

A-level HISTORY

Feedback on Component 1 2022

Pre-event booklet

Published: Autumn 2022



Contents	Page
Key area 1: AO3	4
Key area 2: AO1	35

Key area 1: A03

High-level response(s)

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. 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.

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, 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.

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 characterized 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 a ^{over-}disturbance on ^{parliament} parliament, 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~~^{seek} 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 a ~~reward~~ 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 21st Aug 1485, to ensure that all Yorkist nobility involved against him could be considered traitors. He was thus able to impose on the magnates ~~them~~ with bonds and therefore extract their wealth and ensure ^{their} complicity. Whilst this did serve to ~~serve~~ improve royal finance, it was most successful in its aim to reduce noble wealth. Green is unwavering 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~~ ^{Green} overexaggerates the 'severity' of

Henry's actions and overstatements are not that his own greed underpinned financial policy.

Guy argues that Henry was a sensible and apt 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 overstates his personal political presence.

Guy is convincing in suggesting that Henry was neither blood-thirsty or self-centred. This can be seen in his reasonable ~~and~~ foreign policy that certainly lacked the ambition of English power evident in his son's reign. To suggest, however, that Henry led his army to France because the 'nobility admired mighty chivalric kings' is an over-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 constrained when 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 not a competent leader, neither self-centred or blood-thirsty, he is not convincing in suggesting that Henry's

politics were ever rooted in a desire to parallel
to the country's admiration for kingship and
chivalry.

But is convincing in asserting that Henry VII
needed 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
betrayal of Sir William Stanley, his
step-uncle and trusted lord Chamberlain.
Having been exposed as a compliser 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 instrumentalisation of power in not a few
royal councillors, like Bishop Beaufort,
served to perpetuate this perception of him.
- especially concerning their involvement in royal
financial policies. Whilst this is correct
in stating that Henry 'sowed the seeds for
the Tudors', this was not the product of his
'dynamic force'. His centralised form of govt
created fear rather than admiration.

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

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

Looney argues that Henry was never successful in fully asserting monarchical authority. He argues that Henry was restricted by the English formalities of power. Looney asserts that due to his own military weakness, Henry was dependent on English property owners. He states that Henry was ultimately dependent on the economic complicity of his nation. Looney is convincing in his suggestion that Henry was largely dependent on townsmen and local government, but overstates Henry's weakness in his policy. Henry ultimately pursued 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 Semmel and Herbert), he ultimately remained supreme. His victory at the Battle of Stone in 1487 suggests that his 'standing army' was capable of defending his monarchical authority. Though he was dependent on property

barons' such as the traditional for-
mation to operate or Henry of him in
further regions, by the end of his reign,
this method proved effective. However,
~~Henry's reliance on landowners~~
~~was not the only way to ensure~~
~~Henry's reliance on landowners.~~
Henry's reliance on landowners
was not the only way to ensure
Henry's reliance on landowners.
Henry's reliance on landowners
was not the only way to ensure
Henry's reliance on landowners.
Henry's reliance on landowners
was not the only way to ensure
Henry's reliance on landowners.
Henry's reliance on landowners
was not the only way to ensure
Henry's reliance on landowners.

Lochner overexaggerates Henry's devotion
of power to 'men of the sword'. Whilst
Henry's reliance on local government did
sometimes mean indirectly receiving
order from within he did not have
that, such as the Duke of Burgundy.
His epithet epithet in central government
showed that this did not impact too
much of a difficulty. By ensuring
his own centralised power by supplying
nobility with Acts of attainder
punish & it accordingly, Henry ensured
that his reliance on landowners
was underpinned by his ~~centralised~~
unassisted monarchical authority and
unvaried power.

Thus, whilst Lochner is convincing
in suggesting that Henry relied on
the cooperation of the political nation,
he is less convincing in suggesting that
Henry was not an absolute monarch.

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 ~~it~~ 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

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 billion 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 ~~to~~ to starvation which would not have occurred if the economy was not so bankrupt. Thus the ~~source~~ ^{interpretation} lacks convincingness as it undervalues 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.

~~But~~ 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~~ 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 ^{rapid} 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

of the economy were ignored. This adds value to Hocking's 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 workers 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 ~~fast~~ rapid growth Russia's industrial economy experienced. However, Hocking 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 ~~valid~~ convincing as it correctly identifies that Russia focused on the commanding heights of the economy while neglecting areas such as consumer goods. ^{the} However, it is dragged down by its downplaying of the importance of the NEP and failure to mention the failures in agriculture.

*In addition the economy did seem to be stagnant 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 ~~economic~~ 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 grudgingly 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 consistency 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 focus on capitalism.

Student C, Q1, Paper 1H, Summer 2022

within extract A, Freeze presents an overly-positive view on the Soviet economy, despite some accumulating impressive achievements. Freeze's main argument centres around the ~~the~~ introduction of Lenin's NEP, brought about to solve the crisis of war communism which he makes bear indication of in ~~his~~ ~~the~~ by stating it was 'in need of respite by 1921'. Freeze makes the convincing statement that by '1926 it had already begun to revive' as the NEP indeed achieved initial re-stabilisation, with 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 ~~long~~ short-term in its success, ~~and~~ with a spike in agriculture - so, by 1927, grain procurement was 75% of 1926, agriculture was still extremely backward (farms using wooden ploughs) and, ~~the~~ NEP what grain production had been at 17 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 ~~next~~ Five-Year-Plans beginning in 1928, and considering that electricity output had increased 300% and coal ^{output} from doubled during the first plan, Freeze's ~~of~~ assertion that it 'could boast some real achievements' seems very convincing. However, once again, Freeze seems to ignore the pitfalls; due to unrealistic high targets, none of the first five-year plans' targets were actually achieved, despite Freeze's argument of 'gross industrial production' 'surpassed the targets'. Moreover, he also glosses over the failures that with Stalin's process of collectivisation, early mentioning that 'agriculture lagged behind', which seems to not emphasise the fact that, by 1941, the USSR

was not producing less grain than under the NEP. Finally, Pivze returns to a more convincing argument about the 'great economy' was in a strong position on the eve of war' as industrialisation ^(double typed) ~~was~~ increased three-fold by 1941 and indeed strengthened the economy until the 3rd FY with the foundations for war. At least the USSR did need close the gap with the west' as it to overtake Britain in ^{iron and steel production} ~~output~~ ~~and~~ ~~production~~ by 1940, the economy still faced issues of uneven industrial development and a talk continued focus on quantity over quality. Overall, Pivze's argument is convincing. The real ^{economic} achievement but fails to acknowledge the negatives.

William Hovsing, in extract B, ~~too~~ provides a generally convincing, ~~it~~ yet perhaps ^{overly} ~~strongly~~ negative picture of the Soviet economy. Hovsing 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 1920s war. Hovsing's argument contributes 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, ~~and~~ ~~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 do to develop heavy industry in order to 'catch up' with the USA. Indeed Hovsing continues to point out the 'regimented' nature of consumer goods and housing which never received attention despite the promise of increased five-year plans to double the output of higher

industries including consumer goods. However, Hough's ~~the~~ perhaps depicts the plans too negatively in his discussion of the neglect of 'chemical and electrical' goods industries, ~~with~~ a heavy production nonetheless doubled during the second five-year plan of 1933-37. Moreover, the emphasis of 'construction projects' also take on a negative association for Soviet history. Considering that many, like Rogovin, who had founded the largest ~~to~~ blast furnace in the world, led to great initial success. Overall, Hough's a general argument that 'Soviet's seemingly impressive' growth ~~is~~ was 'top-sided and unsustainable' ^{is generally} ~~is generally~~ ^{immaculate}, definitely for the better process of collectivisation, yet it also ~~is~~ ~~states~~ ~~resents~~ the achievements as less than they really were.

Within extract C, Overy's ~~the~~ argument is partially convincing yet is also arguing overly-negatively, focusing on the how the Soviet economy affected the people such as workers and peasants. Overy's opening discussion on the NEP meaning 'business' and 'popular with workers and peasants' ~~is~~ ~~a~~ seems very unconvincing considering that, whilst the NEP may have revived the economy in the short term, it was a constant source of trouble for ordinary people - excluding the urban and the NEP was being wiped off of private enterprise. Various ~~in~~ 'scissors crisis' (as termed by Trotsky) occurred during the NEP as ~~scissors~~ prices of goods rose from the late 1920s, ~~where~~ ~~grain~~ ~~prices~~ 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 rise, despite better working conditions, and they resented being led by single managers or factories.

Strong. However, Strong does not see the NEP as 'ideologically wrong', which is confusing considering Lenin was taking opposition from within the party, mainly concerning the return of private trade or betrayal of socialism. Strong commends with the ~~argument~~ ^{expectation that} 'capitalism had to be destroyed', which was indeed the principle Stalin led with when he aimed to introduce his new centralized command economy - ~~which~~ he dropped the 'Great Break' from the past - at the 15th party congress in 1927. Strong's following argument ~~is~~ focused on the 'Economic Solution' of 'ordinary workers and farmers' which seems partially valid; the during Stalin's process of collectivisation there ~~was~~ ^{were} incentives given to peasants such as tax breaks and better quality land if they followed the system, however, most that ^{many} ~~of~~ the peasants were also forced by violent methods such as shock brigades, something which Strong only ~~focuses on~~ ^{focuses on} near the end of their argument, ~~to the focus on~~ ^{to neglects} ~~the~~ ^{'economic'} propaganda alongside ~~the~~ also played a big role in getting workers on board. For instance, Arseny Shadrin - who reportedly mined 14k kg of gold in 1935 - was used as the model proletarian and used in various campaigns to promote industrialisation. Many workers responded to this ~~type~~ ^{type} propaganda, ~~the~~ ^{including} Strong's argument that ~~it~~ ^{it} worked 'better in theory' than a too ~~dominate~~ ^{dominate} ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~strong's~~ ^{strong's} ~~argument~~ ^{argument} ~~did~~ ^{did} ~~turn~~ ^{turn} convincing in collectivisation, where many peasants received via ~~as~~ ^{as} ~~and~~ ^{and} ~~losing~~ ^{losing} ~~their~~ ^{their} ~~livestock~~ ^{livestock} ~~which~~ ^{which} ~~had~~ ^{had} ~~been~~ ^{been} ~~from~~ ^{from} 1928 - 32). ~~Another~~ ^{Another} ~~strong's~~ ^{strong's} ~~downside~~ ^{downside} 'work penalties' seems convincing as failures to meet the targets of the five-year-plan would often

lead to arrest or worse, and many over-exaggerated figures to prevent this, indeed causing a 'cycle of cuts' as O'Reilly put it considering the famine in Ukraine (1932) caused around 5.7 million deaths due to over-enthusiastic reporting. Overall, O'Reilly's argument ~~is~~ ^{is} about the ~~the~~ Soviet Union's 'extraordinary violence' in 'factories and fields' has value, especially in agriculture, but also presents worker response and industrial success as merely negative.

Mid-/low-level response(s)

Student A, Q1, Paper 1C, Summer 2022

The overall view of ~~extra~~ extract A is Henry VIII was that Henry VII was controlling and ~~had~~ would oversee everything to do with ~~stanes~~ finance. AS well as ~~made~~ Sure people knew that his right to the throne was purely his.

"Although he based his rights to the throne solely on parliamentary title, his main concern was the accumulation of ~~breach~~ which would relieve him of the need to call parliament." This is convincing as Henry VII ~~re~~ predated his reign to 21st August 1485 as the battle of Bosworth took place ~~at~~ on 22nd 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 30th of October 1485 this meant by the time he ~~met~~ Parliament ~~it~~ they ~~was~~ on the 7th November 1485 they would have to respect him as king. This can be seen as unconvincing as ~~for~~ Henry VII only called parliament 7 times during his reign ~~we~~ which would show that his ~~set~~ ~~was~~ main concern" was elsewhere.

"Henry also revived the criminal jurisdiction of the Royal Council and enabled justices of the peace to try without ~~juris~~." This unconvincing as that even though Henry did revive the ~~eff~~ Royal Council he did ~~not~~ use it as much and it was rather insignificant. Henry allowing justices of the peace to ~~try~~ without ~~juris~~ 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 the throne for his ~~own~~ himself and his dynasty.

QA

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

~~Above it all was~~

"Above all it was Henry's ~~dynastic~~ dynastic sense, not his divine right as his propaganda claimed, which secured the throne for the Tudors". Henry secured the throne for Tudors through his ~~treachery~~ treachery which also gave him recognition ~~but~~ rather securing the

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 power family recognising Henry as king. Not only resulting in 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 illustrates that Henry's dynamic force

Henry VIII secured the Tudor throne through his Treaty of Ayton in 1497 with James IV of Scotland. This treaty demonstrated Henry's dynamic force 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 seeing threatened by this decided to invade Scotland however James IV started to lose grip 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 ~~be~~ be look to

'The facts of geography and poor communications were largely responsible for this and compelled the king to devolve responsibility to men on the spot.' This is unconvincing as Henry ~~he~~ had control over ~~it~~ in terms of regional government. They were quite effective. For example ~~in~~ in Wales he appointed his uncle Jasper Tudor and Sir Rhys ap Thomas. The two of them oversaw ~~the~~ government in ~~the~~ Wales. In Ireland, Henry appointed ~~to~~ Poyning's to oversee government in Ireland this was not done on the spot but ~~at~~ in advance. Communications were good as Jasper Tudor and Sir Rhys ap Thomas ~~we~~ ~~reporter~~ 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.

Student B, Q1, Paper 1C, Summer 2022

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.

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 Abington 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.

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

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 ~~his~~ 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 kings 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

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.

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 ~~as~~ 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

suggesting his 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.

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 extract's 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

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' 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 ~~introduced~~ 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 the lack of police force and standing army. For example, Henry introduced Justices of the Peace (JP) 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, ~~Admiralty~~ 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 dependant on others, he was able to ensure local protection and centralisation of government.

Student C, Q1, Paper 1H, Summer 2022

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 major projects like Magnitogorsk and the ~~Stinger~~ 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 set only in the years leading up to war. ~~So I find this argument~~ For example the number of tanks made in the first-year plans were more than ever before in Russia, so I find this argument more convincing.

Hoselink's argument ~~displays~~ displays the Russian economy very well and calling it 'topical and unworkable' is a very accurate way of describing it. His first point ~~states~~ ^{states} that the huge success 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 doubling during the first one. Other than this however, little effort was put into other areas, which Hoselink's statement portrays perfectly.

His second point ~~is~~ 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 52% of peasants and in 1934 90% were part of collective farms. His final point is that the industrial changes weren't planned very well. This is correct 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 Overy 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. His second point is that the plans were 'over-optimised' 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 actually 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. His final point

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 DTP.

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

~~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 weaker 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 geopolitical developments occurred. Overall, the Empire and its legacy influenced the British people and popular culture to a large extent.

A strong case can be made that the Empire influenced British popular culture through media and sport. Alf Lawson played ~~to~~ the main role in a popular British TV series, and his role was characterised by his xenophobia and dislike of immigrants ^{from the Commonwealth (CW)}. Although Lawson 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 630 Jamaicans seeking employment. The Windrush generation had a significant impact on how the Empire was seen, right up to the

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 migrants 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.

A weak case can be made that the Empire did not influence the British people ^{so strongly} and popular culture, as ~~geopolitical development~~ ~~occurred~~. ~~Decolonisation proved a serious~~ ties 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 the Empire still influenced the British people.

An even weaker case can be made that the Empire did not influence the British people & popular culture so strongly, as ~~geopolitical development~~ ~~changed~~ Britain's situation. ~~Decolonisation~~ brought about the end of the Empire, with the Indian gaining independence in 1947, Burma in 1948 and Kenya in 1963. Meanwhile Britain strengthened 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 and provided to European countries. This shows that Britain had to

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 expanded sectors, and domestic opposition with Mosley's Union Movement in 1957. Although geopolitical developments made 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 ~~English~~ and minority communities originating from 1947-67.

Student B, Q3, Paper 1J, Summer 2022

Education, primarily, could mean any other social policy, with such the social policies, primarily, the government, these changes, it is quite to the education, mainly, education, it is to set up schools all across the country, in an attempt to improve the education of children, however, although it appears, in the surface, like this, it is a social policy, primarily, to improve, which is level of education, it means, these schools, but are increasingly, limited, subject, this, new, examination, but is only available to a very small section, of the state, of Indian society, for the rest of the population, there was little change made to their education, so, in terms of education, very, limited, change, occurred, across, India, after 1958.

So, overall, in the education, mainly, it is to set up schools, in India, only, means, to a small extent, between 1958 and 1965, although, in the surface, it appears, to be a social policy, primarily, to improve, economic, and social, reforms, in result, most of these changes, were simply, superficial, for changes, made, following, need, little, impact, on the, way, to, living, lives, of the, ordinary, Indian, citizen, with, changes, being, very, limited, across, the, country, as, only, a, small, group, of, society, it, could, also, be, seen, that, with, social, reforms, primarily, related, to, education, and, the, most, important,

both, levels, were, not, and, would, have, had, had, leading, significant, consequences, for, the, Indian, population, would, as, a, result, there, would, be, significant, and, important, changes, as, well, as, a, changing, world, stage, it, could, be, argued, that, these, changes, led, to, a, significant, reduction, in, Indian, poverty, and, subsequently, led, to, a, better, social, status, it, could, also, be, argued, that, the, most,

actually strengthened by its position, and it was other powers that constituted themselves imperial powers during this time period.

It could be argued that this view is inaccurate, as in the 19th century the British Empire, and indeed power appeared to be strengthened by what 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 gave colonies acquired included the Cameroons, Iraq and Palestine, the British Iraq and Palestine being especially valuable as they secured 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 to be weakened even further in order to maintain an imperial empire. Therefore as a consequence Britain had to start making concessions to colonies where there were nationalist feelings. The government in London had to establish a degree of self rule, however, in return for years of governance on their part, Britain granted independence 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 fund the defence of their newly acquired empire. So, overall it could be argued that in reality what did actually seem to weaken Britain's imperial power, as it could no longer maintain full control in many of its colonies, and therefore started the path towards decolonisation.

It could further more 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 ~~debut~~, and for as a consequence of lend-lease, Britain was massively in debt to the US. ~~As~~ 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 loss of power is clear 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 to try 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} ~~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 accurate to state that WW2 significantly weakened Britain's imperial power and put ~~her~~ 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

power during this time period. It could be argued that nationalist movements were more significant in causing depression if used nationalist advances that forced Britain to push both the 1914 and 1939 governments towards their own positions there and providing more authority on their own affairs to India, Mexico, or Ireland. It was constant rebellions and fighting by the 1930s that played a significant role in why Britain spent more independence. However, despite that it could also be considered that the two world wars, in various instances, these nationalist movements had the impact they were able to make for the witnessing certain British defeats gave them confidence, as they no longer saw Britain as invincible, and crushed the hopes of Britain to remain a superpower, which is Britain's greatest weakness. Just before the world wars, they were no longer able to fully suppress nationalist uprisings, so consequently made concessions and eventually granted independence to almost the rest of Africa, India, and elsewhere. Despite nationalist movements growing, the role of the weakening of Britain's imperial position, and ultimately it was the world wars that allowed them to make such a significant impact.

So, in ~~other~~ conclusion, one could find this statement mostly correct, that Britain's imperial power was greatly weakened by its participation in the two world wars. The wars did significantly economically and militarily weakened Britain. This therefore presented 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 weaknesses being arguably the most significant factor

In understanding Britain's economic position, it was unfortunately a combination of both political events and the war that led Britain down the path towards decolonisation.

Student C, Q2, Paper 1J, Summer 2022

In the years 1858 to 1890, following the military, Britain's rule over India certainly changed India economically and socially. However, while the benefits of the economy and protection may have increased, and the 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 suffered similarly to how they had before hand.

In terms of economic change, following the military, India definitely saw certain aspects improve improving, however ~~however~~ this was for the people's ^{benefit} ~~benefit~~ over Britain's strategic benefits ~~is it is~~ position can be questioned. Arguably this was for Britain's strategic position over benefits to the people. For instance, ~~increased in~~ ~~the~~ ~~protection~~ ~~increased~~ The growing economy can perhaps be witnessed in the fact that tea plantations increased from 1 to 295 between 1951 to 1971, suggesting a changing 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 built following the military, ~~pro~~ displaying more effort to improve India's ~~to~~ ~~transporting~~ ~~goods~~ and again facilitating trade. However, in the way it seems that India's ~~industrial~~ Britain was changing ~~is~~ ~~seen~~ to be better, yet it can also be argued that these measures were strategic; the railways providing quick ~~rate~~ of passage for horses and the tea plantations increasing export to Britain and allowing

Motilal and Abanindranath set a college for women
female teacher, also created the National Indian
association for in 1884 1870 to promote Hindu reforms,
displaying active effort for the sake to improve
educational opportunities, Sanitary, of the 1712
Calcutta University students to graduate in 1882,
1/3 entered government services and now went
into the legal profession, displaying the British being
more open to enhanced political voice of the people.
The return of the Indian movement. They also
promoted the idea of a more religiously tolerant
policy following the meeting, highlighting things attempted
to be made in a number of the bills.
It is necessary that quality, active improvements
and social reforms were made to improve Indian society
and. These measures all helped the general state
of India by increasing opportunities for the people,
improving things for the better.

Enhance, socially, there were attempts to win support
of the people. This was seen in Congress; extensive
use of public law 1894, trying to use laws those
abolished by British rule. Furthermore, Indians were
given out the of Indian medals to reward
help during the meeting and the British promised to
rule more sensitively. Overall response, socially
British rule in India seemed to change for the
better, but in political and social opportunities
and education still remained as before 1857.

On the other hand, the social change made was not equally
only benefited those of the upper classes, according to
suggesting that the reforms imposed were
primarily superficial.

For instance, over 62,000 out of the 74 Bengal regiments were disbanded due to their disloyalty during the mutiny. Additionally, 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 ^{regimental} regiments were made to live in separate areas to prevent disunity. ~~These measures~~ The officers were also requested to treat the people more sensitively following the outcry that resulted from the use of enfield 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 were ~~a big~~ ^{provided a} social change, but not a ~~big~~ social change of before the mutiny, but only to accommodate British rule.

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 aided in Britain's strategic position at the expense of the general state of India.

Mid-/low-level response(s)

Q2, Q3, Q4, Paper 1L, Summer 2022 The quest for political stability: Germany, 1871–1991

0 2 'Opposition in the Reichstag had little impact on Bismarck's policies in the years 1871 to 1890.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

0 3 'In the years 1890 to 1914, a culture of militarism dominated Germany.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

0 4 To what extent was the weakness of democracy in Germany, in the years 1914 to 1934, due to economic problems?

[25 marks]

Student A Q2, Paper 1L, Summer 2022

However, East Germany, Russia, produced too much paper money, therefore making money for a small period of time worthless. Although the west were able to recover from the crisis that the East had caused, it meant that until the west had sorted out the problem, they were struggling financially, therefore they raised their taxes to combat possible inflation. Despite these negative factors, West Germany were still able to support themselves through the huge amount of industries that they were controlling.

To conclude, the extract is in good value in terms of its relations to the post war Economy of west Germany due to its support and evidence of the Germany industries.

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 into place, which ^{was} 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 potential attack from the SPD and socialists who were planning to overthrow Bismarck. Police powers were increased, amending thousands of socialists who threatened to violate 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 prevented socialists from gaining power, gained over a million new members as a result of the laws. Bismarck advised 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.

Bismarck had little opposition in the Reichstag when he introduced the economic protectionism ~~to~~ policy. The policy introduced a law 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.

Finally, Bismarck faced little opposition in the Reichstag when it came to dealing with Society. Bismarck introduced several social reforms even helped Society, especially those who were least fortunate. These new social reforms faced very little opposition as it was majestically supported by those within the Reichstag, therefore it was passed and it made a huge effect on Society due to its positive effects.

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

Economic problems in Germany between 1914 and 1933 caused significant weaknesses of democracy. This can be evident in the introduction of the ~~1919~~ Treaty of Versailles in 1919. The 1929 wall street crash and minor economic issues such as unemployment and hyperinflation crisis.

After the first world war, Germany suffered greatly due to economic and political losses that occurred. In 1919, a peace treaty, the Treaty of Versailles was introduced to help sanction

Student B, Q4, Paper 1L, Summer 2022

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 standards 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.

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 usually it was more useful, Germans would rather take the wheelbarrow than the money in it. This shows the prejudice of democracy due to Germany's inability to hold a stable economy.

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 accepted American 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 million marks to Germany under the Dawes Plan to give Germany a helping hand in starting payments of reparations.

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.

Q2, Q3, Q4, Paper 1G, Summer 2022 Challenge and transformation: Britain, c1851–1964

0 2 'In the years 1851 to 1873, all social groups within Britain benefited from the impact of economic growth.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

0 3 'In the years 1868 to 1905, the Liberal and Conservative parties pursued similar policies towards Ireland.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

0 4 To what extent was there a political consensus between the Labour and Conservative parties in the years 1940 to 1964?

[25 marks]

Student Q4, Paper 1G, Summer 2022

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.

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 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 ~~to~~ 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. *

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

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 ~~52~~ 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. 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.

Overall, I do believe that the consensus between the Labour and Conservative party in the years ~~1945~~ 1945 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 ^{mostly} 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 Butler's Education Act ~~is~~ 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. The Butler act was passed during the coalition but labelled as a Labour policy, as it was passed by LAB, 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. Labour's division highlights ~~the~~ different

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

Notes

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

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

aqa.org.uk