards the Spanish marriage was responsible for the outbreak of Wyatt's Rebellion of 1554. [35]

Option 2: England 1603–1649

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

1 Either

(a) Explain the aims of James I's religious policies in the period 1603–1625. [12]

Or

(b) Explain the reasons for the changes in the English economy in the period 1603–1649. [12]

2 Read the sources and answer the questions which follow.

Opposition to the Personal Rule of Charles I, 1629–1640

Source 1

Extract from a speech made by John Pym in the House of Commons, 17 April 1640. This was during the Short Parliament.

Another grievance is that the great courts of justice allow the people to be oppressed. As an example, I might refer to the Court of Star Chamber, which has promoted and tolerated the sale of monopolies, which should have been a matter for parliament. Star Chamber has become a means of raising revenue and has prosecuted sheriffs who failed to collect Ship Money, a tax that goes against all precedents and laws. This is not the purpose for which Star Chamber should be used. The Privy Councillors, who sit as judges in Star Chamber, should be above criticism. But now if these same privy councillors should sink so far as to tolerate and plot projects and monopolies, what shall we think of this? This is a great grievance.

© Parliamentary Copyright

Contains Parliamentary information licensed under the Open Parliament Licence v3.0.

Source 2

Extract from *A True Relation of the State of Business Concerning Soap*, an anonymous pamphlet written in 1641. In 1632, Charles I sold a monopoly on soap production to a group of gentlemen who claimed to have discovered a superior method of producing soap.

Many citizens of London were put out of the soap trade, and therefore lost their livelihood, by knights and gentlemen who had no experience of the trade. These knights and gentlemen, who had purchased a monopoly, prosecuted the soap-makers of London in the Court of Star Chamber. This trial and the sentences they received were like nothing ever seen before. The soap-makers were fined great sums, imprisoned for twenty months, had their equipment broken and were almost ruined financially.

© *Charles I* by C.W. Daniels and J. Morrill, Cambridge University Press (1988) ISBN: 9780521317283

Source 3

Extract from Ann Hughes, *The Causes of the English Civil War*, published in 1991.

The relative calm of the 1630s was deceptive. Without parliaments there was no obvious arena where a principled challenge to the King's policies could be mounted. Very few openly challenged the legality of Ship Money. Until the burdens of the Bishops' Wars were added, most people paid Ship Money with little open complaint, but alarm at the introduction of annual Ship Money payments is apparent in more private sources. Various social groups expressed anxiety. Prerogative taxation sharply increased the numbers liable to be taxed, while religious and cultural divisions involved large sections of society. Evidence is lacking for those outside the political elite, but it is probably significant that so many of the MPs in 1640 were widely known for their opposition to the King's religious and political policies.

© *The Causes of the English Civil War* by Ann Hughes, St Martin's Press (1991) ISBN-031205226X

- (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is it as evidence for an historian studying attitudes towards Charles I's use of the royal power to raise revenue during the period 1629–1640? [13]
- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess the extent to which the use of controversial taxes and fines was responsible for the opposition to the Personal Rule of Charles I in the period 1629–1640. [35]

Option 3: England 1815–1868

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

1 Either

(a) Explain the circumstances in which the Parliamentary Reform Act was passed in 1832. [12]

Or

(b) Explain the reasons for the divisions in the Tory Party in the period 1846–1865. [12]

2 Read the sources and answer the questions which follow.**Unrest in England, 1815–1820****Source 1**

Extract from an account by John Tyas of the “Peterloo Massacre”. Tyas, who was a correspondent for *The Times*, attended the meeting at St Peter’s Fields in Manchester on 16 August 1819. His account was published as an editorial in *The Times* on 19 August.

It appears that, only twenty minutes after the meeting began, the cavalry charged the assembled crowd. They arrested the principal speaker, Henry Hunt, and several of those around him. They attacked the demonstrators who, after throwing some stones at the cavalry, fled in confusion. A large proportion of the crowd consisted of women. About ten people were killed and many others taken to hospital; in fact, the total number of seriously injured is supposed to have been around 100. Was this meeting in Manchester an unlawful assembly? Was the notice of it unlawful? I believe not. Was the subject proposed for discussion unlawful? Definitely not. Before the cavalry rode into the crowd, did anything happen at this meeting which was unlawful or represented a breach of the peace? Nothing has come to my notice to suggest that this was the case.

© *The Peterloo Massacre, 16 August 1819* by Marjie Bloy, PhD. Published by The Victorian Web

Source 2

Extract from a speech by George Tierney in the House of Commons, 30 November 1819. As the leader of the Whigs, Tierney is responding to the Six Bills, soon to become the Six Acts, introduced by the Tory Government in the aftermath of the Peterloo massacre.

Is repression the Government's only response to the people's grievances? Will these new bills not simply inflame the situation rather than restore calm? Property will only be exposed to greater danger if the repression of the people continues, and no attempt is made to promote social harmony. Not only is the right to meet to be taken away, but the freedom of the press is to be restricted. This is an attack on the principles of the British constitution. The proposed new laws are unjustified.

© Parliamentary Copyright

Contains Parliamentary information licensed under the Open Parliament Licence v3.0.

Source 3

Extract from Joseph W. Hunt, *Reaction and Reform 1815–1841*, published in 1972.

The period 1817–1819 witnessed high prices, harsh conditions for the workers and considerable unemployment. Of these, it was probably unemployment which was the most important cause of political agitation. The Tory Government feared an imminent revolt and believed that a deliberate conspiracy was being prepared. But very few men were deliberately trying to engineer a revolution, certainly not those with the largest following, like Cobbett, Cartwright and Hunt. They brought the government into disrepute but were only trying to change its policies, not undermine the constitution. In general, they had neither the will nor the ability to make a revolution, and therefore one must conclude that there was some degree of panic in the reaction of the ruling classes to the disorders of this period.

© *Reaction and Reform 1815-1841, 1st Edition, Joseph W. Hunt (1972) ISBN-9780003272130*

- (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is it as evidence for an historian studying the unrest in England in the period 1815–1820? [13]
- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess the extent to which the unrest in England in the period 1815–1820 was due to the actions of the Tory Government. [35]

Option 4: Unification of Italy and Germany 1815–1871

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

1 Either

- (a) Explain the reasons for the growth of nationalist and liberal ideas in the Italian states in the period 1815–1848. [12]

Or

- (b) Explain the reasons for the difficult relationship between Cavour and Garibaldi. [12]

2 Read the sources and answer the questions which follow.

The Outcome of the Austro-Prussian War, 1866

Source 1

Minutes of a meeting of the Austrian Cabinet, 21 February 1866. The meeting was chaired by the Austrian Emperor, Francis Joseph.

The Emperor observed that Prussia's threatening attitude in the Schleswig-Holstein question raised the issue of whether Austria should prepare for war. He warned that the Prussian army was at present much more ready for war than Austria's military forces. He also pointed out that Prussia's railway network would enable its troops to be transported more quickly to the battlefield. By contrast, the Austrian army had been reduced to the lowest possible acceptable level of a peace time army and it would take a very long time to restore it to its full capacity.

Both the Finance Minister and the Minister of Trade urged a peaceful solution to the conflict between Austria and Prussia because war would have disastrous effects on Austria's finances and economy. The meeting concluded that Austria should, for the time being, not make preparations for war.

© *The Foundation of the German Empire* by Helmut Böhme.
Published by Oxford University Press (1971) ISBN: 9780198730132

Source 2

Extract from a letter from Henry Howard, British Ambassador to Bavaria, to Lord Stanley, British Foreign Secretary, 3 December 1866.

Prussia's success in the Austro-Prussian War was partly due to its efficient military organisation. But Austria was also at least partly responsible for its own misfortunes. It made numerous political mistakes and none was greater than its attempt to uphold its position in both Italy and Germany with inadequate resources.

© *German History in Documents and Images: The Public Mood in Bavaria and Other States through British Eyes*. Published by The German Historical Institute.

Source 3

Extract from Alan Farmer and Andrina Stiles, *The Unification of Germany 1815–1919*, published in 2007.

Prussia's victory in the Austro-Prussian War was not a foregone conclusion. At the beginning of the war, Austria's position was far from hopeless. It had the support of most of the other German states and enjoyed the advantage of a central geographical position. But its military leaders missed several opportunities to inflict casualties on the Prussian armies, while its political leaders lacked diplomatic skill. Austria was forced to fight on two fronts, in the north against Prussia and in the south against Italy, because the Italians honoured their secret treaty to support Prussia. At the Battle of Sadowa (Königgrätz) on 3 July 1866, the major battle of the war, the Prussians used their new breech-loading needle gun. Its rate of fire was five times greater than anything the Austrians possessed and it proved decisive.

© *The Unification of Germany 1815-1919, 3rd Edition* by Alan Farmer and Andrina Stiles, Hodder Education (2007) ISBN: 9780340929292

- (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is it as evidence for an historian studying the outcome of the Austro-Prussian War of 1866? [13]
- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess the extent to which Austria's military weaknesses were responsible for its defeat in the Austro-Prussian War of 1866. [35]

Option 5: Germany 1918–1945

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

1 Either

(a) Explain why the Treaty of Versailles of 1919 was so unpopular in Germany. [12]

Or

(b) Explain the successes of Schacht and Göring's economic policies in Germany in the period 1933–1939. [12]

2 Read the sources and answer the questions which follow.

The Creation of the Nazi Dictatorship, 1933–1934

Source 1

Extract from a speech by Otto Wels, Chairman of the Social Democratic Party (SPD), to the Reichstag, 23 March 1933. Wels is responding to Hitler's speech supporting the passing of the Enabling Law.

In view of the persecution the SPD has suffered recently, no one should be surprised that we are going to oppose the Enabling Law. The general election of 5 March 1933 has resulted in a majority for the Nazi and nationalist parties and given them the opportunity to govern according to the constitution. But this opportunity brings with it an obligation to protect democratic ideals and equal rights for others. It is not possible to establish a stable society through terror. Never in the history of the Reichstag has the power of the democratically elected representatives of the people been eliminated to the extent which is now the case by means of this new Enabling Law. This type of dictatorial government is destined to have even more dangerous consequences. Defeated opponents should not be intimidated as if they were outlaws. Freedom and life can be taken from us, but not honour. We send greetings to the persecuted and the oppressed. No Enabling Law gives you the right to eradicate ideas such as freedom and justice, which are indestructible.

© *Behind Valkyrie: German Resistance to Hitler, Documents by Peter Hoffman.*
Published by McGill-Queen's University Press (2011) ISBN: 9780773537705

Source 2

Extract from the diary of Erich Ebermayer, 25 March 1933. He was a 33-year-old German author of plays and novels.

Yesterday was the last important day for the Reichstag for a long time to come. For all intents and purposes, it no longer exists. The Reichstag passed the Enabling Law by 444 votes to 94. By this new law, the present government has seized absolute power. Hitler's government now no longer needs the Reichstag to pass any kind of law.

© *The Nazi Germany Sourcebook: An Anthology of Texts* by Roderick Stackelberg and Sally A. Winkle. Published by Routledge (2002) ISBN:9780415222143

Source 3

Extract from Frank McDonough, *Hitler and Nazi Germany*, published in 1999.

The device Hitler used to create a one-party dictatorship was the Enabling Law. In March 1933, the members of the Reichstag, except those in the Communist Party, who were not allowed to take their seats, were asked to transfer all legislative power to Hitler. The venue for the death of German democracy was the Kroll Opera House in Berlin. Only the Social Democrats had the courage to vote against the Enabling Act which freed Hitler from any restraint on his power from the Reichstag, the President and the voters. It was a significant move on the road towards dictatorship. The Nazis established a "Legal Revolution" during 1933. On 30 June 1934, the Night of the Long Knives occurred.

© *Hitler and Nazi Germany* by Frank McDonough. Cambridge University Press (1999) ISBN: 9780521595025

- (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is it as evidence for an historian studying the passing of the Enabling Law in March 1933? [13]
- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess whether the passing of the Enabling Law was the most important factor in the creation of the Nazi dictatorship between 30 January 1933 and 2 August 1934. [35]

THIS IS THE END OF THE QUESTION PAPER

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.