



**ADVANCED SUBSIDIARY (AS)
General Certificate of Education
2018**

History

Assessment Unit AS 1

Historical Investigations and Interpretations

[SHY11]

WEDNESDAY 16 MAY, AFTERNOON

**MARK
SCHEME**

General Marking Instructions

Introduction

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

Assessment objectives

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

Candidates should be able to:

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

Quality of candidates' responses

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

Flexibility in marking

Mark schemes are not intended to be totally prescriptive. No mark scheme can cover all the responses which candidates may produce. In the event of unanticipated answers, examiners are expected to use their professional judgement to assess the validity of answers. If an answer is particularly problematic, then examiners should seek the guidance of the Supervising Examiner.

Positive marking

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

Awarding zero marks

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

Type of mark scheme

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

Levels of response

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

The following guidance is provided to assist examiners.

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

Quality of written communication

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

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

Level 1: Quality of written communication is basic.

Level 2: Quality of written communication is satisfactory.

Level 3: Quality of written communication is good.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Option 1: England 1509–1558

AVAILABLE
MARKS

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

- 1 (a) Analyse the role played by Thomas Cranmer in achieving the Royal Divorce.

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

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

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation and analysis. Responses at this level will demonstrate a superficial understanding of Cranmer's role in the Royal Divorce. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding with some degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation and analysis. Responses will be more detailed and provide some coherent information about the role of Cranmer in achieving the Royal Divorce. They may mention his position as Archbishop of Canterbury and how he was determined to achieve the divorce to gain approval from King Henry VIII. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([5]–[7])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will begin to analyse a range of factors. They should analyse the steps taken by Cranmer, his relationship with the King and his position at the royal court. Responses should also look at his attempts to achieve an annulment and the legal proceedings that achieved the Royal Divorce. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([8]–[10])

Answers at this level consistently demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and concisely. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound explanation and analysis. They will fully analyse the role played by Cranmer in achieving the Royal Divorce. Cranmer had written a treatise in 1530 in favour of a Royal Divorce and had played a role in European affairs before 1533 as a former ambassador to Charles V. Candidates may also demonstrate how the King made Cranmer Archbishop of Canterbury in March 1533 to help him deliver a Royal Divorce. By May 1533 Cranmer had achieved the Royal Divorce through the legal proceedings of the Dunstable court which led to Anne Boleyn becoming the new Queen. Cranmer had used his position as Archbishop of Canterbury to deliver the Royal Divorce through his judgements which annulled Henry VIII's marriage to Catherine of Aragon. This upheld royal supremacy, which led to the break with Rome. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high degree of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately. [10]

10

- (b) Analyse the causes of the Many Headed Monster Rebellions of 1549.

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

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

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation and analysis. Responses at this level will demonstrate a superficial understanding of the causes of the Many Headed Monster Rebellions of 1549. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding with some degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation and analysis. Responses will be more detailed and provide some coherent information about the causes of the Many Headed Monster Rebellions of 1549, such as the religious causes. They may mention that the Western Rebellion is also known as the Prayer Book Rebellion. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant

AVAILABLE
MARKS

material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([5]–[7])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will begin to analyse a range of causes, for example the unpopularity of Somerset's religious changes. The rebels in Cornwall were unhappy with these religious changes under Somerset and wanted a return to the old religion and its practices. Responses should also refer to how economic and social discontent helped to bring about rebellions in 1549, such as Kett's Rebellion. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([8]–[10])

Answers at this level consistently demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and concisely. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound explanation and analysis. They will fully analyse the religious, political, economic and social causes of these rebellions of 1549. The rebels in Cornwall had a range of grievances in addition to their religious reasons. They feared further attacks on Church property and the traditions of Cornwall, such as its language. The Western Rebellion was motivated by government interference and the unpopular policies of Somerset, as well as some economic factors. Kett's Rebellion appeared to have developed from an anti-enclosure riot and protest. Answers should mention the role of economic and social discontent in both rebellions in 1549, observing perhaps that both areas involved in these rebellions faced growing economic hardship, with rising inflation and unemployment levels. Rebels in both areas were unhappy about rising levels of taxation and fears of enclosure. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high degree of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[10]

10

AVAILABLE
MARKS

- 2 (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is Source 1 as evidence for an historian studying the economic effects of the dissolution of the monasteries in England? You must use contextual knowledge in your answer.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

This question targets AO2: the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context. Candidates must use contextual knowledge in their answer.

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

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

Answers may, typically, paraphrase or quote at length from the source, but fail to comment explicitly on relevant points in the light of the question. They may observe that Sir Richard Rich was an MP who was personally benefiting from the dissolution of the monasteries.

Level 2 ([6]–[10])

Answers may, typically, confine themselves to the content of the source and assess its usefulness with reference only to the information it provides. For example, this is a government document confirming a grant of mainly former monastic lands and properties to just one MP, Sir Richard Rich. This source details some of the land and properties he was to be granted or given control over in 1539, mainly in London and Essex.

Level 3 ([11]–[15])

Answers will utilise the source more comprehensively. They will not only discuss the content of the source well but also highlight its strengths by focusing on its mode, author, date, motive, audience and tone. The mode represents a key strength of the source as it is an official government document confirming the disposal of some former monastic lands and properties to just one individual MP in 1539. The source details how these former monastic lands and properties were to be granted to Sir Richard Rich MP as his own property or by a lease from the Crown. Although the author is an unknown government official, it is valuable as it is from that period. The motive of the source is to announce this transfer of land to the local people, who are the intended audience. Answers could also mention that, as Chancellor of the Court of Augmentations, Rich appears to be using his position for his own personal gain and benefit. The source is useful as it is written in 1539, just after the monasteries had been dissolved. The tone is formal as it is an official document confirming the legal transfer of ownership of former monastic lands and properties.

Level 4 ([16]–[20])

Answers will not only discuss the merits of the source, but also its limitations. Any plausible limitations should be rewarded. Answers will fully exploit the source and show full appreciation that its value does not just lie in its content but comment on its date, author, mode, motive, audience and tone. To obtain a mark at Level 4, candidates must include relevant contextual knowledge in their answer. This source is written just after the completion of the dissolution of the monasteries, when former monastic land and properties are being disposed of by the Crown. From their contextual knowledge candidates may refer to how many MPs and leading nobles benefited from

similar grants of former monastic lands after the dissolution. They could also mention that Sir Richard Rich was a close political friend of Cromwell, who managed the dissolution of the monasteries for King Henry VIII until 1540. Answers could also refer to the role of the Court of Augmentations, a government department created in 1536 to administer the new revenues to the Crown from the dissolution of the monasteries. The source is limited as it is only one document dealing with the disposal of land and properties to just one individual. It focuses exclusively on the benefits for some very well connected individuals, such as Sir Richard Rich MP, of the dissolution of the monasteries. However, it fails to mention the economic discontent created by the dissolution of the monasteries in England after 1536 and the role of Cromwell in this process.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[20]

20

- (b) Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B.** Historians have different views about particular issues. Using both interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of the economic and social effects of the dissolution of the monasteries in England do you find more convincing?

This question targets AO3: the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

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

Level 1 ([1]–[7])

Answers at this level will display a limited understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will reveal a limited analysis of the interpretations of the economic and social effects of the dissolution of the monasteries. Answers at this level will display little or no understanding of the historical context. Responses may discuss only one of the interpretations. Candidates will not identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing or will reach an unsubstantiated judgement.

Level 2 ([8]–[14])

Answers at this level will display a satisfactory understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will begin to analyse the two different interpretations of the economic and social effects of the dissolution of the monasteries. Answers at this level may display some understanding of the historical context. Candidates will reveal a satisfactory understanding of the views of Rogerson et al in Interpretation A and Elton in Interpretation B. Interpretation A argues that the dissolution was not good economically, as the poor suffered economic hardship. It also mentions some of the social effects of the dissolution of the monasteries. Interpretation B argues that the dissolution of the monasteries had limited economic impact. It also suggests that the social effects of dissolution were "radical and far-reaching". Candidates may identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide some evidence in support of their judgement.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Level 3 ([15]–[22])

Answers at this level will reveal a good understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will present a good analysis of the different interpretations of the economic and social effects of the dissolution of the monasteries. Answers at this level will display a good understanding of the historical context. In Interpretation A, Rogerson et al make a number of points to support their view that the economic effects were negative for the poor but beneficial for the Crown. Rogerson et al suggest that the social effects of dissolution, with the transfer of land to the gentry, cannot be regarded as a social revolution. However, in Interpretation B Elton argues that dissolution created a new social group of “landowning gentry.” Interpretation B also refers to new groups in Tudor society who benefited the most from the effects of dissolution, such as the gentry. This interpretation also suggests that dissolution did not exacerbate the problems of poverty and enclosure. Candidates will identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide good evidence in support of their judgement.

Level 4 ([23]–[30])

Answers at this level will reveal a very good understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will present a very good analysis of the different interpretations of the economic and social effects of the dissolution of the monasteries. Answers at this level will display a very good understanding of the historical context. In Interpretation A, Rogerson et al suggest that the Crown has gained some £800,000 from the sale of former monastic lands by 1547, resulting in less severe levels of taxation on Henry VIII’s subjects. Rogerson et al also maintain that monks and nuns experienced more economic hardship as a result of the dissolution in England. These were not the only groups in Tudor society to experience the effects of the dissolution of the monasteries. In Interpretation B, Elton argues that the social effects of the dissolution of the monasteries have been exaggerated, which explains the limited effects of dissolution on the problem of poverty. However, Elton also describes some of the groups who benefited economically from dissolution, such as the gentry. Many other groups in Tudor society not mentioned by Elton also gained from the economic effects of dissolution such as the nobility and the new landed classes. In this interpretation it also suggests that in the long term the Crown benefited financially from the economic effects of the dissolution. The Crown was able to find people willing to purchase or lease the former monastic lands and properties in this period. Interpretation A highlights the social effects of dissolution but is lacking in detail on the economic effects of the dissolution of the monasteries. Interpretation B has good information on the economic effects but lacks information on the social effects of the dissolution of the monasteries. Candidates will identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide very good evidence in support of their judgement.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[30]

Option 1

AVAILABLE
MARKS

30

60

Option 2: England 1603–1649

AVAILABLE
MARKS

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

- 1 (a) Analyse the impact of royal favourites in the reign of James I.

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

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

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation and analysis. Responses at this level will demonstrate a superficial understanding of the impact of royal favourites in the reign of James I. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding with some degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation and analysis. Responses will be more detailed and provide some coherent information about the impact of royal favourites in the reign of James I. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([5]–[7])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will begin to analyse a range of ways in which James I's favourites influenced life at court or political life. They may focus largely on one of James I's key favourites – the Earl of Somerset or the Duke of Buckingham. Candidates may argue that favourites had a significant impact on the distribution of royal patronage. They might also point out examples of policy decisions that were affected by Somerset or Buckingham. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([8]–[10])

Answers at this level consistently demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and concisely. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound explanation and

analysis of the impact of royal favourites in the reign of James I. Clear and explicit examples of their impact will be given. For example, candidates may discuss the damage to James I's reputation as a result of the Overbury affair. They may also explain the Duke of Buckingham's influence over the distribution of gifts and offices under James I or his involvement in royal foreign policy in the period 1623–1625. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high degree of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately. [10]

- (b) Analyse the beliefs of the radical political groups which emerged between 1646 and 1649.

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

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

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation and analysis. Responses at this level will demonstrate a superficial understanding of the beliefs of the radical political groups that emerged between 1646 and 1649. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding with some degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation and analysis. Responses will be more detailed and provide some coherent information about the beliefs of the radical political groups that emerged between 1646 and 1649. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([5]–[7])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will begin to analyse a range of groups, discussing the beliefs of groups such

AVAILABLE
MARKS

10

as the Levellers, Ranters, Diggers and Fifth Monarchists. There may be explanation of the religious, political, social or economic beliefs of these groups. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([8]–[10])

Answers at this level consistently demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and concisely. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound explanation and analysis. For example, the radical, democratic beliefs of the Levellers may be explained. The Diggers were in some respects similar to the Levellers but believed in the abolition of private property and radical equality. The Ranters and Fifth Monarchists are notable more for their religious and social beliefs. The latter believed in the imminent return of Jesus Christ, while the Ranters rejected traditional Christian morality and advocated greater personal liberty. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high degree of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[10]

10

AVAILABLE
MARKS

- 2 (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is Source 1 as evidence for an historian studying attitudes towards the religious policies introduced during the Personal Rule of Charles I? You must use contextual knowledge in your answer.

This question targets AO2: the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context. Candidates must use contextual knowledge in their answer.

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

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

Answers may, typically, paraphrase or quote at length from the source but fail to comment explicitly on relevant points in the light of the question. They may observe that the source adopts a critical stance towards Charles I's religious reforms.

Level 2 ([6]–[10])

Answers may, typically, confine themselves to the content of the source and assess its usefulness with reference only to the information it provides. Bastwick criticises Charles I's bishops for their pride. He also believes that there are too many ceremonies in the Church of England, which may be a reference to the enforcement of uniformity and the increased emphasis which Laud placed on liturgy and sacraments. Bastwick portrays Laud as cruel and refers to his punishment of opponents.

Level 3 ([11]–[15])

Answers will utilise the source more comprehensively. They will not only discuss the content of the source well but also highlight its strengths by focusing on its mode, author, date, motive, audience and tone. The authorship represents a key strength of the source as Bastwick is able to provide us with a direct insight into Puritan attitudes towards Charles I. The date is also a key strength: by 1637, Laud's reforms had been implemented and a Puritan observer would be able to reflect on the impact of those reforms, without any danger of memory loss or hindsight. The tone of the source is scathing and, in places, deeply insulting. This reveals the depths of the anger that Charles I's religious policies provoked among Puritans. In terms of audience, Bastwick's comments are addressed to the public and this may account for the exaggerated tone and colourful language used. His motive is possibly to provoke outrage and stimulate opposition to Laud's religious policies.

Level 4 ([16]–[20])

Answers will not only discuss the merits of the source, but also its limitations. Any plausible limitations should be rewarded. For example, as Bastwick was addressing the public, there was a risk that he exaggerated in order to make his text more engaging. The tone is also hyperbolic and it is unclear whether this level of anger was widely shared. Bastwick makes no reference to the opinions of others. While this provides a useful example of Puritan rhetoric, it may not be a reliable guide to how Laud, or his policies, were perceived by the wider public. Answers will fully exploit the source and show

AVAILABLE
MARKS

full appreciation that its value does not just lie in its content but comment on its date, author, mode, motive, audience and tone. To obtain a mark at Level 4, candidates must include relevant contextual knowledge in their answer. For example, candidates may point out that Laud's reforms had imposed steep costs on local communities. Churches had to be renovated, altars moved to the east, and vestments used, all of which cost money. Critics had been prosecuted in the Court of High Commission and the Court of Star Chamber, and many had been severely punished. Bastwick himself was later prosecuted, fined and mutilated for the publication of this document. Bastwick also complains that the bishops hold the keys to purses and prisons. This may be a reference to the costs imposed by Laud's 'Beauty of Holiness' campaign and to Charles I's policy of prosecuting Puritan critics.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately. [20]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

20

- (b) **Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B.** Historians have different views about particular issues. Using both interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of the opposition to the policies of Charles I during the Personal Rule of 1629–1640 do you find more convincing?

This question targets AO3: the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

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

Level 1 ([1]–[7])

Answers at this level will display a limited understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will reveal a limited analysis of the interpretations of the opposition to the policies of Charles I during the Personal Rule of 1629–1640. Answers at this level will display little or no understanding of the historical context, perhaps reflecting on the opposition provoked by Charles I's financial or religious policies. Responses may discuss only one of the interpretations. Candidates will not identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing or will reach an unsubstantiated judgement.

Level 2 ([8]–[14])

Answers at this level will display a satisfactory understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will begin to analyse the two different interpretations of the opposition to the policies of Charles I during the Personal Rule of 1629–1640. Answers at this level may display some understanding of the historical context. Candidates will reveal a satisfactory understanding of the views of David Smith and Kevin Sharpe. Candidates may identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide some evidence in support of their judgement.

Level 3 ([15]–[22])

Answers at this level will reveal a good understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will present a good analysis of the different interpretations of the opposition to

the policies of Charles I during the Personal Rule of 1629–1640. Answers at this level will display a good understanding of the historical context. They will be able to explain the unpopularity of the policies referred to by Sharpe and Smith and explain why they provoked opposition. They may also provide evidence of the nature and extent of that opposition. Candidates will comment on specific policies that provoked opposition, perhaps focusing on Ship Money or the suppression of Puritans. They may also discuss the changes made to the culture of the royal court. Candidates will identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide good evidence in support of their judgement.

Level 4 ([23]–[30])

Answers at this level will reveal a very good understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will present a very good analysis of the different interpretations of the opposition to the policies of Charles I during the Personal Rule of 1629–1640. Answers at this level will display a very good understanding of the historical context. Smith refers to opposition to changes in court culture. Candidates may explain which changes were most controversial, perhaps commenting on the greater emphasis placed on art, order, hierarchy and ceremony. Both interpretations refer to opposition to Charles I's financial policies. Candidates may explain what those policies were, referring to the use of prerogative fines, monopolies and Ship Money. Evidence of opposition to Ship Money may be provided, perhaps through reference to the trial of John Hampden in 1637 or the taxpayer strike that followed the Bishops' Wars. With reference to the opposition to Charles I's religious policies, candidates may provide examples of controversial policies. They may comment on Laud's insistence that clergy adhere to the Book of Common Prayer. The promotion of Arminianism and the suppression of Calvinism were also unpopular and provoked criticism. Candidates may refer to the suppression of the Feoffees and the restrictions placed on preaching. They may also discuss Laud's controversial 'Altar policy'. Candidates might also provide evidence of opposition to the Personal Rule of Charles I. They may, for example, refer to the critics and opponents prosecuted by Star Chamber, or to the existence of a Puritan network, involving men such as John Pym, John Hampden and Oliver St John. Interpretation A presents an overwhelmingly critical appraisal of the Personal Rule of Charles I; Interpretation B, while not uncritical, is much more positive. Both interpretations could also be challenged. Interpretation A claims that opposition to Charles I's Personal Rule was widespread, but provides limited evidence of this, arguing that criticisms were private. Interpretation B, in presenting a largely positive analysis of the Personal Rule, makes no mention of the constitutional concerns that Charles I's policies clearly provoked. Candidates will identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide very good evidence in support of their judgement.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[30]

30

Option 2

60

AVAILABLE
MARKS

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

AVAILABLE
MARKS

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

- 1 (a) Analyse the reasons for the success of the Anti-Corn Law League.

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

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

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited explanation and analysis. Responses at this level will demonstrate a superficial understanding of the reasons for the success of the Anti-Corn Law League. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form of style and writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding with some degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation and analysis. Responses will be more detailed and provide some coherent information about the reasons for the success of the Anti-Corn Law League. For example, there may be reference to the lectures organised by the League and to the agitation by its representatives in Parliament. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form of style and writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([5]–[7])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will begin to consider a range of factors relating to the success of the Anti-Corn Law League. For example, candidates may refer to the important propaganda role played by the Anti-Corn Law League after its establishment in 1838–1839, especially by means of a programme of high-profile lectures and public meetings. The League also produced its own newspaper and took advantage of the new penny post system to mail its literature direct to the public. Candidates may also note that by 1841 the Anti-Corn Law League had representation in Parliament, where Richard Cobden put pressure on the new Conservative Government of Robert Peel to grant reform. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form of style and writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There

is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([8]–[10])

Answers at this level consistently demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and concisely. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound explanation and analysis. Top level answers will clearly discuss the reasons for the success of the Anti-Corn Law League. Candidates may note that the work of John Bright, the son of a Rochdale cotton mill owner, and Richard Cobden, a successful businessman and member of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, was critical. Both were inspirational public speakers, Cobden taking his talents to the House of Commons, to which he was elected in 1841. Cobden and Bright were, however, part of a wide movement that brought the anti-Corn Law case to the general public by means of lectures, public meetings and pamphlets. The League also produced its own newspaper and sought favourable publicity through the national press. A strong emphasis was placed on petitioning, and between 1839 and 1843 some 16 351 petitions were tabled, with a total of 5.8 million signatures. Above all, the League could draw on funds to an unprecedented level – £50 000 in 1843, £100 000 in 1844 and 1845, and £250 000 in 1845–1846. It was without question the most successful public pressure group of the age. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form of style and writing. Relevant material is organised with a high degree of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately. [10]

- (b) Analyse the impact of the economic and social reforms of Peel's Second Ministry between 1841 and 1846.

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

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

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited explanation and analysis. Responses at this level will demonstrate a superficial understanding of the impact of the economic and social reforms of Peel's Second Ministry between 1841 and 1846. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form of style and writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

10

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding with some degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation and analysis. Responses will be more detailed and provide some coherent information about the impact of the economic and social reforms of Peel's Second Ministry between 1841 and 1846. For example, there may be reference to the Factory Act of 1844. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form of style and writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([5]–[7])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will begin to consider a range of factors relating to the impact of the economic and social reforms of Peel's Second Ministry between 1841 and 1846. For example, in terms of the economy, there may be reference to Peel's free trade measures and the Bank Charter Act. This Act brought stability to the banking system and the issuing of bank notes. English currency now became more stable and London was regarded as the world's leading monetary centre. In relation to social reform, there may be reference to the Mines Act of 1842, which forbade the employment of females in mines, and of boys under the age of ten. However, the provision of only one inspector to enforce the terms of the Act was inadequate. Moreover, the Act said nothing about safety in mines and there continued to be regular explosions and disasters. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form of style and writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([8]–[10])

Answers at this level consistently demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and concisely. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound explanation and analysis. Top level answers will clearly discuss the impact of the economic and social reforms of Peel's Second Ministry between 1841 and 1846. To boost trade, Peel's budgets of 1842 and 1845 swept away a large proportion of duties, leading to a trade revival, an increase in exports and a fall in unemployment. To offset the fall in government revenue by reducing tariffs, Peel reintroduced income tax in 1842. The Companies Act ensured tighter controls over the creation of companies, which had to be officially registered and issue regular accounts. However, the Act did not apply to railway companies, which had special approval from Parliament, and here bad practice continued. The promptings of Shaftesbury contributed to Peel's reforms to ease the disgraceful conditions in some factories, mines and industrial towns, so in this sense much of the credit can be attributed to Shaftesbury. The Factory Act required dangerous machinery to be fenced. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form of style and writing. Relevant material is organised with a high degree of clarity and

AVAILABLE
MARKS

coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[10]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

10

- 2 (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is Source 1 as evidence for an historian studying the Second Reform Act of 1867? You must use contextual knowledge in your answer.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

This question targets AO2: the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context. Candidates must use contextual knowledge in their answer.

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

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

Answers may, typically, paraphrase or quote at length from the source but fail to comment explicitly on relevant points in the light of the question. For example, they may observe that the source is a speech by an MP in the House of Commons.

Level 2 ([6]–[10])

Answers may, typically, confine themselves to the content of the source and assess its usefulness with reference only to the information it provides. For example, Source 1 reveals Cranborne's concerns about the Reform Bill of 1867, particularly the widening of the electorate.

Level 3 ([11]–[15])

Answers will utilise the source more comprehensively. They will not only discuss the content of the source well but also highlight its strengths by focusing on its mode, author, date, motive, audience and tone. The author represents a key strength of the source, as it is a speech by the Conservative MP Viscount Cranborne in the House of Commons. The date of the source enhances its value, as the debate about the Reform Bill is ongoing. The Bill had been introduced by Disraeli on 18 March 1867, and, as the content of this source illustrates, it was not a measure that all Conservatives supported. Cranborne is particularly concerned that the Reform Bill will undermine the essentially representative nature of the current electoral system by enhancing the role of party managers, whom he refers to as men lacking "the purest motives or highest character". Cranborne seems to be committed to maintaining the political status quo, with his reference to the threat the proposed legislation poses to "those who up until now have been recognised as the leaders of the people". The latter reference might be interpreted as alluding to the landed interest in the country, of which, of course, Cranborne was a representative figure. He emphasises the point that the new Bill will, in his view, transfer power to party officials who will not have the real interests of constituents or voters at heart. Candidates might consider the audience to be of significance, as Cranborne is addressing the House of Commons and will wish to present a coherent and convincing argument against the Bill to his fellow MPs, particularly those of his own party.

Level 4 ([16]–[20])

Answers will not only discuss the merits of the source, but also its limitations. Any plausible limitations should be rewarded. Answers will fully exploit the source and show full appreciation that its value does not just lie in its content but comment on its date, author, mode, motive, audience and tone. To obtain

a mark at Level 4, candidates must include relevant contextual knowledge in their answer. They may conclude that the real strength of the source is the spotlight it throws on Conservative divisions over the Reform Act and that this was a highly contentious issue, something that indeed divided both of the main parties. However, it can be argued that a fundamental weakness of the source is that it provides no detail about the Bill itself, instead presenting a very generalised interpretation of what Cranborne sees as the main problem with the measure: that it takes power away from what he calls “local interest” and hands it to unscrupulous party officials or managers. The date of the source is something of a handicap in that the Bill was still subject to amendment and so its final shape was not known. However, candidates might argue that what really concerned Cranborne was the advance of democracy – and the associated retreat of the aristocracy – in terms of political power. Contextual knowledge may allow candidates to argue that Cranborne had in fact accused Disraeli of betraying his party by promoting a more democratic franchise, and had indeed gone so far as to resign from the Conservative Government as Secretary of State for India when the Bill was initially introduced. In terms of the Act itself, the vote was given to every male adult householder living in a borough constituency and to male lodgers paying £10 a year for unfurnished rooms. As a consequence, the total electorate was doubled from 1 million to 2 million.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[20]

20

- (b) Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B.** Historians have different views about particular issues. Using both interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of the introduction and impact of the Second Reform Act of 1867 do you find more convincing?

This question targets AO3: the candidate’s ability to analyse and evaluate, in relation to historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

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

Level 1 ([1]–[7])

Answers will display a limited understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will reveal a limited analysis of the interpretations of the introduction and impact of the Second Reform Act of 1867. Answers at this level will display little or no understanding of the historical context. Responses may discuss only one of the interpretations. Candidates will not identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing or will reach an unsubstantiated judgement.

Level 2 ([8]–[14])

Answers will display a satisfactory understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will begin to analyse the two different interpretations of the introduction and impact of the Second Reform Act of 1867. Answers at this level may display some understanding of the historical context. Candidates will reveal a satisfactory understanding of the views of Blake in Interpretation A and Adelman in

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Interpretation B. Interpretation A argues that the Reform Act of 1867 was a carefully considered measure by Disraeli, designed to create the type of alliance between the aristocracy and the working class that he had previously envisaged. Adelman's analysis in Interpretation B disagrees with Blake. Adelman argues that Disraeli is not trying to prepare his party for the future but is simply seeking to gain an immediate political advantage over Gladstone and the Liberals and at the same time make his own position within the Conservative Party more secure. Candidates may identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide some evidence in support of their judgement.

Level 3 ([15]–[22])

Answers at this level will reveal a good understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will present a good analysis of the different interpretations of the introduction and impact of the Second Reform Act of 1867. Answers at this level will display a good understanding of the historical context. Interpretation A credits Disraeli with a farsighted approach in relation to the Second Reform Act, recognising that it will be essential for his party to accept the inevitability of further electoral reform and to embrace it in order to secure its future in British politics. However, as Blake points out, this commitment to reform is in accord with Disraeli's already established vision of what the source refers to as an "alliance between the aristocracy and the urban working class". Adelman's focus is very much on Disraeli, and in contrast to Blake, he dismisses Disraeli's actions in relation to the Second Reform Act as pure political opportunism, fashioned solely to outflank Gladstone and the Liberals. Adelman directly challenges Blake's assertion that Disraeli was attempting to "educate his party" and prepare it for the democratic politics of the future. Rather, Interpretation B argues that Disraeli was not motivated so much by democratic principles as by a desire to make his own leadership of the Conservatives in the House of Commons more secure. In his final point, Adelman challenges the perception that the Reform Act was truly democratic noting the limitations in the detail of the legislation. Candidates will identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide good evidence in support of their judgement.

Level 4 ([23]–[30])

Answers at this level will reveal a very good understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will present a very good analysis of the different interpretations of the introduction and impact of the Second Reform Act of 1867. Answers at this level will display a very good understanding of the historical context. They may argue that the Second Reform Act of 1867 was Disraeli's vision of Tory democracy – referred to by Blake in Interpretation A – put into practice. A potential strength of Interpretation A is that Blake substantiates his case that the Second Reform Act was based on principles that Disraeli had already established. He does this by drawing a connection between Disraeli's earlier pronouncements, the Reform Act of 1867 and the social reform programme put in place by the future Conservative Government in 1875 and 1876, thereby demonstrating coherence and consistency of purpose. Candidates might elaborate on the legislation produced by Disraeli's Government in that period, in considering Blake's argument. While Blake does not entirely dismiss party political calculation in relation to Disraeli's approach to reform in 1867 – noting the great election victory that was to come in 1874, the Conservatives' first since 1841 – he does not see it as the primary factor

behind the Act, unlike Adelman in Interpretation B. Indeed, candidates might consider this focus on Disraeli's alleged political opportunism to be the principal strength of Interpretation B. Adelman directly refutes Blake's claim that Disraeli was attempting to educate his party in the reality of late nineteenth-century politics, arguing instead that Disraeli's motives were quite cynical. He emphasises the desire to undermine Gladstone's leadership of the Liberals and at the same time advance his own position within the Conservative Party. Candidates might develop the point about Gladstone by reflecting on the intense personal rivalry that existed between Disraeli and his Liberal opponent. On one level, the Reform Act of 1867 can certainly be seen as a personal victory for Disraeli, defeating Viscount Cranborne and Jonathan Peel, both of whom resigned from the government in opposition to electoral reform, and both of whom Adelman mentions. However, Interpretation A suggests that the 1867 Reform Act might not simply have been about Disraeli's political manoeuvrings or parliamentary rivalry, but rather the pressure exerted by outside forces, namely the Reform League. Adelman, however, concludes his analysis with a strong argument, questioning just how democratic the Reform Act really was. His reference to continued "Conservative domination of rural Britain" highlights a significant shortcoming of the Act. While the franchise was extended to all householders in the boroughs, as well as lodgers who paid an annual rent of £10 or more, voting rights in the counties remained restricted. More importantly, a redistribution of parliamentary seats was needed if the working class was going to gain what Adelman calls "effective political power". A possible challenge to Interpretation A is that Robert Blake, while acknowledging the pressure for reform that existed outside Parliament, presents the Reform Act of 1867 as part of a master plan by Disraeli the visionary leader to give shape to the doctrine of 'Tory democracy' and prepare his party for the future. The emphasis is on statesmanship – but this is to the exclusion of party political calculation. In other words, candidates could reasonably argue that in 1866–1867 Disraeli saw an opportunity, with the Liberals divided, to outflank his political opponents and at the same time score a personal success against his bitter rival Gladstone. Long-term political advantage would be a bonus, not necessarily the goal. A possible challenge to Interpretation B is that Paul Adelman's analysis of Disraeli's securing of the 1867 Reform Act is overly cynical. While not necessarily refuting Adelman's argument in its entirety, candidates might point to the legislative record of Disraeli's government between 1874 and 1880, particularly in the field of social reform, to demonstrate that 'Tory democracy' was not simply a gesture to the working class, or worse, a ruse to make them vote Conservative, but rather an indicator that the Conservative leader was following a coherent and indeed principled policy of which the Reform Act of 1867 can be seen as a cornerstone. Candidates will identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide very good evidence in support of their judgement.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[30]

Option 3

AVAILABLE
MARKS

30

60

Option 4: Italy and Germany 1815–1871AVAILABLE
MARKS

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

- 1 (a) Analyse the aims of those who took part in the revolutions which broke out in the Italian states in 1848.

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

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

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation and analysis. Responses at this level will demonstrate a superficial understanding of the aims of those who took part in the revolutions which broke out in the Italian states in 1848. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding with some degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation and analysis. Responses will be more detailed and provide some coherent information about the aims of those who took part in the revolutions of 1848, but will make a limited selection, for example, the desire of those, especially in the northern part of Italy, to expel the Austrians from Lombardy and Venetia. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([5]–[7])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will begin to analyse a range of aims of the Italian revolutionaries of 1848. A range of aims will be mentioned, which may include the objectives of nationalists and liberals. Some idealistic Italian national aspirations were involved, but the basic wish was simply to get Austrian influence out of Italy, seen in the rebellions in Lombardy and Venetia, but also finding support from Piedmont, the Papal States, Tuscany and Naples. Liberalism was a further aim, manifesting itself in demands for a constitution, for example in Piedmont and in the Papal States. Although most nationalist and liberal revolutionaries

were middle class, there were also, at this time of economic depression, social demands from both urban workers and downtrodden peasants, contributing to the outbreak of revolution in 1848. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([8]–[10])

Answers at this level consistently demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and concisely. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound explanation and analysis of the variety of aims and differing perspectives of the revolutionaries of 1848. Liberalism, although strong, was in Rome and Venice supplanted by a more radical republicanism. Anti-clericalism became strong in the Roman Republic, yet others sought a federal Italy under the Pope. Charles Albert, supported by nationalists, was essentially a Piedmontese expansionist, while Sicilian rebels wanted freedom from Neapolitan rule. Those peasants who took part in the revolutions aimed to reduce the number of days they had to work for their lords, or to obtain guarantees of grazing rights. In towns and cities the workers' aims were for state intervention to provide jobs, and to obtain plentiful, cheap food. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high degree of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately. [10]

10

- (b) Analyse the role of Garibaldi in achieving the unification of Italy.

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

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

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation and analysis. Responses at this level will demonstrate a superficial understanding of Garibaldi's role in uniting Italy. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding with some degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation and analysis. Responses will be more detailed and provide some coherent information about the role played by Garibaldi, referring perhaps to the expedition of the Thousand, which, ultimately, added the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies to the new Kingdom of Italy. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([5]–[7])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will begin to analyse a range of factors showing the role of Garibaldi in achieving Italian unity. A nationalist and democrat, Garibaldi's main contribution to the unification of Italy was as a dashing, inspirational military leader. Responses may observe that, capitalising on Sicilian unrest, he assembled a small force which drove the Neapolitan forces out of the island, crossed to the mainland, and took Naples without a fight. The people voted, in a plebiscite, to join the new Italian kingdom, but Garibaldi's plans to capture Rome were thwarted by the Piedmontese army, and Garibaldi, now a professed monarchist, handed over all his conquests to Victor Emmanuel. The southern half of Italy had been added to Cavour's existing northern kingdom and Garibaldi had played a major role in the unification of Italy. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([8]–[10])

Answers at this level consistently demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and concisely. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound explanation and analysis of Garibaldi's role in achieving the unification of Italy. At this level responses may refer to Garibaldi's earlier career, participating in the First War of Independence (1848–1849), then leading and defending the Roman Republic. Garibaldi's military campaign of 1859 will receive due credit, but needs to be put into the context of the flabby response of the Neapolitan army. It might also be queried whether, after handing his conquests over to Victor Emmanuel, Garibaldi's assistance had been less to Italian unification than Piedmontese expansionism. His subsequent attempts to seize Rome in 1862 and 1867 were unsuccessful. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high degree of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[10]

10

AVAILABLE
MARKS

- 2 (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is Source 1 as evidence for an historian studying the causes of the Franco-Prussian War? You must use contextual knowledge in your answer.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

This question targets AO2: the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context. Candidates must use contextual knowledge in their answer.

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

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

Answers may, typically, paraphrase or quote at length from the source but fail to comment explicitly on relevant points in the light of the question. They may observe that the document is Napoleon's attempt to explain why France went to war in 1870.

Level 2 ([6]–[10])

Answers may, typically, confine themselves to the content of the source and assess its usefulness with reference only to the information it provides. They may note that the Emperor is attempting to justify to the people of France why the country has gone to war. The proclamation was issued a few days after hostilities commenced.

Level 3 ([11]–[15])

Answers will utilise the source more comprehensively. They will not only discuss the content of the source well but also highlight its strengths by focusing on its mode, author, date, motive, audience and tone. A strength of the source is its author, Napoleon III, Emperor of France, in whose name the war was being fought. Its date is a strength since it appeared six days after the declaration of war on Prussia. Its mode is a proclamation, official and widely circulated to reach the whole country. Its audience is the entire nation, while its purpose is to justify the French declaration of war and possibly win over those who doubted its wisdom, such as Thiers. The tone is utterly serious: he refers to "the national sense of honour" and "the destiny of our country." He goes on to blame Prussia provoking mistrust with its actions, a reference to the Hohenzollern claim to the Spanish throne. France, he believed, had been treated with contempt, a probable reference to the refusal to allow the French ambassador a further interview with King William. He argues that France has been "conciliatory" and shown "patience" towards an aggressive Prussia. Napoleon III suggests that he is responding to a nationwide call for war, talks of fighting to achieve peace, and implicitly draws a distinction between Germany, with which he has no quarrel, and Prussia.

Level 4 ([16]–[20])

Answers will not only discuss the merits of the source, but also its limitations. Any plausible limitations should be rewarded. Answers will fully exploit the source and show full appreciation that its value does not just lie in its content but comment on its date, author, mode, motive, audience and tone. To obtain a mark at Level 4, candidates must include relevant contextual knowledge in their answer, such as the blame which may be attached to each side for the

Spanish dispute. Answers may note that the emperor's self-congratulatory "conciliatory" attitude to Prussia may simply reflect his weak position, as he had gained no concessions for staying neutral in the Austro-Prussian War, 1866, and his policy over the Hohenzollern Candidature may be seen as an attempt to claw back diplomatic credibility. The source has several limitations. For example, responses may observe that it omits the views of those within France who opposed the War. It suggests French unanimity over the need to avenge the perceived snub by Prussia, but makes no reference to the minority voices in the debate in the Chamber, who felt that the withdrawal of Leopold was sufficient, or to the pressure mounted on an ailing Napoleon from the Court and from the strongly anti-Prussian Foreign Minister Gramont. But the most important limitation of the source is that it offers only the perspective of the French government and ignores that of the other belligerent, Prussia. Bismarck later boasted that he had edited the Ems Telegram so as to provoke French rage, although nothing in the amended version is strictly untrue, but, regardless of his intentions, the effect was to create war fever in France.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[20]

20

- (b) Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B.** Historians have different views about particular issues. Using both interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of the causes of the Franco-Prussian War of 1870–1871 do you find more convincing?

This question targets AO3: the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

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

Level 1 ([1]–[7])

Answers at this level will display a limited understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will reveal a limited analysis of the interpretations of the causes of the Franco-Prussian War of 1870–1871. Answers at this level will display little or no understanding of the historical context in which war broke out. Responses may discuss only one of the interpretations. Candidates will not identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing or will reach an unsubstantiated judgement.

Level 2 ([8]–[14])

Answers at this level will display a satisfactory understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two extracts. Responses will begin to analyse the two different interpretations of Bismarck's responsibility for the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War. Answers at this level may display some understanding of the historical context in which the proposal that a member of the Hohenzollern family should become King of Spain caused such alarm in France, and subsequent events which led many to feel that the only way to salvage French honour was to go to war. Candidates will reveal a satisfactory understanding of the views of both A J P Taylor and Edward Crankshaw, the latter laying much of the blame for the war at Bismarck's door, the former suggesting that he had neither planned nor even foreseen it. Candidates may identify which of the two interpretations

AVAILABLE
MARKS

they find more convincing and will provide some evidence in support of their judgement.

Level 3 ([15]–[22])

Answers at this level will reveal a good understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will present a good analysis of the different interpretations of Bismarck’s responsibility for the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War of 1870–1871. Taylor, at the outset, states categorically that Bismarck did not plan the war, but, for the sake of his reputation, indulged in a propaganda campaign to suggest that the Hohenzollern Candidature and the subsequent Ems telegram were both part of a well-constructed “trap for France”, as his aide Bucher claimed. Crankshaw, on the other hand, claims that the Minister-President was willing and ready to fight France in Prussian interests. Thus, in contrast to Taylor, who saw “no reason for a war against France”, Crankshaw believes that he wanted to goad France in such a way that the German states, fearing France, would rally around Prussia. He asserts that the campaign to humiliate Napoleon III could only end in war. He stresses the French need to fight or collapse. Answers at this level will display a good understanding of the historical context in which war was declared, noting the part Bismarck played in urging the Hohenzollern Candidature for the Spanish throne even when King William, the head of the family, was unenthusiastic. When Leopold’s name was finally withdrawn, it was Bismarck who edited the Ems telegram which explained how Benedetti failed to secure a further interview with King William when the French sought a permanent withdrawal. This made it look as if France had been insulted: a “slap in the face,” as Gramont put it. Candidates will identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide good evidence in support of their judgement.

Level 4 ([23]–[30])

Answers at this level will reveal a very good understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will present a very good analysis of the different interpretations of Bismarck’s part in the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War, noting, perhaps, the stress Crankshaw places on Bismarck’s concern for Prussian rather than German interests, a clue to his engineering of the war. He believes that “no self-respecting ruler could be expected to tolerate such provocation.” On the other hand, answers may note that Taylor sees Bismarck, keen to impress posterity, as creating a myth around his planning of the war. Answers at this level will display a very good understanding of the historical context, of Bismarck’s opportunity to compel the Southern states to support Prussia in the war, and the belligerent French Minister Gramont’s and Napoleon III’s inability to fend off Eugénie and the other hawks in his entourage. In support of Taylor, they may note that French insecurity and hurt pride led them to reject a satisfactory settlement and seek an unrealistically sweeping diplomatic victory over Prussia. Taylor’s claim that Germany had no reason for a war against France might be challenged on the grounds that war was necessary to absorb the southern states into the Reich. Crankshaw could be challenged on the grounds that he does not mention the part played by the French in reigniting the Hohenzollern crisis when it appeared to be settled. Candidates will identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide very good evidence in support of their judgement.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[30]

30

Option 4

60

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Option 5: Germany 1919–1945

AVAILABLE
MARKS

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

- 1 (a) Analyse why the Weimar Republic experienced political instability between 1919 and 1923.

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

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

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation and analysis. Responses at this level will demonstrate a superficial understanding of why the Weimar Republic experienced political instability in the period 1919–1923. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding with some degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation and analysis. Responses will be more detailed and provide some coherent information about why the Weimar Republic experienced political instability in the period 1919–1923 but with significant omissions. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([5]–[7])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will begin to analyse a range of factors to explain why the Weimar Republic experienced political instability in the period 1919–1923. Candidates may point out that one factor was the effects of the Versailles Treaty, especially with regard to the clauses concerning reparations, war guilt, disarmament and territorial arrangements. This annoyed right-wing nationalists and identified the new republic from the outset with a dictated peace. Another factor was the Weimar Constitution, which introduced proportional representation, thus ensuring that a polarised, divided society would be reflected in a multiparty *Reichstag*. All governments would therefore be unstable, short-lived coalitions. Candidates make a good selection and use

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

Level 4 ([8]–[10])

Answers at this level consistently demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and concisely. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound explanation and analysis of why the Weimar Republic experienced political instability in the period 1919–1923. Another factor was that the political instability of the first phase of the Weimar Republic occurred against a background of economic hyperinflation. The Franco-Belgian occupation of the Ruhr in January 1923, after Germany defaulted on its reparation payments, resulted in passive resistance. It should also be borne in mind that key elements of German society opposed the Weimar Republic from the outset. The German army had a lukewarm attitude to the Republic. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high degree of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately. [10]

- (b) Analyse the different groups in Germany who opposed and resisted the Nazi regime in the period 1939–1945.

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

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

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation and analysis. Responses at this level will demonstrate a superficial understanding of the different groups in Germany who opposed and resisted the Nazi regime in the period 1939–1945. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding with some degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation and analysis. Responses will be more detailed and provide some coherent information

AVAILABLE
MARKS

10

about the different groups in Germany who opposed and resisted the Nazi regime in the period 1939–1945. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([5]–[7])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will begin to analyse a range of groups in Germany who opposed and resisted the Nazi regime in the period 1939–1945. For example, some young people and students protested against the regime. The Edelweiss Pirates were working-class young people who formed urban gangs. In Cologne in 1944 twelve of them were publicly hanged because of their assassination of a Gestapo officer. The White Rose student resistance movement distributed a series of leaflets to students at Munich University and eventually to many towns in central Germany in 1942–1943. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([8]–[10])

Answers at this level consistently demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and concisely. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound explanation and analysis of the different groups in Germany who opposed and resisted the Nazi regime in the period 1939–1945, selecting evidence to illustrate such dissent from groups such as the Christian Churches and the right, namely the conservatives and the military. In August 1941 the Catholic Bishop Galen's sermon attacking Nazi euthanasia policy proved so powerful that the Nazi authorities actually stopped the programme. There was right-wing opposition from the traditional elites, including the Kreisau Circle and the Beck-Goerdler Group who were associated with Operation Valkyrie in July 1944, when elements of the military failed to assassinate Hitler. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high degree of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[10]

10

AVAILABLE
MARKS

- 2 (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is Source 1 as evidence for an historian studying the consequences of the Reichstag Fire? You must use contextual knowledge in your answer.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

This question targets AO2: the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context. Candidates must use contextual knowledge in their answer.

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

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

Answers may, typically, paraphrase or quote at length from the source but fail to comment explicitly on relevant points in the light of the question. They may observe that the source is the recollection by the Head of the Gestapo of the immediate reaction of the Nazi leadership to the Reichstag Fire on the evening of 27 February 1933.

Level 2 ([6]–[10])

Answers may, typically, confine themselves to the content of the source and assess its usefulness with reference only to the information it provides. The source reveals that Göring and Hitler used the fire to claim that the communists were plotting revolution and so justify their suppression.

Level 3 ([11]–[15])

Answers will utilise the source more comprehensively. They will not only discuss the content of the source well but also highlight its strengths by focusing on its mode, author, date, motive, audience and tone. The author represents a key strength of the source. Diels was present at the scene of the burning Reichstag and witnessed the immediate statements of Göring and Hitler, which he purportedly recalled in detail. The Nazi leaders engaged in anti-communist rhetoric and viewed the fire as part of a widespread communist uprising. Diels had already interrogated van der Lubbe and came to the conclusion that the Dutch communist had acted alone, thus implying that there were no plans for a communist uprising. Such a view was immediately rejected by Hitler, therefore raising the question of why the Nazi leader was so convinced that the fire was part of a widespread communist conspiracy. By 1950, with the Nazi regime no longer in existence, Diels could safely publish his account of what he observed without recrimination. The date, the motive and the mode of the source could therefore also be considered as potential strengths. The tone of the source is largely descriptive with Diels describing what he observed.

Level 4 ([16]–[20])

Answers will not only discuss the merits of the source, but also its limitations. Any plausible limitations should be rewarded. Answers will fully exploit the source and show full appreciation that its value does not just lie in its content but comment on its date, author, mode, motive, audience and tone. To obtain a mark at Level 4, candidates must include relevant contextual knowledge in their answer. For example, they may point out how the Nazi leadership quickly exploited the opportunity the fire presented to justify the suppression of the communists due to the supposed threat of an uprising. Hitler was able

to persuade President Hindenburg to sign a decree giving him emergency powers. This was the Decree for the Protection of the People and State, which suspended civil and political rights. Thus, the police were given increased powers to arrest, and detain without charge, those deemed to be a threat to state security. The police arrested over 10 000 communists in two weeks. A major shortcoming of the source is that it does not provide the historian with information as to how the Nazi regime attempted to suppress the communist opposition after the fire. A further potential limitation of the source is that Diels does not provide evidence as to why he came to the conclusion that van der Lubbe had acted alone. Another potential limitation of the source concerns the accuracy of Diels's memoirs since they were published seventeen years after the event, especially with regard to the detail of the statements that Göring and Hitler allegedly made.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately. [20]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

20

- (b) Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B.** Historians have different views about particular issues. Using both interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of the means by which the Nazis created a dictatorship in the period 1933–1934 do you find more convincing?

This question targets AO3: the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

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

Level 1 ([1]–[7])

Answers at this level will display a limited understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will reveal a limited analysis of the interpretations of the means by which the Nazis created a dictatorship in the period 1933–1934. Answers at this level will display little or no understanding of the historical context. Responses may discuss only one of the interpretations. Candidates will not identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing or will reach an unsubstantiated judgement.

Level 2 ([8]–[14])

Answers at this level will display a satisfactory understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will begin to analyse the two different interpretations of the means by which the Nazis created a dictatorship in the period 1933–1934. Answers at this level may display some understanding of the historical context. Candidates will reveal a satisfactory understanding of the views of Bendersky in Interpretation A and Noakes and Pridham in Interpretation B. Interpretation A argues that the use of legal means was crucial in the process by which a dictatorship was created, while Interpretation B argues that the use of violence was also an important factor. Candidates may identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide some evidence in support of their judgement.

Level 3 ([15]–[22])

Answers at this level will reveal a good understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will present a good analysis of the different interpretations of the means by which the Nazis created a dictatorship in the period 1933–1934. Answers at this level will display a good understanding of the historical context. Bendersky in Interpretation A emphasises the importance of a “legal strategy”, characterising the process by which a dictatorship was created as a “Legal Revolution.” Interpretation A refers to the Reichstag election of March 1933, the Decree for the Protection of the People and State and the passing of the Enabling Law as important legal methods by which the Nazis created a dictatorship in the period 1933–1934. However, Noakes and Pridham in Interpretation B argue that violence, intimidation and terror were also important elements in the process by which a dictatorship was created. Interpretation B acknowledges the importance of legal means but argues that it was only one method that the Nazis utilised and that the use of violence in the process has been underestimated. Noakes and Pridham suggest that the process was “anything but peaceful” and that from March 1933 the terror perpetrated by local Nazi organisations “erupted into an orgy of violence.” Candidates will identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide good evidence in support of their judgement.

Level 4 ([23]–[30])

Answers at this level will reveal a very good understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will present a very good analysis of the different interpretations of the means by which the Nazis created a dictatorship in the period 1933–1934. Answers at this level will display a very good understanding of the historical context. In support of Bendersky’s arguments in Interpretation A, responses may point out that the Enabling Law was passed in the Reichstag by 444 votes to 94, thus giving the Nazis the required two-thirds majority required for a constitutional amendment. The Enabling Law would allow Hitler to make laws without the approval of the Reichstag and without reference to the President. A dictatorship would be grounded in legality. Candidates may elaborate on the reference to August 1934 in Interpretation A and discuss the Law Concerning the Head of State of the German Reich which merged the offices of the President and Chancellor. In support of Noakes and Pridham’s arguments in Interpretation B, responses may provide evidence of the Nazis using violence in 1933. From March 1933 the SA unleashed a reign of terror against left-wing opponents. There was a sustained assault on trade union and KPD offices, as well as on the homes of left-wing politicians. Gangs of Stormtroopers broke up SPD and KPD meetings. Thousands of left-wing activists were imprisoned in makeshift concentration camps. By July 1933, 26 789 political prisoners had been arrested by the SA and imprisoned in 70 camps. It has been estimated that the SA murdered 500 people in 1933. Candidates may elaborate on the reference to June 1934 in Interpretation B and discuss the Night of the Long Knives when the SS shot at least 90 people, including about 50 SA leaders in a purge to defeat “the Second Revolution.” The interpretation in each extract could also be challenged. It could be suggested that Bendersky in Interpretation A concentrates solely on legal means and that Noakes and Pridham in Interpretation B provide limited evidence to support their interpretation. Candidates will identify which of

AVAILABLE
MARKS

the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide very good evidence in support of their judgement.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[30]

Option 5

Total

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

30

60

60