

# A-level HISTORY

**Feedback on Component 1 2022**

Commentaries booklet

Published: Autumn 2022





---

Contents	Page
Key area 1: AO3	4
Key area 2: AO1	38

# Key area 1: A03

## High-level responses

Q1, Paper 1, Summer 2022

1C: The Tudors 1485–1603

### Extract A

Henry VII's character, silent and jealous, resulted in a steady drift towards absolute royal control. Although he based his right to the throne solely on parliamentary title, his main concern was the accumulation of treasure which would relieve him of the need to call parliament. Henry was both grasping and mean, and money was hoarded. A wide range of sources of income was exploited; benevolences were revived, and Morton extorted gifts to Henry's Exchequer. So successful were these efforts that at the end of his reign Henry was able to bequeath a hoard of two million pounds to his successor. 5

Furthermore, Henry VII broke the power of the magnates; limits on retaining were enforced with the utmost severity, as seen when the Earl of Oxford, a significant supporter of the King, was fined £10 000. Henry VII also revived the criminal jurisdiction of the Royal Council and enabled justices of the peace to try without juries. 10

Adapted from JR Green, *A Short History of the English People*, 1874

We are unable to display Extract B for copyright reasons.

### Extract C

Henry VII was never an absolute monarch. He may have wished to rule in the manner which he had observed whilst in exile in Brittany and France, and to impose formality on the Court, but his power and authority in England were limited by custom and law. Even if he had wished to sweep away these barriers, he could not have done so. He had no police force and no standing army. In times of danger, even more than in times of peace, 5

he was dependent on the support of property owners. Equally, his administration was decentralised rather than concentrated in the capital. The facts of geography and poor communications were largely responsible for this and compelled the King to devolve responsibility to men on the spot. The Council could advise, encourage, warn, and threaten, but in the last analysis, in local government, Henry was dependent on the co-operation of the political nation. 10

Adapted from R Lockyer, *Henry VII*, 1997

0 1

Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to Henry VII.

[30 marks]

Henry VII by R Lockyer and Andrew Thrush © 1997. Informa UK Limited. Reproduced by permission of Taylor & Francis Group via PLSClear.



### Student A, Q1, Paper 1C, Summer 2022

Green argues that Henry VII's reign was characterised by his frugal nature. They argue that Henry's shrewdness with money was the product of his own insensitivity and greed. Green focuses on Henry's financial aims in his suppression of the nobility. Whilst they are convincing in suggesting that Henry was inevitably frugal in his financial policy, Green is less convincing in suggesting that this was the result of his miserly character. Henry's shrewdness was mainly rooted in his desire to ensure dynastic security.

Green is unconvincing in suggesting that Henry's 'main concern' was the 'accumulation of the treasure' necessary to avoid calling parliament. Whilst it is true that Henry VII called parliament just a total of seven times during his reign, and therefore Green is convincing in asserting that Henry intended to avoid <sup>over-</sup> reliance on <sup>parliament</sup>, it is unfair to suggest that Henry's financial aims were rooted in a desire to avoid parliament. Instead, Henry was over-concerned with the security of his own crown, this, rather than his personal greed, led to his frugal financial policy. Green is fairly convincing in suggesting that Henry 'hoarded' money. Despite an annual pension from France of £5000 and his accumulation of crown lands at the beginning of his reign, through Acts of Attainder against the Yorkist nobility, Henry continued to ~~invest~~ <sup>seek</sup> desperate measures to increase crown finance. This can be seen in his

asking for donations to Arthur's baptism (after his death in 1501) as ~~based~~ based on traditional prerogative rights. Nevertheless, Henry's ~~own~~ shrewd financial policy and limitation of parliament cannot be deemed the product of his 'mean' or 'jealous' character. Henry intended to ensure a ~~stable~~ strong financial position for his successor to ensure the security of the Tudor dynasty.

Green also argues that Henry 'broke the power of the magnates'. This is particularly convincing at the beginning of Henry VII's reign when he was most concerned with asserting monarchical dominance.

He dated his reign to the day prior to the Battle of Bosworth, the 21<sup>st</sup> Aug 1485, to ensure that all Yorkist nobility involved against him could be considered traitors. He was thus able to impose ~~on~~ the magnates ~~with~~ high bonds and therefore extract their wealth and ensure ~~loyalty~~ complicity. Whilst this did serve to ~~some~~ improve royal finance it was most successful in its aim to reduce noble wealth. Green is unconvincing in suggesting that 'retaining' laws against the nobility were 'enforced with the utmost severity' considering the fact that Henry made changes to allow retaining when licensed.

Overall, Green is convincing in their assertion of Henry's shrewd and frugal approach to crown finance. ~~but~~ <sup>Green</sup> overexaggerates the 'severity' of

very good grasp of arguments evaluation with substantiated





Henry's actions and overestimates the role that his own greed underpinned financial policy.

Guy argues that Henry was a sensible and pragmatic king who was both respected and powerful. He argues that Henry was able to centralise English government through his political skill and reputation. He argues that this is what earned Henry his dynastic security rather than his divine right to kingship. Guy is convincing in his assertion of Henry's governing skill, however, overexaggerates his personal political presence.

Guy is convincing in suggesting that Henry was neither blood-thirsty or self-centred. This can be seen in his peaceful ~~and~~ foreign policy that certainly lacked the delusion of English power evident in his son's reign. To suggest, however, that Henry led his army to France because the 'nobility admired highly chivalric kings' is another exaggeration. Henry's invasion of France, late into the campaigning season was used to pressure the French king into a peace treaty. As Henry knew the king would be concerned with his stance in the Italian wars, Henry used his invasion for tactical foreign policy (the French king would be keen to settle the dispute). Therefore, while Guy is convincing in suggesting that Henry was a competent leader, neither self-centred or blood thirsty, he is not convincing in suggesting that Henry's

policies were ever rooted in a desire to pander to the nobility's admiration for kingship and chivalry.

Guy is convincing in asserting that Henry VII helped to 'centralise' English politics. ~~However~~ He is unconvincing, however, in suggesting that this owes to a reconsideration of his appearance as a 'shadowy and remote' king. Henry VII's increased centralisation of politics was largely a response to ~~the~~ the portrayal of Sir William Stanley, his step-uncle and trusted lord chamberlain. Having been exposed as a conspirator in the Warbeck plot, Stanley was tried and executed. Thus, Henry ~~seemingly~~ sought to establish the privy chamber, where only the king's most trusted advisers could gain favour, and where favour could be very easily lost. This did not owe to the diminishment of Henry's 'shadowy and remote' ~~reputation~~ reputation. In fact, his investment of power in just a few royal councillors, like Empson & Dudley, served to perpetuate this perception of him - especially considering their increasingly unpopular financial policies. Whilst Guy is correct in stating that Henry 'served the throne for the throne', this was not the product of his 'dynamic force'. His centralised form of govt created fear ~~to~~ rather than admiration.

In conclusion, Guy is convincing in suggesting that Henry was a competent king and that



nuanced  
evaluation  
which  
shows  
strong  
contextual  
awareness

his policies helped to centralise government. He is less convincing in suggesting that Henry ever acted in the interest of the nobility (especially in his invasion of France) and his assertion that Henry gained a personable political presence.

Lochner argues that Henry was never successful in fully asserting monarchical authority. He argues that Henry was restricted by the English formalities of power. Lochner asserts that due to his own military weakness, Henry was dependent on English property owners. He states that Henry was ultimately dependent on the complicity of his nation. Lochner is convincing in his suggestion that Henry was largely dependent on landowners and local government, but overestimates Henry's weakness in this policy. Henry ultimately provided the most effective means of ensuring law and order.

To suggest that Henry was never an 'absolute monarch' is an overexaggeration. Whilst Henry was subject to multiple threats to his throne (including plots that sought to replace him with Peter of Savoy and others), he ultimately remained supreme. His victory at the Battle of Tewkesbury in 1471 suggests that his 'standing army' was capable of defending his monarchical authority. Though he was dependent on property

owners' such as the traditional northern magnates to operate on Henry's behalf in further regions, by the end of his reign, this method proved effective. ~~Therefore, Lochner not only exaggerates Henry's military incompetence but also the extent of Henry's reliance on local landowners.~~ ~~However,~~ ~~when~~ Henry's initial plan to impose southern magnate nobility on northern regions proved unsuccessful, owing to Henry's reliance on northern property owners.

Lochner overexaggerates Henry's devotion of power to 'men on the spot'. Whilst Henry's reliance on local government did sometimes mean inadvertently removing ~~men~~ men whom he did not truly trust, such as Duke of Acquitain, his ~~exaggerated~~ ~~epitome~~ epitome in certain government ensured that this did not impact too much of a difficulty. By ensuring his own centralised power (by suppressing nobility with Acts of attainder, ~~bonds & recognizance~~), Henry ensured that his reliance on landowners was underpinned by his ~~unassisted~~ ~~unassisted~~ unassisted monarchical authority and centralised power.

Thus, whilst Lochner is convincing in suggesting that Henry relied on the cooperation of the political nation, he is ~~not~~ ~~not~~ convincing in suggesting that

understanding very good. use of evidence not as stro

L5: Excellent understanding of the arguments in all three interpretations. Range of knowledge used effectively to evaluate each of the arguments.



## Commentary

This script demonstrates a very good understanding of each of the extracts. There is additionally a focus on evaluation from the outset and a heavy, but appropriate, use of phrases such as 'convincing'. Views are supported by means of good, specific factual information and short but focused quotes from the extracts. The evaluation is thus supported, although there are still some assertive statements, especially for Extract C. The view is balanced and goes beyond simply



describing the period or the extract. As demanded at the very highest level, the consistent direction of this answer is an evaluative one with evidence used to support judgement.

Level: 5, Mark: 27

## Paper 1H, Tsarist and Communist Russia, 1855–1964

For Extracts A–C, please see Paper 1H, pages 2–3.

0 1

Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to the development of the Soviet economy in the years 1921 to 1941.

[30 marks]

### Student B, Q1, Paper 1H, Summer 2022

Extract A argues that Russia's economy was in disarray by 1921 but had ~~had~~ turned around and ~~was~~ rivaled that of the rest of the world by 1941. ✓

The first main point of extract A is that Russia had made some real achievements by 1932. This is certainly convincing as by the end of the first five year plan (1927–32) Russia's ✓ industrialization was beginning to take shape. Coal production doubled ✓ and industrial centers such as Magnitogorsk ✓ flourished leading the way with revolutionary technologies. However, despite this



great leap forward, the human cost was significant; hundreds of thousands died to bring about this achievement which still fell short of the original goals. This adds value to the interpretation as it correctly expresses Russia's industrial boom. The next argument is that agriculture was also transformed. This is less convincing as collectivization was ultimately a failure. By 1938, 90% of former serfs worked as collectivized farms. These were inefficient as they were poorly run and often the government took too much grain for the peasants to be able to feed themselves. Ultimately this led to starvation. 3 million peasants died in a famine in Ukraine in 1932-33 as a result of ~~the~~ grain requisition. The final point is that the economy was strong on the eve of war. This is unconvincing as by wartime, agriculture was still severely undeveloped. Furthermore, only heavy industry was prioritized leading to a Russia which lacked consumer goods. This caused peasants to hoard grain as a result due to them not being able to buy anything. A direct impact of this

was mass starvation during wartime. Of the 25 million deaths which occurred as a result of WW2, in Russia, most of them were civilian casualties attributed ~~without~~ to starvation which would not have occurred if the economy was not so lurching. Thus the ~~source~~<sup>interpretation</sup> lacks convincingness as it misrepresents the Russian economy on the eve of war. Overall, Extract A is somewhat convincing as it does emphasize the success of initial industrialisation however it fails to touch on the impacts of solely prioritizing heavy industry.

Quite a thorough evaluation with solid contextual support

~~Ext~~ In Extract B, Hosking argues that the Russian economy was partly planned in the years 1921 to 1941 however it did meet some success in heavy industry. His first argument is that the NEP failed as it ~~did~~ only brought production to 1913 levels by 1928. This argument is unconvincing as by the time of the NEP, Russia was war-torn and destitute. Over 4000 factories had been destroyed during WW1 and civil war so ~~Russia was~~ it is futile to compare it to pre-war levels due to the damage industry sustained during the conflict. The NEP incentivised entrepreneurs in the emergent middle class to open businesses which got Russia back on track at a time when state-driven industry was in shambles. This created a strong platform for the <sup>rapid</sup> industrialisation of the late 20s and 30s. ~~Thus~~ Therefore the interpretation lacks value as it downplays the NEP which was key to getting Russia up and running after consecutive conflicts. The Extract's second argument is that the first 3 five year plans increased output significantly however other aspects

good observation



of the economy were ignored. This adds value to Haskings' interpretation as industry certainly increased as a direct result of the 5 year plans. The ambitious targets as well as the fear of being sent to a gulag motivated fervour to work hard in order to fulfill the quotas. Production of oil, iron and pig iron almost doubled during these years which shows a steep increase in production. This makes the source valuable as it accurately represents the ~~increase~~ rapid growth Russia's industrial economy experienced. However, Haskings states that the electric industry was relatively neglected. This is not true as various projects including the Narvsk Dam aimed to increase energy production and succeeded multiplying the energy output five-fold during the period of five year plans. This shows the sources clear disregard for certain aspects of the economy causing it to lose credibility.

Overall, Extract B is mostly ~~relevant~~ convincing as it correctly identifies that Russia focused on the commanding heights of the economy while neglecting areas such as consumer goods. However, it is dragged down by its downplaying of the importance of the NEP and failure to mention the failures in agriculture.

considers key arguments of B with relevant contextual support; planning issue not

\* In addition the economy did seem to be slapdash and unorganised with target numbers picked out of nowhere with no thought and wasteful projects such as the needless expansion of the railways which saw countless workers die.

Extract C's main argument is that the economic growth leading up to 1941 was only achieved through ~~econom~~ military coercion. While it is true some coercion was used such as the fear of being sent to labour camps for not meeting the steep demands set by the Stalinist government, the main driving force for the economic expansion was the workers themselves. So called "champions of labour" were promoted who were an example to the labourforce, encouraging them to increase production. This was a period of patriotism workers shrugged off the harsh conditions of industrial centers such as Magnitogorsk and toiled grueling 12 hour shifts for the glory of the motherland. They were motivated not by the fear of failing to meet targets but by the underlying concern that "we shall be crushed" which was perpetuated by Stalin. Extract C highlights the workers "struggle" however for the workers, at least the ones who bought into Marxist dogma, this was the epitome of communism and they were glad to have escaped the poor rural communities they grew up in and the kolkhozes where they made 1/6 the wage of a factory worker. Although millions died to realize the five year plans, they died with a sense of purpose in their hearts. Overall, Overy's interpretation lacks convincingly as it focuses on the workers being motivated by the fear of sanctions when in reality they strove for progress themselves. However some value is added by the acknowledgement of the importance of the NEP despite its foundations in capitalism.

perhaps exaggerated but a good and thoughtful argument with contextual awareness; a bit out of C

There is good, and in places very good, understanding here and the contextual support is strong and well used. Slig



### Commentary

This response relies heavily on detailed factual support in order to establish a good, substantiated judgement about each of the three extracts. At times, there is perhaps slightly too extensive use of knowledge to the detriment of the core task of evaluation – although the analytical task is never entirely lost sight of. This treatment of each of the extracts is broadly even and, whilst slightly formulaic, is balanced and illustrates a good understanding of the key arguments of each. The



response is plainly not descriptive in nature, but instead successfully establishes an answer from the outset as demanded of the highest level.

Level: 5, Mark: 25

### Student C, Q1, Paper 1H, Summer 2022

<p>0.1</p> <p>overall argument identified</p>	<p>within extract A, Freeze presents an overly-positive view on the Soviet economy, despite <del>also</del> acknowledging impressive achievement. Freeze's first argument centres around the <del>the</del> introduction of Lenin's NEP, brought about to solve the crisis of war communism which he makes clear indication of in his <del>the</del> by stating it was 'in need of reform by 1921'. Freeze makes the convincing statement that by '1924 it had already begun to reform' as the NEP indeed achieved initial <del>restoration</del> <sup>restoration</sup>, real production increasing 23% from 1920 to 1923. However, Freeze's argument that 'industrial production proved rapid' and 'recovery was even more marked in agriculture' appears less convincing considering the NEP was <del>very</del> short-term in its success, <del>and</del> <sup>and</sup> especially in agriculture - as, by 1927, grain procurement was 75% of 1926, agriculture was still extremely backwards (farms using wooden ploughs) and, <del>the</del> NEP whilst grain production had been at 12 million tons in 1913, under the NEP the figure barely surpassed 3 million. Freeze's next argument centres around the impressive industrial growth achieved under Stalin's <del>new</del> Five-Year-plans beginning in 1928, and considering that electricity <del>output</del> <sup>output</sup> had increased 300% and coal <del>iron</del> <sup>iron</sup> doubled during the first plan, Freeze's <del>of</del> assertion that it 'could boast some real achievements' seems very convincing. However, once again, Freeze seems to ignore the failures; due to unrealistic high targets, none of the first five-year plans' targets were actually achieved, despite Freeze arguing 'gross industrial production' 'surpassed the targets'. Moreover, he also glosses over the failures met with Stalin's process of collectivisation, only mentioning that 'agriculture lagged behind', which seems to <sup>not</sup> emphasise the fact that, by 1941, the USSR</p>
---	---

a fair survey which shows understanding and the application of good contextual knowledge

was now producing less <sup>growth</sup> than under the NEP. Finally Fritze returns to a more convincing argument that the 'Soviet economy was in a strong position on the eve of war' as industrialisation <sup>(which had</sup> increased three-fold by 1941) had indeed strengthened the economy whilst the 3rd FYP laid the foundations for war. ~~As~~ whilst the USSR did indeed 'close the gap with the west' as it ~~to~~ overtook Britain in ~~metal and machinery~~ <sup>iron and steel production</sup> by 1940, the economy still faced issues of uneven industrial development and a ~~lack~~ continued focus on quantity over <sup>quality</sup>. Overall, Fritze's argument ~~to~~ emphasises the <sup>economic</sup> achievement but fails to acknowledge the negatives.

With Hoshang, in extract B, ~~to~~ provides a generally convincing, ~~if~~ yet perhaps <sup>overly</sup> ~~overly~~ negative picture of the Soviet economy. Hoshang begins by addressing the 'failure of the NEP', which indeed was not managing to secure the economy in the long-term despite its revitalisation after the ~~2nd~~ the civil war. Hoshang's argument continues to acknowledge the considerable 'increased industrial output' of Stalin's five-year-plans, which is convincing knowing that industrial production had increased three-fold by 1941, ~~yet~~ <sup>and</sup> ~~the~~ note of 'new resources' yet also notes how these plans were used to direct resources into a 'few chosen areas', which holds value knowing that Stalin's aim was always ~~to~~ to develop heavy industry in order to "catch up" with the USA. ~~Indeed~~ Hoshang continues to point out the 'neglected' areas of consumer goods and housing which never received attention despite a the promise of the second five-year plan to double the output of lighter



final section on imbalance is not well-developed but otherwise a sound survey of strengths and weaknesses

industries including consumer items. However, Hoxhing ~~also~~ perhaps depicts the plans too negatively in his discussion of the neglect of 'chemical and electrical' ~~prod~~ industries, ~~even~~ as ~~heavy~~ production nonetheless doubled during the second five-year plan of 1933-37. Moreover, ~~the~~ mentions of 'construction projects' also take on a negative association for ~~forced~~ Hoxhing considering that many, like Magnitogorsk that housed the largest ~~blast~~ blast furnace in the world, led to great Soviet success. Overall, Hoxhing's ~~a~~ general argument that 'Russia's seemingly impressive' growth ~~is~~ <sup>is generally</sup> ~~was~~ 'top-sided and unsustainable' ~~is generally~~ <sup>is generally</sup> ~~unimpressive,~~ definitely for the failed process of collectivisation, <sup>?</sup> yet it also ~~shows~~ presents the achievements as less than they really were.

Within extract C, Overy's ~~data~~ argument is partially convincing yet is also arguably <sup>negatively</sup> overly-negative, focusing on ~~the~~ how the Soviet economy <sup>negatively</sup> affected the people such as workers and peasants. Overy's opening discussion on the NEP proving 'successful' and 'popular with workers and peasants' ~~is~~ <sup>seems</sup> very unconvincing considering that, whilst the NEP may have revived the economy in the short <sup>term</sup>, it was a constant source of trouble for ordinary people - excluding the kulaks and the NEPmen who ~~mixed~~ <sup>mixed</sup> off of private enterprise. Various ~~in~~ 'scissors crisis' (as termed by Trotsky) occurred during the NEP as ~~higher~~ prices of goods rose from the city, whilst ~~grain~~ <sup>grain</sup> ~~prices~~ <sup>prices</sup> remained low, causing peasants to hold back their grain whilst they waited for grain prices to rise. The workers, too, were dissatisfied; unemployment was on a high, despite better working conditions, and they resented being led by single managers on factories.



Orlov. However, Orlov does note the NEP as 'ideologically ungrounded', which is convincing considering Lenin was facing opposition from within the party, many viewing the return of private trade as a betrayal of socialism. Orlov continues with the ~~convincing argument~~ <sup>assertion that</sup> 'capitalism had to be destroyed', which was indeed the principle Stalin led with when he aimed to introduce his new centralised command economy - ~~what~~ <sup>what</sup> he dubbed the 'Great Break' from the past - at the 15th Party Congress in 1927. Orlov's following argument ~~points~~ <sup>focuses</sup> on the 'economic coercion' of 'ordinary workers and farmers' which seems partially valid; ~~the~~ during Stalin's process of collectivisation there ~~was~~ <sup>indeed</sup> were incentives given to peasants such as tax breaks and better quality land if they followed the system, however, most ~~the~~ <sup>many</sup> of the peasants were also forced by violent methods such as shock brigades, something which Orlov's only ~~focus~~ <sup>points out</sup> near the end of their argument, ~~to the focus on totalitarianism~~. Orlov ~~also~~ <sup>neglects</sup> to mention that, ~~also~~ <sup>propaganda</sup> alongside <sup>'economic'</sup> coercion also played a key role in getting workers on board. For instance, Alexey Stakhanov - who reportedly mined 14x his quota in 1935 - was hailed as the model proletarian and used in various campaigns to promote industrialisation. Many workers responded to this ~~type~~ <sup>propaganda</sup>, ~~the~~ making Orlov's argument that ~~it~~ <sup>it</sup> worked 'better in theory' seem a bit ~~dismissive~~ <sup>dismissive</sup>. Where ~~it~~ <sup>Orlov's</sup> argument does seem convincing is in collectivisation, where many peasants revolted via arson and killing their livestock (which halted from 1928-32). ~~Despite~~ Orlov's downplay of 'harsh penalties' seems convincing as failures to meet the targets of the five-year-plans would often

Thorough survey of C- with understanding and good contextual d

lead to arrest or worse, and many over-exaggerated figures to prevent this, indeed causing a 'cycle of cuts' as Overy put it considering the famine in Ukraine (1932) caused around 5.7 million deaths due to over-enthusiastic reporting. Overall, Overy's argument ~~is~~ <sup>about the</sup> ~~more~~ about the Soviet Union's 'extraordinary violence' in 'satellites and fields' has value, especially in agriculture, but also presents worker response and industrial output as overly negative.

Shows good understanding and evaluates strengths and limitations of almost all arguments (only planning issues in B and C undeveloped) Strong contextual knowledge and supported judgements.  
Level 5

lead to arrest or worse, and many over-exaggerated figures to prevent this, indeed causing a 'cycle of cuts' or directly put it considering the famine in Ukraine (1932) caused around 5.7 million deaths due to over-enthusiastic reporting. Overall, Oren's argument ~~about~~ <sup>about the</sup> ~~the~~ Soviet Union's 'extraordinary violence' in 'collectivisation and war' has value, especially in agriculture, but also presents worker response and industrialisation such as worker negligence.

## Commentary

**Level: 5, Mark: 28**



## Mid-/low-level responses

### Student A, Q1, Paper 1C, Summer 2022

The overall view of ~~extra~~ extract A is Henry VII was that Henry VII was controlling and ~~had~~ would oversee everything to do with ~~source~~ finance. As well as make sure people knew that his right to the throne was purely his.

very partial understanding of extract

NR

unclear how this is relevant or chosen quote

seems confused about what extract is arguing

NR

vague and generalised statement

"Although he based his rights to the throne solely on parliamentary title, his main concern was the accumulation of treasure which would relieve him of the need to call parliament." This is convincing as Henry VII ~~he~~ predated his reign to 21<sup>st</sup> August 1485 as the battle of Bosworth took place ~~in~~ on 22<sup>nd</sup> is showed that Henry was already king. As well as doing that Henry also ~~had~~ had his coronation before ~~he~~ he called Parliament ~~in~~ on 30<sup>th</sup> of October 1485 this meant by the time he ~~met~~ met Parliament ~~to~~ they ~~to~~ on the 7<sup>th</sup> November 1485 they would have to respect him as king. This can be seen as unconvincing as ~~rather~~ Henry VII only called Parliament 7 times during his reign ~~to~~ which would show that his ~~sole~~ ~~was~~ 'main concern' was elsewhere. ?

NR

"Henry also revived the criminal jurisdiction of the Royal ~~for~~ council and enabled justices of the peace to try without juries." This unconvincing as that even though Henry did revive the ~~extrajudicial~~ Royal council he did not use it as much and it was rather insufficient. Henry allowing justices of the peace to try without juries meant that they ~~could~~ ~~also~~ abuse that power.

Overall,

The overall view of Extract B is Henry VII was a distinguished king who secured his throne for himself and his dynasty.

little real understanding and limited knowledge throughout extract exploration

Struggling to find QF or relevance here

Henry VIII had four aims for his foreign policy and (national security, Recognition, Improving trade and Securing the Dynasty). National security was Henry's most "Lastly, Henry's diplomacy and security measures guaranteed his dynasty's survival. A threat that Henry had to face was ~~to~~ Perkin Warbeck who was supported by many of his European counterparts. However through Henry's foreign policy he ~~had~~ got rid of Warbeck and ~~he~~ was able to secure his dynasty's survival. In 1492 Henry VII signed the Treaty of Etaples with Charles VIII a condition that came along this treaty was that Charles would not support Warbeck or any other English rebels. In the Treaty of Ayton with James IV a condition of that treaty was that James would no longer harbour and aid Warbeck. This very convincing of James helped Warbeck and even promised a marriage between Warbeck and his cousin.

some knowledge about foreign policy with no real focus or application to the extract

Above it all was

extract B now?

"Above all it was Henry's dynamic force, not his divine right as his propaganda claimed, which secured the throne for the Tudors". Henry secured the throne for Tudors through his ~~to~~ treaties which also gave him recognition further securing the



more relevant with some knowledge

throne for his descendants. In 1479 he signed the Treaty of Medina del Campo with Ferdinand of Spain. This treaty was successful as Ferdinand agreed to not help any English rebels in particular Warbeck. In addition there was an agreement on the marriage between Prince Arthur and Catherine of Aragon. This showed that coming as it shows a powerful family recognising Henry as king. Not only restoring the throne being secured for him but also for his children.

Henry VII secured the Tudor throne through the Treaty of Ayton in 1497. This treaty with Scotland ~~was~~ illustrates that Henry's dynamic force.

no reference made to extract - clearly has some knowledge of foreign policy they are keen to share but could not

Henry VIII secured the Tudor throne through his Treaty of Ayton in 1497 with James IV of Scotland. This treaty demonstrates Henry's dynamic force ~~as~~ through the events leading up to the Treaty. James was a big supporter of Warbeck. He even gave Warbeck his cousin's hand in marriage to Warbeck. Henry feeling threatened by this decided to invade Scotland however James IV started to lose faith in Warbeck and decided to advantage of this and he left signed the Treaty of Ayton. This treaty was sealed by the marriage between Henry's daughter Margaret and James IV. This shows the Tudor throne being further secured and Henry doing whatever he can to achieve it.

The overall view of Extract C is that Henry was 'dependent' and was not completely successful in terms of his government.

There 'In times of danger, even more than in times of peace he was dependent on the support of property owners' Henry. This convincing as Henry would have to look to

'The facts of geography and poor communications were largely responsible for this and compelled him to devolve responsibility to men on the spot.' This is unconvincing as Henry had control over in terms of regional government. They were quite effective. For example later in Wales he appointed his uncle Jasper Tudor and Sir Rhys ap Thomas. The two of them oversaw the government in Wales. In Ireland, Henry appointed Poyning's to oversee government in Ireland this was not done on the spot but in advance. Communications were good as Jasper Tudor and Sir Rhys ap Thomas reported to London. In Ireland communications was also good as Poyning's made Poyning's law which meant that any law made in Ireland had to have the King's approval and any law made in England applied to Ireland.

Much better here - well selected and relevant info

L2 - Just enough for low L2. There is some accurate comment on C and partially on A. Little of any real value for extract B. Lots of knowledge but largely not focused, applied or relevant to the Q or extracts.

### Commentary

This is a good example of a response that seems to struggle to understand the demands of this question. There is sound knowledge of the period and obviously a good level of factual recall. However, and especially for Extract B, the student does not use this knowledge to evaluate or to analyse. In fact, at times the student loses sight of the extract entirely. Knowledge should clearly be used with a purpose in mind – namely to support or to refute identified opinions. In this

---

response, the student is unaware of how this knowledge should be used. Compounding the difficulty is that at least one of the extracts, A, is misunderstood and consequently the student embarks on a very generalised and assertive overview that lacks specific relation to the extract itself. Level 2 is an appropriate mark here, as there is evidence that some of the extracts have been understood and also there is a good knowledge of the period itself. This is especially true for Extract C.

**Level: 2, Mark: 9**



Student B, Q1, Paper 1C, Summer 2022

01

The overall interpretation of ~~the~~ extract A is that Henry VII was a cruel and harsh king that didn't want to spend money, making the extract very convincing. <sup>^^</sup>

Extract A suggests Henry VII was jealous and mean making the extract highly convincing as Henry's attitude towards the nobility may be seen this way. Henry enforced the 'carrot and stick' policy which was a series of rewards and punishments for the nobility arguably enforced as Henry wanted to be ten times richer than the richest noble and this policy would allow him to consolidate financial power over the nobility although it came across as 'mean'. One example of a 'stick' was retaining limits ~~was~~ where noble were not allowed to retain without a licence. Lord Abergavenny was fined £70,550 for retaining illegally, revealing the 'mean' nature of this policy as that amount is unpayable, therefore making the extract highly convincing.

limited grasp of interpretation - focus on issue of finance

Extract A suggests Henry exploited his sources of income, making the extract highly convincing. When Henry came to power in 1485 after the Battle of Bosworth, he had very little money, and with high profile Yorkists still at large, such as Francis Lovell, this made Henry vulnerable to rebellion so he needed to exploit his income. One way he did

good  
range  
of ck  
for  
wealth

this was through The Act of Resumption in 1486 and this was where all land given out by Yorkist kings was put back under the control of the crown. consequently, allowing Henry to make crown lands of ~~this~~ this or redistribute it as patronage. Henry did not give much patronage out, most notably he gave John de Vere land in East Anglia for supporting him at Bosworth, but mainly Henry kept land for himself allowing him to increase crown land revenue to over £40,000 by the end of his reign. In addition to this Henry introduced the Council Learned in Law, run by Empson and Dudley, and this ran all the king's finances and was despised by the nobility. The Council Learned was in control of bonds and recognisances and taxation of the nobility. Therefore, the extract is highly convincing as there was many ways in which Henry exploited his income.

However, ~~the~~ extract A suggests Henry obtained absolute royal control which makes the source less convincing as the rebellion: The Flight of Suffolk remained a constant threat to Henry throughout the entirety of his reign. The Flight of Suffolk was run by John and Edmund de la Pole and gained foreign support from France. Although the rebellion never led to anything serious, its Yorkist leaders



some awareness of extent of control

and intentions of removing Henry VII suggests the rebellion was a constant threat, therefore Henry did not establish absolute royal control making the extract less convincing.

some comment with some evaluation

Overall, Extract A is mostly convincing as Henry VII can be seen as mean and jealous of the nobility seen through his harsh policies and his exploitation of the council learned. However the extract becomes slightly less convincing as it cannot be proven Henry established absolute royal authority due to the constant threat of the flight of Suffolk.

Extract B suggests it was Henry VII's consolidation of power early on rather than his claim to the throne which allowed him to be such a powerful king.

Extract B suggests that early on, Henry sought to stabilise the country, making the extract highly convincing as in order to stabilise England, he firstly needed to stabilise his position as king. When Henry came to power, an issue of his was the previous quick turnover of kings as a result of the Wars of the Roses and this made him vulnerable to rebellion. Henry was able to secure his position and increase his claim to the throne by marrying Elizabeth of York and receiving papal dispensation

consolidation is rel.

suggesting this Union and Henry as King is approved by God therefore stabilising England as it secured his position on the throne, making the extract highly convincing.

not really the interp.

Extract B suggests Henry was not a bloodthirsty King implying he avoided battle at all costs. This makes the extract very convincing as in Simnel's rebellion in 1487, Lambert Simnel pretended to be one of the Princes in the Tower, having a higher claim than Henry VII and planned to usurp him. Henry defeated Simnel at the Battle of Stoke, but he then allowed Simnel to live in his court and showed him mercy, making the extracts point that Henry was not bloodthirsty highly convincing.

However, extract B suggests that it was Henry's diplomacy and security allowing him to secure his dynasty making the extract less convincing as it could be argued it was his clever foreign policy tactics allowing him to secure his dynasty. For example, the Treaty of Medina Del Campo in 1489 secured the marriage between Henry's son Arthur and Catherine of Aragon. Moreover, the Treaty of Perpetual Peace secured the marriage between James of Scotland and Margaret Tudor. Therefore, Henry secured his dynasty through foreign policy marriages.



some awareness of individual elements rather than the overall interpretation

rather than his diplomacy and security, making the extract less convincing.

Overall, extract B is convincing to an extent as it is accurate in stating Henry's aim to stabilise England which can be seen through his papal dispensation and how he was not bloodthirsty, showing mercy to the young Lambert Simnel. However the extract becomes less convincing as it can be proven it was more his foreign policy than diplomacy and security that guaranteed his dynasty's survival.

The overall interpretation of extract C is that Henry was a weak king who needed to rely on others, therefore had no real power.

Extract C suggests Henry relied and was dependent on property owners making the extract convincing as in the Welsh rebellion of 1486, Rhys Ap Thomas was sent to quash it, which he did successfully and was rewarded with patronage. Despite Thomas's success this is arguably a failure for Henry as he was forced to rely on somebody he didn't even trust (Rhys Ap Thomas was a Yorkist who fought against Henry at the Battle of Bosworth), therefore making the extract highly convincing, as he depended on Rhys Ap Thomas.

Extract C suggests Henry had ~~understanding~~ a lack of local protection as there wasn't a police force or a standing army, making the extract less convincing as there was still an element of protection despite these lack of police force and standing army. For example, Henry introduced Justices of the peace (JPs) and Sheriffs from the gentry and these people were in charge of local justice, providing protection for people, therefore making the extract less convincing.

In addition to this, ~~the~~ Extract C suggests Henry's Government was decentralised making the extract less convincing as it is evident many Governmental operations were centralised. For example, Henry had divided the Government into many sections ensuring they were all run by professionals, including the council learned in law, the Star Chamber, the Court of Wards, ~~Manors~~ and the Court of requests. Therefore suggesting Henry's Government was very central and focused so the extract is less convincing.

Overall Extract C is not particularly convincing as although there is evidence to suggest Henry was dependent on others, he was able to ensure local protection and centralisation of Government.

valid argument

provides some supported comment in all three extracts but the focus is on aspects of the extracts rather than the overall interpretation. There is an imbalance in the depth of

### Commentary

This response has elements of evaluation and analysis and hence deserves to be placed in Level 3. Extracts B and C have been understood, but the understanding of what is in A is jumbled and



not entirely focused on the historical issue identified in the question. This becomes something of a theme for this response in which, whilst there is an appreciation of the extracts, there is little that is in depth or detailed. This generalised approach is reinforced by a somewhat superficial use of subject knowledge, which does support argument but lacks the standard of depth and precision that might be expected of an outstanding script. A little more effective linkage between knowledge and arguments in the extracts would have lifted marks here and perhaps a careful effort to ensure that the arguments within the extracts had been fully appreciated.

Level: 3, Mark: 14

## Student C, Q1, Paper 1H, Summer 2022

01 Overall, Freeze's argument doesn't convince me. His main point is that the economy was a great success under Lenin and Stalin which I do not agree with. His first point is that the economy 'surpassed the targets set by the first five-year plan' and that there were 'impressive results'. Despite the successes of larger projects like Magnitogorsk and the Dnieper Dam, a lot of targets weren't met. This is why I don't agree with this argument as Freeze says targets were surpassed, which on the whole they weren't. His second point is that agriculture was 'transformed' under Stalin's rule. Again, I disagree with this statement as collectivisation was a huge failure. Due to poor harvests there was a great famine in Ukraine between 1932-33 which led to the death of 3 million people. In no way do I think this warrants the agriculture being 'transformed'. His final point is that in the years running up to the war there were huge investments channelled into armaments. This I do agree with as Stalin always had a huge focus on heavy industry throughout his reign and not only in the years leading up to WWII. For example the number of tanks made in the five-year plans were more than ever before in Russia, so I find this argument more convincing.

Hosking's argument ~~displays~~ the displays the Russian economy very well and calling it 'lopsided and unsustainable' is a very accurate way of describing it. His first point ~~notes~~ ~~takes~~ ~~notes~~ the huge increase in industrial output, but also how it was quite selective. It was clear to see heavy industry was the main focus of the five-year plans, with production of iron and steel trebling during the first one. Other than this however, little effort was put into other areas, which Hosking's statement portrays perfectly.

relevant point but needed exemplification

identifies some key arguments but ignores the references pre-1928 and there is limited contextual support

broad understanding of argument in B


2



relevant  
comment  
but  
needed  
stronger  
contextual  
reference

This second point ~~that~~ isn't so convincing to me. He says 'other aspects of the economy were downplayed or neglected' and goes on to mention agriculture. Although collectivisation may not have been a huge success, Stalin did put effort into it so I think it's wrong to say it was completely neglected. By 1930 he managed to collectivise 50% of peasants and in 1934 90% were part of collective farms. This first point is that the industrial changes weren't planned very well. This is accurate as the plans were sprung on the workers when a lot of people weren't really prepared for it. This was a reason the plans weren't so successful, as well as the awful conditions they had to work in and the stress they were put under.

Personally, I think ~~every~~ puts forward a strong argument which interprets the five-year plans as failures. First of all however, he mentions the NEP under Lenin. He argues that it 'proved successful' and that the people liked it, which I agree with to an extent. On the whole I don't think ~~it~~ it was very successful. It was a short term solution that worked for a short time but had to be scrapped. In fairness it began the recovery of the economy ~~post~~ civil war but it did no more than that. This second point is that the plans were 'over optimistic' and there was too much pressure put on the workers, who were key to the success of the plans. Up until 1941, none of the five-year plans were ~~completely~~ completed, despite some of the good things that came out of them like heavy industry. As well as this, there was certainly too much pressure put on the workers as Stalin threatened the safety of them and their families should the targets not be met. This first point

 Write the question number inside the box next to the Understand your answer	Answer
<p>Understands C and offers some, although not extensive contextual support</p> <p>Shows a reasonable understanding of all three arguments; offers accurate but not extensive comment and deploys</p>	<p>mentions the cost of life 'in factories and fields' under Stalin. An example of this is the white sea canal, which in the process of being made hundreds were killed. Awful conditions in factories would have also given the workers a hard time, as well as the people in charge of factories. They were given little protection and the people those with power often resorted to violence if they felt people weren't working hard enough. To me, every's analysis describes the issues with the five year plans perfectly, but I don't totally agree with his interpretation of the 103P.</p>
<p>02</p>	<p>The emancipation of the serfs was certainly the most memorable reform of Alexander II rule. After the failure of the Crimean War (1853-56), he was desperate to make a change and did so by bringing in these reforms.</p> <p>The emancipation of the serfs in 1861 was a huge turning point in Russian history. During the process, 23 million serfs were freed. Although this makes it appear it was a huge success, it <del>wasn't</del> didn't exactly go that way. After this, the newly freed peasants became tied to the <u>mir</u>, which <del>was essentially</del> were essentially small villages run by peasants. This meant it didn't really bring on a huge social change as they were still <u>excluded from society</u>. Up until 1881, they still made up around 90% of the population and there weren't many that did well for themselves at this point who could move away from the <u>mir</u>. This was because of redemption payments. Redemption payments applied to all of the emancipated serfs who had to pay back a 7% tax for 49 years. Not only did they make little enough as it was, they were required to give up some of that they did make, which meant even</p>

### Commentary

This is a rather short response, which possibly this reflects the insufficient use of good contextual knowledge by the student. There is understanding of each of the extracts in relation to the historical theme set in the question. There is also some good, short quotation to support this

---

assertion about the overall or main thesis of each extract. However, the evaluation and analysis is weakened as a result of knowledge that is either not specific enough or does not keenly link to the actual argument identified. Where the knowledge does link, it is reasonable to conclude that the candidate is able to extract argument and to evaluate as demanded by Level 3. However this is not done convincingly largely as a result of the amount of contextual knowledge; hence it cannot go to a higher level.

**(Level: 3, Mark: 16)**



---

# Key area 2: A01

## High level responses

Questions 02, 03, 04, Paper 1, Summer 2022 1J The British Empire, c1857–1967

**0 2**

In the years 1858 to 1890, to what extent did British rule change India both economically and socially?

**[25 marks]**

**0 3**

'In the years 1914 to 1948, Britain's imperial power was weakened by its participation in the two world wars.'

Assess the validity of this view.

**[25 marks]**

**0 4**

To what extent did the Empire and its legacy influence the British people and popular culture in the years 1947 to 1967?

**[25 marks]**

## Student A Q4, Paper 1J, Summer 2022

04

Argument signposted - reasonable analysis.

A strong case can be made that the Empire influenced the British people through immigration. An even stronger case can be made that a strong case can be made that the Empire influenced British popular culture through media and sport. An even stronger case can be made that the Empire influenced the British people through immigration. A weak case can be made that the Empire did not influence the British people as ties with Europe were increased. An even weaker case can be made that the Empire did not influence the British people and popular culture as geographical developments occurred. Overall, the Empire and its legacy influenced the British people and popular culture to a large extent.

Sport/TV. Not fully linked to impact of Empire.

A strong case can be made that the Empire influenced British popular culture through media and sport. Alf Lancaster played ~~to~~ the main role in a popular British TV series, and his role was characterised by his ~~stereotype~~ <sup>from the Commonwealth (CW)</sup> and dislike of immigrants. Although Lancaster stated his character was a parody of those who held those views and made fun of them, many of those people embraced his character and praised it more than it was seen for what it really was, satire. This made them believe their beliefs were justified. British sport was widespread in the Empire and CW, with football, cricket and rugby the most common. This meant that when travelling to the Empire & CW, Brits could feel a sense of familiarity. These examples demonstrate how the Empire had a significant influence on British popular culture.

An even stronger case can be made that the Empire influenced the British people through immigration. The Nationality Act was passed in 1948, extending British citizenship to all members of the Empire and CW, due to British domestic employment needs for London's newly developed transport and NHS, founded in 1947 under the Attlee government. The Windrush ship arrived in London a few months later, with 650 Jamaicans seeking employment. The Windrush generation had a significant impact on how the Empire was seen, right up to the



Relevant analysis - impact of immigration.

modern day. Organisations against immigration also emerged, with Oswald Mosley's Union Movement forming in 1957. They held xenophobic conferences and were sometimes violent towards immigrants from the Empire, with the Teddy Boys, a notorious violent gang. These examples show the Empire's influence and its legacy on the British people in a strong way, as it demonstrates how it affected government legislation, impacting Britons as a result.

Links to Europe - valid balance.

A weak case can be made that the Empire did not influence the British people <sup>so strongly</sup> and popular culture, as geopolitical developments occurred. Decolonisation proved a serious ~~ties~~ <sup>ties</sup> with Europe ever increased. Britain grew closer to Europe economically, and by 1965, Britain traded more with Europe than the Empire and CW. This led to European goods flooding the British market, such as German cars and French food becoming dominant for British consumers. Britain attempted to rival the EEC with the EFTA, formed in 1960, which included countries like Portugal and Norway. When the Association failed, Britain attempted to join the EEC twice in 1963 and 1967. This influenced the British people as it told them the future was European and not Empire. However, the EEC rejected Britain's attempts to join, mainly from French President Charles De Gaulle's resistance, demonstrating how European influence was limited, and <sup>that</sup> the Empire still influenced the British people.

Tenuous link to question.

An even weaker case can be made that the Empire did not influence the British people & popular culture so strongly, as geopolitical developments changed Britain's situation. Decolonisation brought about the end of the <sup>formal</sup> Empire, with the India gaining independence in 1947, Burma in 1948 and Kenya in 1963. Meanwhile, Britain strengthened its relations with the US in the midst of the Cold War, maintaining the 'special relationship'. Britain received one of the largest portions of the \$13bn Marshall Plan aid provided to European countries. This shows that Britain had to

Political situation. Partially linked to question.

focus on other countries' relations instead of the Empire. However, ties to the Empire remained in the form of the Commonwealth, which the vast majority of ex-colonial states joined, such as many African nations like Nigeria and the Gold Coast, and ex-Raj nations such as Pakistan and India. This shows how the Empire continued to influence the British people.

Overall, the Empire and its legacy influenced the British people and popular culture to a large extent. Immigration influenced government legislation, the filling of jobs in newly experienced sectors, and domestic opposition with Mosley's Union Movement in 1957. Although geopolitical developments make Britain focus on other nations, the Commonwealth played a significant role in maintaining post-colonial links between Britain and its ex-colonies. The Empire's legacy continues to the modern day with support and minority communities originating from 1947-67.

Reaches partially supported judgement. Reasonable understanding of the question. Range of relevant contextual knowledge and some balance. Some analysis is less successfully linked back to impact on British people or popular culture. Level 4

### Commentary

The student has produced a largely analytical piece that has a sound range of factors, most of which are linked to the question set. The argument is balanced and moves away from description. In fact, there is a clear argument established, even if this is not always fully supported. The analysis is enough to push into Level 4 as it is balanced and supported. However, the lack of sophistication and depth of support prevents the response from going higher. In addition, there is a tendency for the student to report argument rather than to powerfully express their own opinion. At times, this comes close to a description of the views of others rather than a powerful exposition of view. This further limits the marks awarded.

**Level: 4, Mark: 18**



## Student B, Q3, Paper 1J, Summer 2022

- ✓ Calcutta, Bombay, and many other Indian cities, with over 100,000 Indian receiving degrees from these universities before 1940. Moreover, many carpenter helped to set up schools all across the country in an attempt to improve the education of children.
- ✓ However, although it appears on the surface like this demonstrated a significant <sup>social</sup> change to India, and its level of education, in reality these schools had an increasingly limited impact. This new education was only available to a very small proportion of the elites of Indian society. For the rest of the population, there was little change made to their education. So overall, in terms of education, very limited change occurred across India after 1958.

Reaches well-substantiated judgement. Question has been well-understood and there is a range of well-selected information and sophisticated analysis.

So overall, in education relating to British rule in India only changed to a small extent between 1958 and 1940. Although on the surface Britain appeared to make many economic and social reforms, in reality most of these changes were simply superficial. The changes made actually had little impact on the day to day lives of the average Indian citizen, with changes being in a very limited area of the country, as only impacting a small group of society. It could also be said that while social reforms, specifically relating to traditions, had the most significant <sup>widespread impact</sup>.

- Q3
- Both world war one and world war two had vastly significant consequences both for Britain and the world as a whole. They led to significant financial burdens, as well as a changing world stage. It could be argued that these burdens led to a significant reduction in Britain's power, and consequently imperial control. However, it could also be argued that the wars

Argument signposted.

actually strengthened Britain's position, and it was other factors that contributed towards imperial retreat during this time period.

Counter-argument - strengthened.

It could be argued that this view is inaccurate, as on the surface, the British Empire, and imperial power appeared to be strengthened by WWI. Following Germany's defeat in the war, its empire along with its allies' empires, were broken up and given to other European powers as 'mandates'. Consequently following the Treaty of Versailles, Britain gained millions of new subjects, and ~~millions~~ millions of square miles of new land. Some colonies acquired included the Cameroons, Iraq and Palestine. With Iraq and Palestine being especially beneficial as they provided access to the Suez canal, as well as the large oil reserves in the Middle East. Therefore, as the British Empire was the strongest it had ever been, on the surface, it could be argued that imperial power had in fact been strengthened. However, in reality, this is inaccurate. These new acquisitions meant that Britain's already weakened economy had ~~been~~ to be stretched even further in order to maintain imperial defence.

Balance - not strengthened, WWI

Therefore as a consequence Britain had to start making concessions to colonies where there were nationalist stirrings. The Government of India Act 1919 established dyarchy and gave them a degree of self-rule. Moreover, following 12 years of guerrilla warfare, Britain granted Ireland with dominion status. Therefore it is clear that in many cases, Britain was likely to give in to certain nationalist demands, as a consequence of then being unable to police the entirety of their newly acquired empire. So, overall it could be argued that in reality WWI did actually serve to weaken Britain's imperial power, as it could no longer maintain full control in all of its colonies, and therefore started the path towards decolonisation.



Weakened - WWII

It could furthermore be argued that WW2 caused even greater damage to Britain's imperial power. The economic consequences of World War Two for Britain were even more substantial for Britain than they had been following World War One, and as a consequence of Lend-Lease, Britain was massively in debt to the US. In addition to this, the war had resulted in a great shift in world power. Britain was no longer the world power it had once been, as proved by its need for assistance from the US, now the world stage was dominated by the US and the USSR. Moreover, the US was strongly anti-imperialist, so maintaining good relations with them meant for Britain having to sacrifice their empire. This was so obvious to see, as Britain lost multiple significant colonies immediately following the conclusion of the war. India was granted independence in 1947, as Britain felt it was unnecessary and a waste of resources trying and suppress any further conflict there. Moreover, a changing of leadership to the more anti-imperialist Labour Party increased Britain's desire to leave India behind. Furthermore, also in 1947, Britain chose to give Palestine over to a UN commission, no longer prepared to deal with the constant conflict occurring there. This is significant in showing how far Britain was weakened, as they had previously been so keen to maintain control of Palestine due to its access to the Suez canal. So overall, it is accepted to state that WW2 significantly weakened Britain's imperial power and put it well on its way to empire's eventual demise.

However, it must also be considered that other factors played a significant role in the loss of Britain's imperial

Challenge from nationalist movements. Range of examples

Power during this time period. It could be argued that nationalist movements were more significant in causing decolonisation. It was nationalist demands <sup>(from Indian nationalist Congress)</sup> that forced Britain to pass both the 1919 and 1935 governments of India Acts, ~~weakening~~ <sup>weakening</sup> their own position there, and providing more autonomy on their own affairs to India. Moreover, in Ireland it was constant rebellions and fighting by the IRA that played a significant role in why Britain granted them independence. However, despite this it must also be considered that the two world wars indirectly influenced these nationalist movements and the impact they were able to have. For one, witnessing certain British defeats gave them confidence, as they no longer saw Britain as undefeatable, and crushed the myth of Britain as superior. Moreover, due to Britain's greatly weakened state after the world wars, they were no longer able to fully suppress nationalist uprisings, so consequently made concessions and ~~eventually~~ granted independence, to avoid the risk of conflict. So, overall, despite nationalist movements playing a role in the weakening of Britain's imperial position, ~~ultimately~~ it was the world wars that allowed them to have such a significant impact.

So, in ~~conclusion~~ conclusion, overall I find this statement mostly valid, that Britain's Imperial power was greatly weakened by its participation in the two world wars. The wars both significantly economically and militarily weakened Britain. This therefore meant that it was unable to fully suppress any nationalist movements, so was forced to make concessions, and ~~weaken~~ their imperial power. This means that overall, despite the world wars being arguably the most significant factor



it weakening Britain's economic position, it was ultimately a combination of both nationalist movements and the wars that led Britain down the path towards decolonisation.

Reaches substantiated judgement. Balanced answer, which is well-focused. Range of examples - minor limitations in some places to contextual knowledge. Fully analytical, with a very good understanding of the question. Level 5

### Commentary

This response clearly establishes an argument from the very outset and maintains it as the piece develops. This analytical direction is thoroughly and convincingly supported by good contextual knowledge that is, in almost all cases, used to directly reinforce opinion being expressed. The few occasions in which the knowledge comes to dominate accounts for the slight reduction in marks for this essay. However, this does not detract from the impression of a well-balanced and judgemental piece that is focused on proving a point from the very outset.

**Level: 5, Mark: 23**

Student C, Q2, Paper 1J, Summer 2022

02

Argument  
signpost  
d.

In the years 1858 to 1890, following the mutiny, Britain's rule ~~while~~ Britain's rule certainly changed India economically and socially. However, while the benefits of the economy and production may have increased, and the ~~as~~ social opportunities for Indians seemingly improved, this was arguably superficial, only the wealthy sector of society reaping the benefits, the poorer classes of the country having ~~nothing~~ suffering similarly to how they had before hand.

Change -  
economic.

In terms of economic change, following the mutiny, India definitely saw certain aspects ~~improving~~ <sup>benefit</sup> improving, however ~~whether~~ this was for the people's ~~wealthy~~ <sup>benefit</sup> and Britain's strategic benefits ~~it is~~ <sup>is</sup> position can be questioned. ~~arguably~~ this was for Britain's strategic position and ~~benefits~~ <sup>issues</sup> to the people. For instance, an increase in tea plantations. ~~An increase~~ The growing economy can perhaps be witnessed in the fact that tea plantations increased from one to 1 to 295 between 1951 to 1971, suggesting a ~~change~~ a change in production within the country to facilitate trade. What's more, the railways increased dramatically, from 288 miles in 1958, to 3000 miles <sup>built</sup> following the mutiny, ~~pro~~ displaying more effort ~~being put into~~ <sup>to</sup> India for transporting goods and again facilitating trade. ~~However~~, in this way it seems that ~~India's~~ <sup>Britain</sup> was changing India to be better, yet it can also be argued that these measures were strategic, the railways providing quick rates of passage for troops and the tea plantations increasing exports to Britain and allowing



Counter-argument - did not change. Analysis here is slightly about improvement or not, str

for more cheap labour and low pay for Indians. Therefore while ~~at~~ economic Britain did ~~have~~ ~~on~~ economic measures to increase productivity, what's more, the subsistence farming prevailed in India, specialisation of high value cash crops over low value grains leading to Indian dependence on food imports, and thus the consumption per head declining. This displayed that Britain had made little change to the economic situation ~~in India~~ as the people positively, instead the increasing trade leading to devastating effects. This was reinforced by the famine rates that remained extremely high, as in the 1870s, over 6 million Indians died.

It is therefore that while economically, India benefited Britain more and more

Furthermore, land irrigation and investment schemes only impacted 6% of India, the British ~~the~~ rule again doing little change to the internal state of India.

It is therefore that, while certain improvements were made to India in the form of railways and telegraph lines, the people of India suffered drastically, famine rates high, irrigation doing little and food imports from Britain ~~blowing~~ <sup>blowing</sup> their own viable market development, suggesting that economically, Britain changed India for the worse.

Social change - covering range of question focus.

Socially, during 1858, <sup>the</sup> British made several changes in their treatment to India people, the Indian ~~making~~ opening their eyes to the need of new change. For example, the doctrine of lapse was removed, meaning ensuring the loyalty of princely states whom that previously had been land stripped from them unfairly. The tradition of adoption was inventively mocked by Dalhousie. Furthermore, Mary Carpenter, a moral reformer, went to India and created girls' schools in

- ✓ Monbasa and Ahmedabad and a college to train female teacher, also created the National Indian association in 1870 to promote Indian reforms,
  - ✓ displaying active efforts to improve educational opportunities. Similarly, of the 1712 Calcutta University students to graduate in 1882,
  - ✓ 1/3 entered government service and more went into the legal profession, displaying the British being more open to enhanced political voices of the people.
- ~~For the reform of the Indian army as they also proposed to rule in a more religiously sensitive way following the meeting, highlighting changes attempted to be made in attitudes of the British.~~
- ~~If it is therefore that socially, active improvements and reforms were made to increase Indian trust and. These measures all helped the material state of India by increasing opportunities for the people, suggesting change for the better.~~

Furthermore, socially, there were attempts to win support of the people. This was seen in Lord Curzon's rehashing of India from 1899-1905, trying to win back those alienated by British rule. Furthermore, Indians were given out Star of India medals to reward helping during the military and the British promised to rule more sensitively. Overall therefore, socially British rule in India seemed to change for the better, Indians provided with more opportunities and education and sensitivity as before 1858.

On the other hand, the social changes made are arguably only benefited those of the upper classes, similar to suggesting that the measures imposed were primarily superficial.

Balance/  
analysis.





Unclear  
example -  
political  
representat  
ion.

For instance, while many more Indians were given educational opportunities, these were only really accessible by the wealthy part of society, evidence being the widespread illiteracy rates that were maintained. Furthermore, the vernacular press act imposed by Lord Lytton in 1878 was intended to gag criticism over British or non-English newspapers, implying an attempt to silence opinions. The leaders of the <sup>Indian National Association (INA)</sup> ~~seemed to accept~~ suggested a growing dislike for British rule, perhaps as a result of the limited accessibility to reforms. The INA made to the first sense of nationalism <sup>coordinating a</sup> ~~was~~ so what's more, that a two-tiered government system was created, effectively keeping the belief that races should be kept apart. Indians disallowed from reaching the higher levels of the legislative assembly, going against the intended ~~political activity~~ <sup>political activity</sup>. This ~~disproportionate job of~~ displayed that while a change had been made in including Indians more in government service, the change was superficial and limited, as they had no real say over any policies. The race distinction was also going back on that the British promising to rule more sensitively, their stereotypes and racism preventing true inclusion. Therefore, while overall social changes were made and some were for the better, such as May Capers, ~~not~~ on a country-wide scale, they were extremely limited. The change only beneficial to the wealthy who could enter educational jobs. ✓

So social change was also made in the army, the reform as a result of the mutiny changing India into a country that could be more easily controlled.

Change in  
army -  
questiona-  
ble  
whether  
this is  
social.

For instance, 62 K~~to~~ out of the 74 Bengali regiments were disbanded due to their disloyalty during the mutiny. Additionally, ~~the army~~ the army was made into a ratio of 1:2 of British to Indian troops in an attempt to maintain control. What's more, ammunition was put into British hands and <sup>regimental</sup> regiments were made to live in separate areas to prevent disunity. ~~These measures~~ The officers were also requested to treat ~~the~~ as the people were sensitively following the outcry that resulted from the use of enfold rifles covered in pig fat which had ~~off~~ offended Hindu and Muslim beliefs. ~~These measures~~ While this measure was positive and demonstrated more sensitive actions towards the troops, the rest of the army reforms were made to maintain ultimate British control, comparable to that of the economic improvements like the railways. The mutiny had shown the British that they had to rule more carefully and restrict military among Indian troops. It is therefore that the army reforms <sup>provided a</sup> ~~were a~~ big social change, but not a ~~benefit~~ to social change of before the mutiny, but only to accommodate British power.

To conclude, Britain's rule in India did change from 1858 and 1890 due to the mutiny's impact showing them they were out of control. However, the changes that were made only benefited the elite and the poor continued to suffer. The changes only added to Britain's imperial position as the expert of the internal state of India.

Reaches judgement. Generally question has been well-understood, although some material is less relevant. Nonetheless, there is a range of sophisticated and detailed analysis which addresses all parts of the Q. LE.





---

### Commentary

The clear strength of this response is the attempt to answer all aspects of the set question. There is range of knowledge and a very good attempt to include a variety of factors. This does possibly weaken some of the powerful focus established at the outset and the original examiner correctly identifies that some of the factors have only a tenuous link. Knowledge is, however, generally used well to support a thesis advanced by the student. This response clearly moves beyond simple description or summary, but towards the end of the piece especially there is a more generalised attempt to support argument and this is where some of the more obscure links are made. It's possible that more time spent on the initial themes would have secured higher marks. However, this remains a keenly analytical piece, which is evaluative from the outset and provides a good and substantiated answer to the set question.

**Level: 5, Mark: 22**

## Mid-/low-level response(s)

### Student A Q2, Paper 1L, Summer 2022

02

Intro Judgement made

RS impact

Some relevant assessment/support but long development and not moving the answer on

Development but needs to be more analytical and linked to focus

Between the years 1871 to 1890, opposition of the Reichstag had little impact on Bismarck's policies. This is evident in the huge amount of support Bismarck had from his parties and the government, which helped Bismarck to pass policies in the Reichstag.

Firstly, Bismarck suffered from a lot of opposition from the SPD and Socialist parties. Bismarck's ideal Germany would be ~~autocratic~~ and free of Socialists. Bismarck believed that the Socialists threatened the unity of Germany and the society within it. Therefore during the late 1870's, Bismarck put the anti-Socialist laws <sup>was</sup> into place, which <sup>was</sup> supported from a large majority of other parties. The SPD opposed this, due to the idea that they would eventually lose support. The law was passed in May to prevent a political attack from the SPD and Socialists who were planning to overthrow Bismarck. Police powers were increased, arresting thousands of Socialists who threatened to break laws included in the Anti-Socialist laws that included any Socialist gatherings and meetings. The laws remained in place due to the huge support that he was getting, as society was also in support of him. However, the SPD, despite the laws that



Moving beyond the focus here

a bit vague

prevented Socialists from gaining power, gained over a million new members as a result of the laws. Bismarck dissolved the Reichstag in hope that it would break support away from the SPD, however it was evident that this was far from useful. This shows that despite the growing support that ~~Bismarck~~ the SPD was gaining, it had no effect against the anti Socialist policies that he was putting into place. ?

Lim RS opp

Some relevant assessment but not

Bismarck had little opposition in the Reichstag when he introduced the economic protectionism ~~policy~~ policies. His policies introduced a ban on foreign wheat exports to help the agriculture within Germany at the time. Bismarck suffered little opposition within the Reichstag allowing for an immediate pass and the policy to be put into action. The policy had huge support from everyone who supported agriculture, which included farmers. Those who opposed the policy had little effect on the policy when it was introduced meaning that the law

was able to be kept in place.

Needs better development

Finally, Bismarck had little opposition in the Reichstag when it came to dealing with Society.<sup>?</sup> Bismarck introduced several social reforms which helped Society, especially those who were least fortunate. These new social reforms faced very little opposition as it was majority supported by those within the Reichstag, therefore it was passed and it made a large effect on Society due to its positive effects.

Judgement

Overall, it is evident that Bismarck's policies between the years 1871 to 1890 were not affected by opposition in the Reichstag, therefore there were little effect on his policies. Bismarck was able to successfully pass laws and policies that affected Germany politically, economically and socially.

L3 Reasonable understanding with fair range. Some valid assessment but more development needed. There is no real balance to the answer.

04

### Commentary

This response begins in a promising fashion with an attempt to provide an answer to the set question in a short and focused introduction. However, subsequent attempts to prove this judgement are weak as the student either lacked the specific knowledge necessary or had difficulty linking events to possible judgements. Whilst the level of knowledge is generally good, the level of understanding is much less convincing and some of the information used is only loosely linked to the set question. In addition, much of this knowledge, even for a breadth question, was too superficial to really support an effective argument. The lack of balance further reduces the marks available to this response. There are elements of analysis and there is an attempted evaluation, and hence the mark should be above Level 2, but the judgement is not convincingly supported and so it remains in Level 3.

**Level: 3, Mark: 13**



## Student B, Q4, Paper 1L, Summer 2022

<p>Q4</p> <p>Judgement not substantiated</p>	<p>The weakness and fall of democracy in Germany between 1918 - 1934 was due to economic problems. The end of the war left Germany with War debts due to the Treaty of Versailles, stating that the war was Germany's fault and they would have to pay 6.6 billion marks as reparations. However the German economy couldn't handle these reparations as it was on shaky grounds anyway. Pre war living standard were on the rise but wages were low in comparison to other countries, meaning what money Germany could pay wouldn't be enough for the other countries involved. Therefore democracy was presented as weak due to its economic standing in the World.</p>
<p>Limited assessment and generalistic development</p> <p>No clear link</p>	<p>The occupation of the Ruhr, by the French worsened the economic situation of Germany as France's need for payment forced Germans to print money faster, making the value of the mark worthless. This period of hyperinflation showed the weakness of democracy through their inability to pay France without causing more economic problems for themselves. The value of the mark was so little people were using it as fuel in their fireplaces that way it was more useful, Germans would rather take the wheelbarrow than the money in it. This shows the fragility of democracy due to Germany's inability to hold a stable economy.</p>
<p>Generalist development with little clear explanation of weakening democracy</p>	<p>The apparent 'Golden years' of 1924 to 1929 shows signs of economic growth. However this sudden growth is only due to foreign investment from America in order to help Germany pay back reparations. From Chancellor to foreign minister, Stresemann is the face of this 'Golden' period as he agreed to accept America's aid. Many people saw Stresemann as the man who rebuilt after the damage of the War, however, it can also be said he did not rebuild but rather paper over the cracks. America loaned 200 000 000 marks to Germany under the Dawes Plan to give Germany a helping hand in starting payments of reparations.</p>
<p>Development not clearly linked to focus</p>	

With Germany still struggling to keep up with payments a new plan was agreed. The Young Plan replaced the Dawes Plan and reduced the reparations Germany owed from 6.6 billion marks down to 1.58 billion marks, while this felt like economic growth this left Germany more unstable as it was very reliant on American investment. This showed German democracy as weak in the years 1914-1934 due to the economy being heavily reliant on foreign investment.

The fall of democracy in Germany was brought on by America recalling all their loans, leading Germany to the Wall Street Crash in October 1929. This event left Germany in an economic depression, ruining the people's view on democracy. The inability to recover economically helped Germany go from democracy to dictatorship as in the German people's eyes a democracy is too weak.

Low L2. Partial understanding. There is support here but much is not linked clearly to the focus and assessed in the right way. There is no balance. Judgement does begin to address the focus.

### Commentary

This response struggles to make effective links to the question. Whilst there is an assertive opening which does appear to show understanding, very little of the material then used is linked to the question set. On the surface, this appears a sound response from a student with some understanding or knowledge of the period. However very little of this knowledge moves beyond the generalised. It's difficult, therefore, to conclude that the question has been fully understood. The brief occasions in which there is an attempt to make a link is enough to lift out of Level 1, but there is little to suggest that the response is even descriptive of the themes or issues of the period; therefore it cannot advance far into Level 2.

**Level: 2, Mark: 6**



Student C, Q4, Paper 1G, Summer 2022

04

some view  
offerd

In the years 1940 to 1964, the extent to which Labour and conservative had reached a political consensus was rather to a far extent. There had been a previous similarity to a few ideas in the years of the coalition government under Churchill. This seemed to have carried on even after the Labour government of 1945, as hardly any ~~fewer~~ repeals had taken place.

Would  
benefit from  
a range of  
contextual  
support

The coalition government did of course butt heads on a few policies because they did of course have rather contradicting opinions but they realized that it was an important time to unite. Some reforms and policy passed by that government was aimed at younger generations focusing on immunisation and education etc. They also passed other policy which focused on employment and housing for victims of the blitz. This all represented a very collective attitude and consensus, government intervention was a necessary factor

Needs to address the question

and this was finally agreed on.

Attlee's first ministry 1945 to 1951 was seen as the biggest reforming ministry in the history of British politics at that time. They had a very specific list of reforming policy which would involve state intervention on nationalisation, education, ~~the~~ welfare state and family insurance/allowance. The Beveridge report 1942, during the coalition government, had basically laid out ~~a~~ what the Labour party was aiming to develop on, he addressed 5 evils of: want, squalor, idleness, ignorance and disease and stated how ~~the~~ each policy would help. Similarly Bevan had introduced the idea of National Health Services and State welfare. Now although these went against the conservative ideology of conservatives, they were not all entirely against the idea. Churchill did think that it could produce a very unrealistic optimism and insurance companies were opposed, it was agreed that social change was needed through political reform. \*

some difference - needs to link to the focus

The idea of the political consensus is really highlighted in 1951 after the conservatives won the election. They were very careful in how they went about the previous Labour policy



Some commentary

as they understood just how important Nationalisation and government intervention was, especially to the electorate. In the next few years of conservative dominance 1951 to ~~62~~ 64 the only thing that was denationalised was the Steel and transport industries, the government wanted to have a minor control in key industries. They did not reverse any policy which set up the NHS and they supported the family allowance policies to help families care for children.

could develop

In fact in 1952 they increased the money given to families per child from 3 shillings to 8 shillings. It was argued that the conservatives had not really adopted these opinions and that it was instead the aim to just act in agreement to gain support. ~~However~~ However, it may be countered by the fact that after the 1951 election and within the next 13 years, the conservatives would have reversed any policy they disagreed with. This is because they were not faced by huge labour opposition, Bevan and Gaitskell had split the party at this time. It would have been unlikely for the conservatives to lose all their support if they reversed some policy, therefore showing a certain extent of agreement.

some argument

Judgement -  
although not  
really covered  
the period -  
mentions  
Churchill

Overall, I do believe that the consensus between the Labour and conservative party in the years ~~1945-1956~~ 1940 to 1964 was to a rather large extent.

The idea that State intervention was very necessary can be recognised and the policy passed by one party would remain <sup>mostly</sup> untouched by the other.

Showing political agreement and Consensus.

\* Page 11, Line 28

The reform of education was also very important ~~from~~ for the country. The Butlers Education Act ~~19~~ 1944 was a good example of political agreement. Its aims were increase the amount of children in school by making attendance compulsory and separating primary and secondary. It also introduced nursery and the 11+ examination, which would determine what secondary school the child would attend out of the three, tech, grammar and modern.

Education  
reforms

The Butlers act was passed during the coalition but labelled as a Labour policy, as it was passed by 2AB, Butler, and it was met with minimal opposition. This is a good example of Party Consensus.

There was however not always political consensus within the parties. Labours division highlights ~~the~~ different



internal division - not really linked to the question

opinions in a party passing the policy. Bevan and Gaitskell had split the Labour party during the conservative government over prescription charges. This later lead to the resignation of Bevan and showed weakness of Labour. Gaitskell had the opportunity to pull the party back together in 1959 ~~however~~ however missed the opportunity.

The answer is quite partial. It ends really with Churchill's government. Some description. Limits to the range. L2

### Commentary

This is something of a mix between a descriptive answer and an overly assertive attempt to address the focus. This combination produces a largely unconvincing response. Whilst there is certainly a view/judgement offered at the outset, this is not supported by good and precise subject knowledge. In fact, the support offered tends to be further opinion or generalised statement and there is very little use of factual material. When precise factual material is utilised, for example in the second paragraph, this is not clearly linked to supporting an argument or judgement. Hence it remains descriptive as found at Level 2. The full demands of the question are not therefore addressed and there are in addition some notable gaps in the chronology. This further limits the marks available for breadth questions which need to convey an awareness of the full period set in the question.

**Level: 2, Mark: 10**





---

## Contact us

Our friendly team will be happy to support you between 8am and 5pm, Monday to Friday.

**Tel:** 0161 958 3865

**Email:** [history@aqa.org.uk](mailto:history@aqa.org.uk)

**Twitter:** [@AQA](https://twitter.com/AQA)

[aqa.org.uk](https://aqa.org.uk)