GCE AS MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2023

HISTORY - UNIT 2
DEPTH STUDIES 5–8: NON-BRITISH HISTORY

2100U50-1
2100U60-1
2100U70-1
2100U80-1

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2023 examination. It was finalised after detailed discussion at examiners' conferences by all the examiners involved in the assessment. The conference was held shortly after the paper was taken so that reference could be made to the full range of candidates' responses, with photocopied scripts forming the basis of discussion. The aim of the conference was to ensure that the marking scheme was interpreted and applied in the same way by all examiners.

It is hoped that this information will be of assistance to centres but it is recognised at the same time that, without the benefit of participation in the examiners' conference, teachers may have different views on certain matters of detail or interpretation.

WJEC regrets that it cannot enter into any discussion or correspondence about this marking scheme.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Marking guidance for examiners for Question 1

Summary of assessment objectives for Question 1

Question 1 assesses assessment objective 2. This assessment objective is a single element focused on the ability to analyse and evaluate contemporary source material in its historical context. The mark awarded to Question 1 is 30.

The structure of the mark scheme

The mark scheme for Question 1 has two parts:

- Advice on the specific question outlining **indicative content** that can be used to assess the quality of the specific response. This content is not prescriptive, and candidates are not expected to mention all the material referred to. Assessors must credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates.

- An assessment grid advising which bands and marks should be given to responses that demonstrate the qualities needed in assessment objective 2.

Deciding on the mark awarded within a band

The first stage for an examiner is to decide the overall band. The second stage is to decide how firmly the qualities expected for that level are displayed. Third, a final mark for the question can then be awarded.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

AO2: Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

		Value of the sources	**Analysis and evaluation of the sources in their historical context**	**Focus on the question set**
Band 6	**26–30 marks**	The learner shows clear understanding of the strengths and limitations of the sources.	The sources are clearly analysed and evaluated in the specific and wider historical context.	The learner will make a sustained and developed attempt to utilise the sources to directly answer the question set.
Band 5	**21–25 marks**	The learner considers the strengths and limitations of the sources.	There is some analysis and evaluation of the sources in the specific and wider historical context.	The learner deploys the sources appropriately to support the judgement reached about the question set.
Band 4	**16–20 marks**	The learner develops a response which begins to discuss the strengths and limitations of the sources.	There is some analysis and evaluation of the sources with an awareness of the wider historical context.	The learner deploys the sources to support the judgement reached about the question set.
Band 3	**11–15 marks**	The learner uses most of the source material to develop a response.	There is some analysis and evaluation of the sources.	The learner begins to discuss the sources' use in the context of the question set.
Band 2	**6–10 marks**	The learner uses some of the source material to develop a response.	The learner begins to analyse and evaluate the sources but it is largely mechanical.	The learner attempts to comment on the sources' use but lacks context.
Band 1	**1–5 marks**	There is limited evidence of the use of the sources.	Sources are used for their content only.	
Award 0 marks for an irrelevant or inaccurate response.				

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

2100U50-1

Depth study 5: Religious reformation in Europe c.1500–1564
Part 1: The outbreak and spread of the Reformation in Germany c.1500–1531

0 1 **Using your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the reasons for the outbreak of the Reformation between 1509 and 1519.** **[30]**

Candidates are expected to demonstrate their ability to analyse and evaluate a range of source material with a high degree of discrimination. Source evaluation skills should focus on discussing the strengths and the limitations of the three sources. To judge value to the enquiry there should be consideration of the content and the authorship of the sources and of the historical context in which they were produced.

Candidates will consider the value of the sources to an historian **studying the reasons for the outbreak of the Reformation between 1509 and 1519**. Understanding of the historical context should be utilised to analyse and evaluate the strengths and limitations of the sources. Appropriate observations in the analysis and evaluation of the sources may include the following.

Source A Desiderius Erasmus, a humanist, writing in his book *In Praise of Folly* (1509)

Now the general run of priests … how stoutly they fight for their right to tithes … How sharp sighted they are in ferreting [digging] out of the writings of the Fathers anything they can use to intimidate the simple people and make them think they owe even more than a tenth. But at the same time it never occurs to them how often those writings explain the duties which priests in turn are supposed to perform for the people … A priest is supposed to be free from all worldly desires and ought to meditate on nothing but heavenly matters. But these agreeable fellows say they have fulfilled their duty perfectly when they have mumbled through their church services in some fashion or another. As for me, by Heaven, I would be amazed if any god either heard or understood such prayers.

Marking notes:

The general historical context associated with this source is the anti-clericalism that existed in Europe prior to the Reformation and the impact of the Northern Renaissance. The specific historical context may include reference to Erasmus's publication of *In Praise of Folly* in an attempt to encourage reform of the Church in line with his humanist views and the teachings of the *Devotio Moderna*. In particular, this is the kind of argument that would soon lead to the criticism "Erasmus laid the egg and Luther hatched it". The source is not, however, a criticism of the beliefs or practices of the Church so much as a critique of how these are carried out – that priests were more interested in money than they were in performing church services, and as a result they were doing nothing to help their parishioners achieve salvation. It was anger at this that Protestant critics were soon able to turn into support for their cause.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Source B Albert of Brandenburg, the newly appointed Archbishop of Mainz, authorizing the sale of indulgences in a letter to his diocese (1515)

A sinner who is deprived of divine grace … [may obtain, through the purchase of an indulgence] perfect remission [of their sins] and God's grace anew. In addition, through this remission of sins, punishments to be undergone in purgatory because of offence done to the divine majesty, are remitted in full, and the punishments of the said purgatory are totally wiped out … There is no need for the contributors to be of contrite heart or to make oral confession, since this grace depends … on the love in which the departed died and the contributions which the living pay.

Marking notes:

The general historical context associated with this source is the sale of indulgences as authorised by the Papacy; the specific historical context may include reference to the need for the new Archbishop of Mainz to sell indulgences to pay off the loans he had to take out to be able to buy his Church office. This resulted in the Tetzel mission to sell indulgences, which would soon inspire Luther's 95 Theses. The source is essentially an advert for indulgences, explaining what they can do to help people's souls avoid purgatory, but it also contains one of the justifications that most angered Luther: that it was not necessary to be penitent to receive God's grace, just as long as you had paid. Similar to Source A, this angered people as it suggested that the Church was more interested in money than salvation.

Source C Martin Luther, writing in a letter – about the upcoming Disputation of Leipzig – to Georg Spalatin (1519)

For my debate I am examining the decretals [decisions of ecclesiastical law] of the Popes, and let me tell you below my breath that I am undecided whether the Pope is Antichrist or his apostle, because in these decretals – I am telling the truth! – he has miserably perverted and crucified Christ. I am exceedingly grieved to see the people of Christ fooled under pretence of the laws and name of Christ. Someday I shall send you my annotations to these decretals, in order that you may see what it means to make laws without regard to the Scriptures, in the endeavour to usurp the autocracy; not to mention other evidences quite similar to those ascribed to Antichrist, which are perpetrated by the Roman Curia, and rush forth from there. From day to day the Scriptures are becoming of more aid and assistance to me.

Marking notes:

The general historical context associated with this source is from the period in which Luther was preparing to debate Eck at Leipzig, laying out his ideas. The specific historical context may include reference to the need to justify his position to his critics, especially those within the Church. At this point, Luther was still trying to encourage reform within the Church rather than trying to break away from it. His argument is that the Papacy has been re-writing Christian traditions and teachings for their own purposes and that they have moved away from what was written in the Bible – one of his key arguments at Leipzig was that religion should be based on 'sola scriptura'. This is also significant as Spalatin, the secretary of Frederick the Wise, was a humanist who would be sympathetic to this position. The issues raised in Sources A and B are the kinds of issues that Luther is referring to in Source C.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

2100U60-1

Depth study 6: France in revolution c.1774–1815
Part 1: France: the causes and course of revolution c.1774–1792

0 1 **Using your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the causes of the French Revolution, 1776–1789.** **[30]**

Candidates are expected to demonstrate their ability to analyse and evaluate a range of source material with a high degree of discrimination. Source evaluation skills should focus on discussing the strengths and the limitations of the three sources. To judge value to the enquiry there should be consideration of the content and the authorship of the sources and of the historical context in which they were produced.

Candidates will consider the value of the sources to an historian studying the **causes of the French Revolution, 1776–1789**. Understanding of the historical context should be utilised to analyse and evaluate the strengths and limitations of the sources. Appropriate observations in the analysis and evaluation of the sources may include the following.

Source A The Austrian Ambassador, in a secret dispatch to the Austrian Empress Maria Theresa, mother of the Queen (1776)

Among the rumours which circulate contrary to the prestige and reputation essential to a queen of France, there is one which appears more dangerous and unpleasant than the rest. It is complained quite openly that the Queen is extravagant and encourages extravagance. The public at first viewed with pleasure the King's gift of the Trianon to the Queen; but it began to be disturbed and alarmed by Her Majesty's expenditure there. By her order the gardens have been completely changed into an English garden, which cost at least 150,000 livres. The Queen has had a theatre built at the Trianon; she has only presented one play there, followed by a supper, but this entertainment was very expensive. The Queen's allowance has been doubled, and yet she has contracted debts. The chief cause of the Queen's debts is known and excites no fewer outcries and complaints. The Queen has bought many diamonds, and her card playing has become very costly.

Marking notes:

The general historical context associated with this source is the perceived extravagance of the royal family, particularly that of the Queen, while the specific historical context may include reference to concerns over royal finance and the indebtedness of the Crown. The source is a secret dispatch to the Austrian Empress, Maria Theresa revealing her daughter Marie-Antoinette's extravagance. It hints at its cause – that is, buying expensive jewellery and, more ominously, incurring gambling debts. The source is significant in that it would provide evidence to an historian of the way the royal family was viewed as being out of touch with ordinary people and squandering money that the state could ill afford. In an absolute state such as France, the wasting of government revenue by the royal family was a source of contention, especially among the Third Estate upon whom the burden of taxation fell.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Source B Daniel Hailes, a secretary in the British Embassy in Paris, in a private letter to the British Foreign Secretary, Lord Carmarthen (16 August 1787)

The Parlement of Paris, and indeed all the other Parlements of the Kingdom, continue to be motivated by the same spirit of opposition to the measure of the Court that has expressed itself clearly ever since the dissolution of the Assembly of Notables. The protection of the people from an increase of taxes is the ground that has been … carefully chosen by the Parlement on which to rest their disobedience; but I have reason to think that the establishment of the provincial Assemblies throughout the Kingdom … is the real, though concealed, motive of their conduct … If, as it is imagined, these provincial assemblies should in future contribute to the limitation of the authority of the King, there can be no doubt that they will affect the authority of the Parlements, whose existence is almost equal in age with the monarchy itself.

Marking notes:

The general historical context associated with this source is the political fallout following the collapse of the Assembly of Notables, while the specific historical context may include reference to the proposal by Louis to set up Provincial Assemblies. The source, a private letter from a British government official in Paris to the British Foreign Secretary, emphasises the degree of political turbulence in France following the dismissal of the Assembly of Notables and the way the Parlement as sovereign law courts are jealously guarding their status against new initiatives in the form of provincial assemblies. An historian would consider the source as significant as it suggests the tension among the institutions and the government and hints at a government that is backtracking. Cracks were starting to appear in the facade of the *ancien régime,* which various groups, notably the bourgeoisie, would seek to exploit.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Source C The *Cahier de doléances* [list of grievances] drawn up by the village of Le Revest before the meeting of the Estates General (March 1789)

The deputies who will elect the Third Order to attend and vote at the Estates General of France will be expressly instructed to petition for the reform of the civil and criminal code ... They will request the right for the Third Estate, of whatsoever order they may be, to qualify for all military posts, honours and pensions [that are at present] confined to the nobility; that no exemptions be given from the payment of any dues and impositions that are owed to the King. They will request: a reduction in the price of salt, to make it uniform throughout the kingdom; the power to grow tobacco on our lands; the right of the Third Estate to have as many members as the first two orders combined; a general tax upon all property, both real and personal, to be collected in the same manner and form; the sending of money due to the King directly from the Province to the treasury of the State.

Marking notes:

The general historical context associated with this source is the momentous decision by Louis XVI to summon the Estates General for the first time since 1614, while the specific historical context may include reference to the process by which every community in France was allowed to submit a list of grievances for the consideration of the Estates General before they met in Versailles in 1789. Source C is an extract from a *Cahiers de doléances* (or simply *Cahiers*, sent from the village of Le Revest in the south of France). The source would be of value to an historian as it lists the grievances of one small community. It is valuable in shedding light on what agitated local people and communities away from the political bubble of Paris. The range of its concerns spans the rather mundane, to much more important concerns that directly affected the Third Estate (that it should have the same number of deputies as the other two, privileged, orders combined).

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

2100U70-1

Depth study 7: The crisis of the American republic c.1840–1877
Part 1: Sectional differences and the road to civil war c.1840–1861

0 1 **Using your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the impact of slavery on US politics between 1850 and 1857.** **[30]**

Candidates are expected to demonstrate their ability to analyse and evaluate a range of source material with a high degree of discrimination. Source evaluation skills should focus on discussing the strengths and the limitations of the three sources. To judge value to the enquiry there should be consideration of the content and the authorship of the sources and of the historical context in which they were produced.

Candidates will consider the value of the sources to an historian studying **the impact of slavery on US politics between 1850 and 1857**. Understanding of the historical context should be utilised to analyse and evaluate the strengths and limitations of the sources. Appropriate observations in the analysis and evaluation of the sources may include the following.

Source A William H Seward, Senator for New York, in a speech to the US Senate (March 1850)

There is another aspect of the principle of compromise which deserves consideration. It assumes that slavery, if not the only institution in a slave State, is at least a ruling institution, and that this characteristic is recognised by the Constitution. But slavery is only one of many institutions there. Freedom is equally an institution there. Slavery is only a temporary, accidental, partial and incongruous [inappropriate] one. Freedom on the contrary, is a perpetual, organic, universal one, in harmony with the Constitution of the United States … But the principle of this compromise gives complete ascendancy in the slave states, and in the Constitution of the United States, to that subordinate [inferior], accidental, and incongruous institution.

Marking notes:

The general historical context associated with this source is the debate as to how to deal with the issue of slavery in the new territories annexed after the war with Mexico. The specific historical context may include reference to the shift from the 1846 Wilmot Proviso, which said that no new territories should have slavery, to the 1850 Compromise in which the Southern Democrats agreed that some of the new territories such as Utah and New Mexico would be allowed to hold ballots on whether to allow slavery – in return the Democrats got a strict Fugitive Slave Act, which meant that agents from the South could track down escaped slaves living in the North and return them to their masters. The source is a northern view of the Compromise of 1850, attacking the idea that slavery is given precedence over the freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution in the South

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Source B An article, commenting on the attack on Senator Charles Sumner in the Senate chamber, in the *New York Evening Post* (May 1856)

The excuse for this base assault is that Mr Sumner, on the Senate floor, in the course of debate had spoken disrespectfully of Mr Butler, a relative of Preston S Brooks. Has it come to this, that we must speak with bated breath in the presence of our Southern masters; that even their follies are too sacred a subject of ridicule; that we must not deny the consistency of their principles or the accuracy of their statements? If we venture to laugh at them, or question their logic, or dispute their facts, are we to be punished as they punish their slaves? Are we, too, slaves, slaves for life, a target for their brutal blows when we do not conduct ourselves to please them? The truth is that the pro-slavery Party, which rules in the Senate, looks upon violence as the proper instrument of its designs … violence has now found its way into the Senate chamber. Violence lies in wait on all navigable rivers and all the railways of Missouri, to obstruct those who pass from the free states to Kansas.

Marking notes:

The general historical context associated with this source is the renewed conflict between Northern and Southern politicians following the repeal of the 1850 Compromise and its replacement by the 1854 Kansas–Nebraska Act along with the violence that followed it. The specific historical context may include reference to an argument in the Senate over violence between supporters and opponents of slavery in 'Bleeding Kansas', which led to the beating of Northern Senator Charles Sumner by Representative Preston Brooks, whom Sumner had maligned in a speech. The source is an account of that beating in a Northern newspaper. It presents the beating with an anti-slavery twist, as this would represent the majority view of the newspaper's readers. This became a cause célèbre, with Sumner a hero in the North, and Brooks a hero in the South.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Source C Frederick Douglass, a former slave, in a speech at the celebration of the anniversary of the founding of the American Abolition Society (May 1857)

It may be quite true that the Constitution was designed to secure the blessings of liberty and justice to the people who made it, and to future generations, but it was never designed to do any such thing for the colored people of African descent. This is Judge Taney's argument … but it is not the argument of the Constitution. The Constitution imposes no such mean and satanic limitations upon its own operation. And, if the Constitution makes none, I beg to know what right has anybody, outside of the Constitution, in order to justify slavery, to impose such a meaning on the Constitution? The Constitution knows all human inhabitants of this country as "the people". It makes, as I have said before, no discrimination in favour of, or against, any class of people, but is fitted to protect and preserve the rights of all without reference to color, size, or any physical peculiarities.

Marking notes:

The general historical context associated with this source is the fallout of the Fugitive Slave Act, along with the intensifying abolitionist campaign in the Northern States. The specific historical context may include reference to the Dred Scott Supreme Court case in 1857, in which Chief Justice Taney and six other justices argued that Scott was not free because he had lived in states without slavery while travelling with his master, nor did he have the right to sue for his freedom. The source is a reflection on this long-running court case that had started in Missouri in the 1840s by former slave and leading abolition campaigner Frederick Douglass. Following on from the logic of the Fugitive Slave Law, the judgement was supposed to cement the idea that once you had been a slave you were always going to be a slave, wherever you went and whatever you did.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

2100U80-1

Depth study 8: Germany: Democracy and dictatorship c.1918–1945
Part 1: Weimar and its challenges c.1918–1933

0 1 **Using your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the challenges facing the Weimar Republic in the period from 1919 to 1925. [30]**

Candidates are expected to demonstrate their ability to analyse and evaluate a range of source material with a high degree of discrimination. Source evaluation skills should focus on discussing the strengths and the limitations of the three sources. To judge value to the enquiry there should be consideration of the content and the authorship of the sources and of the historical context in which they were produced.

Candidates will consider the value of the sources to an historian studying **the challenges faced by the Weimar Republic in the period from 1919 to 1925**. Understanding of the historical context should be utilised to analyse and evaluate the strengths and limitations of the sources. Appropriate observations in the analysis and evaluation of the sources may include the following.

Source A Adolf Hitler presents *The Programme of the German Workers' Party* to the public, in a meeting at a Munich beer cellar (24 February 1920). The programme was co-written with Anton Drexler.

The programme of the German Workers' Party is …

1. We demand the union of all Germans in a Greater Germany on the basis of the right of national self-determination.
2. We demand equality of rights for the German people in its dealings with other nations, and the revocation [repeal] of the peace treaties of Versailles and Saint-Germain.
3. We demand land and territory to feed our people and to settle our surplus population.
4. Only members of the nation may be citizens of the state. Only those of German blood, whatever their creed, may be members of the nation. Accordingly, no Jew may be a member of the nation …

23. The publishing of newspapers which are not favourable to the national welfare must be forbidden. We demand the legal prosecution of all those tendencies in art and literature which corrupt our national life, and the suppression of cultural events which violate this demand.

Marking notes:

Provides evidence of the early programme of the forerunner of the Nazi party and Hitler's already prominent role within the party. The specific context will be the events of 1920 with Germany rent by the extremes of left and right: the Kapp Putsch in March and the long-standing left-wing revolt in the Ruhr. The general context is the bitterness of the Versailles settlement referred to here and the reaction to the establishment of the Republic. The source is valuable to an historian not only for its contextual relevance but also for the insight it provides into the mainsprings of Nazi thinking. Note the emphasis on the shortcomings of Versailles and the needs of a greater Germany barely more than a year after the treaty. There is evidence of anti-Semitism and attitudes towards censorship and culture – all to be evidenced in the later history of the Nazi rise to power and relevant to the challenges faced by Weimar. Candidates may comment on the provenance of the source: it is a public programme announced in a Munich beer cellar.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Source B Franz Bumm, the President of the Reich Department of Health, in a speech to the Reichstag (20 February 1923)

Unfortunately, this picture of accelerating and shocking decline in health conditions applies to the whole Reich. Especially hard hit are the middle class, those living on small retirement funds, the widows and the pensioners, who with their modest incomes can no longer afford the most basic necessities at present day prices. It is going just as badly for those who cannot yet earn … The height to which prices have climbed may be shown by the fact that as of 15 February, wholesale prices have risen on average to 5,967 times the pre-war level, those of foodstuffs to 4,902 times, and those for industrial products to 7,958 times. Meat consumption has fallen from 52 kilograms per person in 1912 to 26 kilograms per person in 1922. In the occupied zone (the Ruhr), moreover, this small amount has presumably to be shared with many foreign mouths as well. One finds "old age" and "weakness" listed in the official records on the causes of death; these are equivalent to death through hunger.

Marking notes:

This is a report by a civil servant to the Reichstag in February 1923. The specific context is the occupation of the Ruhr (mentioned at the end of the source) and the hyperinflation affecting Germany. The general context is the deterioration of the German economy and the failure to pay reparations. The source is valuable to an historian for providing the context for hyperinflation and also indicating its impact upon Germans of all classes. The memory of the inflation and its association with the humiliation of Versailles did irreparable damage to the reputation of the Weimar Republic contributing to the rise of extremist political parties. Candidates may comment on the provenance of the source: it is a measured analysis from a well-informed civil servant.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Source C Gustav Stresemann, Foreign Minister of the Weimar Republic, in a private letter to the ex-Crown Prince of Germany (September 1925)

In my opinion there are three great tasks that confront German policy in the immediate future:

1. the solution of the reparations problem in a way that is tolerable for Germany;
2. the protection of those ten to twelve million Germans who now live under foreign control in foreign lands;
3. the readjustment of our eastern frontiers; the recovery of Danzig, the Polish Corridor.

The question of the option between east and west is not affected by our entry into the League of Nations. Such options only become viable when we have military force behind us. Unfortunately, we do not have that …The most important task for German politics is to free German soil from foreign domination. We have to free the stranglehold on our throat. Therefore, German policy must be one of machination [scheming] and the avoidance of any fundamental decision on frontiers. I further request that you fully appreciate the frank tone of this letter since I am naturally obliged to practise the utmost restraint in my public utterances.

Marking notes:

The specific context of Source C is Germany's attempt to repair its economy in 1924–1925 and to recover respectability in the Locarno negotiations. The general context is the aftermath of the Versailles settlement and its effects in Germany. The source is valuable in providing an insight into Stresemann's aims and methods. The challenge for Weimar was the attempted recovery from economic disaster and its emergence from diplomatic isolation. Stresemann's real beliefs as opposed to his public statements are all too clear in the source: note the references to military force, the eastern frontiers and freeing German soil from foreign occupation. Candidates may comment on the provenance of the source: it is a private letter to a member of the exiled monarchy.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

AO3: Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

		Focus on the question set	Analysis of the interpretation
Band 6	**26–30 marks**	The learner discusses clearly the question set in the context of alternative interpretations.	The learner considers the validity of the interpretations in the development of the historiographical context. They demonstrate an understanding of how and why this issue has been interpreted in different ways. They discuss **why** a particular historian or school of history would form an interpretation based on the evidence available to the historian.
Band 5	**21–25 marks**	The learner discusses the question set in the context of alternative interpretations.	The learner discusses the work of different historians and/or schools of history to show an understanding of the development of the historical debate. The learner analyses and explains the key issues in the question set when considering the interpretation in the question.
Band 4	**16–20 marks**	The learner discusses the question set in the context of the development of the historical debate that has taken place.	There is some attempt to explain **why** different interpretations have been formed. The learner considers a counterargument to that presented in the question.
Band 3	**11–15 marks**	The learner attempts to discuss the question set in the context of the development of the historical debate that has taken place.	There is a limited attempt to explain **why** different interpretations have been formed.
Band 2	**6–10 marks**	The learner is able to show understanding of the question set. There is an attempt to reach a judgement but it is not firmly supported or balanced.	The learner's discussion of the interpretation is valid, with reference to alternate interpretations.
Band 1	**1–5 marks**	Any judgement reached is limited and unsupported.	The learner attempts to discuss the interpretation by tending to agree or disagree with it.
Award 0 marks for an irrelevant or inaccurate response.			

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

2100U50-1

Depth study 5: Religious reformation in Europe c.1500–1564
Part 1: The outbreak and spread of the Reformation in Germany c.1500–1531

0 2 Historians have made different interpretations about **the causes of the Peasants' War**. Analyse and evaluate the two interpretations and use your understanding of the historical debate to answer the following question:

How valid is the view that the Peasants' War was caused by Martin Luther? [30]

Candidates are expected to show an understanding of how aspects of the past have been interpreted in different ways. Candidates will consider the provided material and use their own understanding of the historical context and of the wider historical debate in making their judgement regarding the validity of the view **that Martin Luther caused the German Peasants' War**. Candidates will consider interpretations of this issue within the wider historical debate about the **causes of the German Peasants' War**. Some of the issues to consider may include the following.

Interpretation 1 Dr Vivian Green, in this extract from his textbook *Luther and the Reformation* (1964), provides a religious interpretation.

Luther's teaching, with its condemnation of the Pope and curia, its attack on monasteries and its assertion of the priesthood of all believers, must have filtered through to many of the peasants. Müntzer's apocalyptic preaching made an obvious appeal.

The Catholics then and later declared that Luther was partly responsible for the trouble.

Marking notes:

This argues that Luther's attack on the Church, but particularly on monasteries, whose land many of the peasants were working on and whose tithes they had to pay – as well as his emphasis on the priesthood of all believers – would have gained traction with the peasantry. A factor many Catholics latched on to then and in the period since. Evidence for this can be found in the peasant demand to be able to choose their own priest to make sure they were working in the interests of their flock. This is a traditional view that emphasises the role of Luther in many aspects of the Reformation in this period, but in this case that he inspired the peasants, a situation that Thomas Müntzer was then able to exploit. This view was common amongt the princes at the time as well as amongt generations of historians later, especially those who favoured the 'Great Man' school of History.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Interpretation 2 Professor Lyndal Roper, in this extract from her biography *Martin Luther: Renegade and Prophet* (2016), provides a social and economic interpretation.

Print played a powerful role in causing the Peasants' War: the Twelve Articles were rapidly disseminated and they enabled the diverse peasant bands to unite, even though many areas formulated their own local grievances as well … Many monasteries and Church foundations owned land and were amongst the most rapacious [greedy] landlords, whilst the massive monastic tithe barns that stood in so many towns were a visual reminder of their economic power over the peasants in an agrarian society.

Marking notes:

This argues that it was the printing press that enabled the Peasants' War. It was this that enabled criticism of the Church to be spread quickly and accurately through the region. As a post-revisionist view, this printed message combined with the legitimate economic grievances of the peasants against greedy landlords, some of whom were monasteries, to inspire the violent uprisings that became known as the German Peasants' War. Economic grievances can be seen in a number of the Twelve Articles as well as many of the regional variations. Luther's *Admonition to Peace* was spread by the printing press and by arguing that there was some legitimacy to the claim that the landlords were exploiting the peasants it may well have fanned the flames of existing grievances. Certainly the princes thought so, and Luther was forced to issue a condemnation of the peasants.

Wider debate

Candidates may refer to other explanations that surround the role of Müntzer in twisting Luther's relatively conservative message into something much more extreme. Revisionist views emphasised the social explanations for peasant grievances, that they were the result of recent population growth, which was shifting the post-Black Death balance of power back towards the landlords. Similar to this, a Marxist interpretation would emphasise the class war element within these uprisings. Taking a longer view, *bundschuh* rebellions were endemic in Germany throughout this period and the Peasants' War could be seen as a larger scale version of what was already happening on a regular basis.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Source C The Cahier de doléances [list of grievances] drawn up by the village of Le Revest before the meeting of the Estates General (March 1789)

The deputies who will elect the Third Order to attend and vote at the Estates General of France will be expressly instructed to petition for the reform of the civil and criminal code ... They will request the right for the Third Estate, of whatsoever order they may be, to qualify for all military posts, honours and pensions [that are at present] confined to the nobility; that no exemptions be given from the payment of any dues and impositions that are owed to the King. They will request: a reduction in the price of salt, to make it uniform throughout the kingdom; the power to grow tobacco on our lands; the right of the Third Estate to have as many members as the first two orders combined; a general tax upon all property, both real and personal, to be collected in the same manner and form; the sending of money due to the King directly from the Province to the treasury of the State.

Marking notes:

The general historical context associated with this source is the momentous decision by Louis XVI to summon the Estates General for the first time since 1614, while the specific historical context may include reference to the process by which every community in France was allowed to submit a list of grievances for the consideration of the Estates General before they met in Versailles in 1789. Source C is an extract from a *Cahiers de doléances* (or simply *Cahiers*, sent from the village of Le Revest in the south of France). The source would be of value to an historian as it lists the grievances of one small community. It is valuable in shedding light on what agitated local people and communities away from the political bubble of Paris. The range of its concerns spans the rather mundane, to much more important concerns that directly affected the Third Estate (that it should have the same number of deputies as the other two, privileged, orders combined).

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

2100U60-1

Depth study 6: France in revolution c.1774–1815
Part 1: France: the causes and course of revolution c.1774–1792

0 2 Historians have made different interpretations about the **extent and success of changes made by the National Assembly**. Analyse and evaluate the two interpretations and use your understanding of the historical debate to answer the following question:

How valid is the view that the changes made by the National Assembly were successful? [30]

Candidates are expected to show an understanding of how aspects of the past have been interpreted in different ways. Candidates will consider the provided material and use their own understanding of the historical context and of the wider historical debate in making their judgement regarding the validity of the view **that the changes made by the National Assembly were successful**. Candidates will consider interpretations of this issue within the wider historical debate about the success, or otherwise, of **what the National Assembly did**. Some of the issues to consider may include the following.

Interpretation 1 Eric Hobsbawm, in this extract from his book *The Age of Revolution: Europe 1789–1848* (1962), provides an interpretation focusing on the long-term impact of the changes made by the National Assembly.

Between 1789 and 1791 the victorious, moderate bourgeoisie, acting through what had now become the [National] Constituent Assembly, set about the gigantic rationalization and reform of France, which was its object. Most of the lasting institutional achievements of the Revolution date from this period, as do its most striking international results, the metric system, and the pioneer emancipation of the Jews.

Marking notes:

This argues that the National (Constituent) Assembly set about what was nothing short of a gigantic rationalization and reform of many of the key institutions of the French State. Hobsbawm selects a small number of these in his book. Among them are the introduction of standardised weights and measures and the emancipation of Jews. These he notes as ‘lasting institutional achievements.’ The other major area that he highlights as being successful is the economic policy adopted by the Assembly. He notes that this was liberal and marked a triumph for the bourgeoisie as they were the ones who gained the most. As a Marxist, Hobsbawm would be unlikely to be sympathetic to the banning of trade unions. The peasants who made up the majority of the French population benefited from enclosure of land and the encouragement of rural industry.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Interpretation 2 Thomas Carlyle, in this extract from his book The French Revolution: a History (1837), provides an interpretation focusing on the National Assembly's limited attempt to introduce changes.

One thing an elected Assembly of twelve hundred is fit for is destroying. Which indeed is a consequence of its natural talent for doing nothing. Do nothing, only keep agitating, debating, and all things will destroy themselves. So it proved with the National Assembly. It took the name Constituent, as if its mission and function had been to construct and build which it tried to do with its whole soul. Yet it achieved the very opposite to that.

Marking notes:

The second interpretation argues very forcefully that the Assembly was incabable of anything other than destruction. Carlyle is scathing in his contempt of the work of the National Assembly and suggested that it did nothing constructive and that its time was largely taken up by agitating, campaigning and debating. The sum consequence of which was that it was bound to destroy things. He highlighed its alternative name – that of Constituent Assembly – which contained the illusion, according to Carlyle, that constructing a Constitution for France was one of its prime goals. Yet, depite its best intentions, far from doing anything constructive it achieved the very opposite.

Wider debate

Candidates may refer to alternative views of whether the changes made by the National Assembly were successful. Regarding, for example, the new constitution, which was one of the most notable changes, the reform bears all the hallmarks of being dramatic and successful. However, on closer examination, the changes were very limited and were designed to ensure the primacy of the bourgeoisie. In effect it could be argued that a number of the changes were more apparent than real.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

2100U70-1

Depth study 7: The crisis of the American republic c.1840–1877
Part 1: Sectional differences and the road to civil war c.1840–1861

0 2 Historians have made different interpretations about **the causes of the US Civil War**. Analyse and evaluate the two interpretations and use your understanding of the historical debate to answer the following question:

How valid is the view that arguments over states' rights caused the US Civil War? [30]

Candidates are expected to show an understanding of how aspects of the past have been interpreted in different ways. Candidates will consider the provided material and use their own understanding of the historical context and of the wider historical debate in making their judgement regarding the validity of the view **that arguments over states' rights caused the US Civil War**. Candidates will consider interpretations of this issue within the wider historical debate about the **causes of the US Civil War**. Some of the issues to consider may include the following.

Interpretation 1 Hugh Brogan, in this extract from his book *The Penguin History of the United States of America* (1999), provides an interpretation focusing on states' rights.

For the southern states, state government came first; the Union was a limited agreement, as the old anti-Federalists had taught, and the states retained their sovereignty, including the right to secede if they saw fit. Above all, the Union was one of consent: the essence of the Constitution and its checks and balances was that the majority should not be able to coerce a minority. States' rights had evolved as an argument arising from the necessity of protecting the peculiar institution of slavery.

Marking notes:

This argues that it was the political victory of the Republican Party in the 1860 presidential election that caused the secession of the Southern states: the earlier compromises and pro-South victories of the 1850s would no longer be possible with an anti-slavery President in the White House. While the Lincoln–Douglas debates had highlighted several years earlier that this would eventually happen, the South had hoped that their candidate would win, but now faced the impossible political situation that the majority of Americans had voted for a President who was a threat to everything that they believed in. To stay in the Union they would have to accept the view of the majority, that slavery should end, so instead they were forced to leave in order to protect slavery as they could no longer acknowledge the authority of the democratically elected President if slavery was to continue in the South.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Interpretation 2 Brian Holden Reid, in this extract from his textbook *The Origins of the American Civil War* (1996), provides an interpretation focusing on the South's refusal to accept the result of the 1860 presidential election.

The 1860 election confirmed the political authority of, and the electoral support for, the Republican Party in the North. It confirmed, in the most hard and fast manner possible, that the two sections of the US voted predominantly for different candidates on different issues. One of those sections now refused to accept that the majority vote as represented in the election of a Republican president was binding on the South. Such an attitude not only challenged the continuance of the democratic process in the US but also would represent a flagrant challenge to the authority of the central government.

Marking notes:

This argues that, for the South, the right of states to determine their own policies – in this case to maintain the peculiar institution of slavery – was more important than membership of the Union in which the majority of states had just elected a government that was, as they saw it, going to coerce them into giving up slavery. Crucially for these states, the exact reason why they believed in this extreme form of federalism was because they wanted to be able to protect slavery from the rest of the Union. Unlike the freedoms enshrined in the Constitution, slavery had no specific protection other than, under the section that anything not specifically defined by the Constitution was left to the states. This led to the argument, as made by Jefferson Davies when he declared the Confederacy, that membership of the Union was voluntary, and that when the states' rights were threatened that they could legitimately secede.

Wider debate

Candidates may refer to the economic arguments for this conflict, that the economy of the South, based around King Cotton, could only continue if slavery continued, while the economy of the North had grown increasingly independent of that of the South and had no need for slavery. The traditional argument also remains, that it was the existence of slavery itself that drove the wedge between North and South in a way that could only be resolved by the complete victory of one over the other, as compromise seemed increasingly impossible. Combined with a variety of other factors, this is also the main post-revisionist argument.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

2100U80-1

Depth study 8: Germany: Democracy and dictatorship c.1918–1945
Part 1: Weimar and its challenges c.1918–1933

0 2 Historians have made different interpretations about **the Nazi rise to power**. Analyse and evaluate the two interpretations and use your understanding of the historical debate to answer the following question:

How valid is the view that the miscalculations of politicians were responsible for the Nazi rise to power in 1933? [30]

Candidates are expected to show an understanding of how aspects of the past have been interpreted in different ways. Candidates will consider the provided material and use their own understanding of the historical context and of the wider historical debate in making their judgement regarding the validity of the view **that the miscalculations of politicians were mainly responsible for the Nazi rise to power in 1933**. Candidates will consider interpretations of this issue within the wider historical debate about **the rise to power of the Nazis**. Some of the issues to consider may include the following.

Interpretation 1 AJP Taylor, in this extract from his book *Europe: Grandeur and Decline* (1967), provides an interpretation emphasising the responsibility of politicians for Hitler's rise to power.

The answer to the question how Hitler came to power is … to be found more in the actions of those German politicians who were not National Socialists than in those of Hitler himself … If there had been a strong democratic sentiment in Germany, Hitler would never have come to power – or even to prominence. He would have failed if the weak democratic parties had held together … One can blame all parties in turn. The Communists started the habit of violence and disrupted the working-class front. The Social Democrats had lost all ability to act and had lost faith in their strength. The Centre would bargain with anybody, even with Hitler. But the greatest responsibility lay with those who let Hitler in and established him as Chancellor.

Marking notes:

This argues that the failure of politicians in the Weimar Republic paved the way for Hitler's rise to power. Taylor points to the lack of a strong democratic tradition in Germany, the failure of left-wing parties to compromise and combine effectively and the miscalculations of the conservative politicians in 1932-1933 who thought they could control Hitler in a coalition. There is contextual support for these arguments in the strength of authoritarian politics in Germany, the continuity of Wilhelmine institutions in the judiciary and civil service, the inability of the SPD and KPD to combine against a common threat from the right, the alleged irresponsibility of the Centre Party in combining without any great regard for principle and the machinations of Schleicher and von Papen in 1932-1933. The fact that Nazi party electoral support dropped in the November 1932 elections suggested that its support was dependent upon the economic situation.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Interpretation 2 Ian Kershaw, in this extract from his book *To Hell and Back: Europe 1914–1949* (2015), provides an economic interpretation.

The most disastrously affected economy in Europe was the most important … Germany … As the Great Depression tightened its grip, the social fabric cracked … The sense of a formerly great nation now in crisis massively intensified, its very existence in danger; humiliated, helpless and hopelessly divided amongst itself. Under such pressure, the structure of parliamentary democracy gave way … And as it did, one political force alone, in the eyes of increasingly large numbers of Germans, offered the hope of national salvation: Hitler's Nazi Party. The result would be Hitler's takeover of power in Germany on 30 January 1933.

Marking notes:

This emphasises the impact of the Great Depression and its shattering impact upon Weimar's fragile democracy. The appeal of the Nazi Party to a cross section of German society is implied in Kershaw's interpretation, and he sees a direct connection between the Depression and Hitler's rise to power. The contextual support for this can be seen in the improved electoral performance of the Nazis and the KPD between 1928 and 1932, and the effect of Chancellor Brüning's response to the Depression.

Wider debate

Other interpretations which could be discussed include the alleged structural weaknesses of the Weimar constitution, the fragmentation of political parties, the impact of Versailles and hyperinflation. While the responsibility of politicians and the impact of the Great Depression are powerful explanations it should not be forgotten that Hitler's own political skills, leadership, tactical political ability and sheer good luck had considerable parts to play in the rise of the Nazis to power.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.