



Rewarding Learning
ADVANCED SUBSIDIARY (AS)
General Certificate of Education
2024

History

Assessment Unit AS 1
Historical Investigations
and Interpretations

[SHY11]



SHY11

WEDNESDAY 15 MAY, AFTERNOON

TIME

1 hour 30 minutes.

INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

Write your Centre Number and Candidate Number on the Answer Booklet provided.

Choose **one** option.

Answer Question **1(a)** or **1(b)** and Question **2** from your **chosen option**.

Indicate clearly on your Answer Booklet which option you have chosen.

INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES

The total mark for this paper is 60.

Option 1: England 1509–1558

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

Quality of written communication will be assessed in Question 1.

1 Either

(a) Analyse the features of anti-clericalism in pre-Reformation England. [10]

Or

(b) Analyse the economic and social effects of the dissolution of the monasteries in England. [10]

2 Read Source 1, Interpretation A and Interpretation B and answer the questions which follow:

The Extent of the Marian Persecutions

Source 1

Extract from the *Act of Parliament for the Renewing of Three Statutes made for the Punishment of Heresy*, 1554.

There is a need to avoid the errors and heresies which have much increased recently within this realm. In addition, the ordinary priests need authority to proceed against those who commit these heresies. It is therefore ordained and enacted by the authority of this Parliament that three statutes made to punish heresies shall be renewed. First, the statute made in the fifth year of the reign of King Richard II concerning the arrest of heretical preachers. Secondly, the statute made in the second year of the reign of King Henry IV concerning the repressing of heresies and punishment of heretics. Finally, the statute made in the second year of the reign of King Henry V concerning the suppression of heresy and Lollardy. Every article and sentence contained in these three statutes shall from the 20th day of January next be revived and applied with full force and effect.

The Role of Henry VIII in the Royal Divorce

Interpretation A

Extract from an article by B. Johnson, *Henry VIII*, published in 2022.

Catherine's inability to give him a male heir tortured Henry and he began to question whether their marriage was legal and valid. Henry now wanted a divorce so he could marry Anne Boleyn, but Catherine refused to accept an annulment of the marriage. Catherine's nephew, the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V, became involved, threatening the Pope if his aunt's marriage to Henry was annulled. Pope Clement VII was put in a difficult position, as any decision he made would anger one or the other. He delayed announcing a decision for as long as possible before refusing to grant the divorce. Wolsey had failed to secure the divorce for Henry and was dismissed from office. Henry took matters into his own hands and broke from Rome and the Roman Catholic Church. Excommunicated by the Pope, Henry divorced Catherine in 1533 and married Anne, who was now pregnant.

Interpretation B

Extract from G. R. Elton, *Henry VIII*, published in 1962.

Henry's attempts to solve his dilemma of how to annul his marriage to Catherine of Aragon in the accepted legal way were doomed from the start. Wolsey obtained a trial of the case in England, but this was frustrated by his fellow judge, Cardinal Campeggio, on orders from Rome in 1529. Within weeks, Wolsey was ousted, but his disappearance solved nothing, and the councillors who succeeded him could offer little help to their king, who knew only what he wanted, not how to get it. For some three years, Henry's policy on the divorce issue was characterised by confusion. A revolution was needed, and the revolution required a man who could plan it and carry it out. That man was Thomas Cromwell, who, in April 1532, won control of the Council. The revolution consisted of the decision that the English Church should separate from Rome. The revolution that he had not intended gave the king his wish. In January 1533 he married Anne Boleyn and in May a new archbishop, Thomas Cranmer, presided over the formality of a trial that declared the first marriage annulled.

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

[20]

- (b) **Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B.** Historians have different views about particular issues. Using both interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of the role of Henry VIII in the Royal Divorce do you find more convincing?

[30]

Option 2: England 1603–1649

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

Quality of written communication will be assessed in Question 1.

1 Either

(a) Analyse the aims of James I's foreign policy in the period 1603–1625. [10]

Or

(b) Analyse the beliefs of the radical political groups which emerged in England between 1646 and 1649. [10]

2 Read Source 1, Interpretation A and Interpretation B and answer the questions which follow:

James I's Relationship with the Duke of Buckingham 1603–1625

Source 1

Extract from a letter from James I to George Villiers, the Duke of Buckingham. This letter was probably written in December 1623.

To George, my only sweet and dear child:

I intended to send you a letter yesterday evening, even though you asked me not to write to you. But such a drowsiness came over me that I was forced to sit and sleep in my chair for half an hour. Now, I cannot content myself until I have sent you a present, praying to God that I may have a joyful and comfortable reunion with you. I hope that, this Christmas, we will make together a new marriage that will last for ever. I swear to God that I desire only to live in this world for your sake. I would rather be banished to any part of the earth with you than live like a sorrowful widow without you. And so, God bless you, my sweet child and wife. May you always be a comfort to your dear dad and husband.

Opposition to the Personal Rule of Charles I 1629–1640

Interpretation A

Extract from A. Hughes, *The Causes of the English Civil War*, published in 1998.

Religious divisions were crucial in motivating opposition to Charles I and helped to poison the political atmosphere. By the end of the Personal Rule, there was a widespread belief in a Catholic plot to destroy Protestant England and a reasonable fear that Catholics had infiltrated Charles I's court. Arminian policies played a crucial role in convincing many people that the King himself was involved in this plot. Opposition also affected all levels of society, not just the rich. Ship Money sharply increased the numbers liable to pay tax, but religious divisions also involved broad sections of society. In terms of the ruling classes, it is probably significant that many of the men who were elected MPs in 1640 had made names for themselves by opposing the King's religious policies. But the thousands of Puritans who emigrated to America, along with the many who considered joining them, are evidence that both rich and poor feared for the future of Protestantism in England.

Interpretation B

Extract from C. Hill, *The Century of Revolution 1603–1714*, published in 1961.

The Personal Rule of Charles I broke down after eleven years in which it had every chance of succeeding. For opponents of Charles I, religion was nothing more than a useful rallying cry, and we must not exaggerate its ultimate importance. Even Cromwell admitted that it was not the issue that first motivated him. Instead, the Personal Rule of Charles I broke down because it lost the confidence of wealthy owners of property. Financial policy and trade were the most obvious sources of disagreement between the King and the ruling classes. During the 1630s, all sorts of schemes and taxes were tried to raise money for the Crown. The government acted like a fraudulent bankrupt and the entire wealthy elite were united in opposition to it. Charles I was forced to call Parliament by a revolt of the taxpayers. In 1639, the taxpayers went on strike, encouraged by the presence of a Scottish army.

- (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is Source 1 as evidence for an historian studying James I's relationship with the Duke of Buckingham in the period 1603–1625? You must use contextual knowledge in your answer. [20]
- (b) **Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B.** Historians have different views about particular issues. Using both interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of the reasons for opposition to the Personal Rule of Charles I (1629–1640) do you find more convincing? [30]

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

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

Quality of written communication will be assessed in Question 1.

1 Either

- (a) Analyse the terms of the Parliamentary Reform Act of 1832 and its consequences for British politics. [10]

Or

- (b) Analyse the reasons for the success of the Anti-Corn Law League. [10]

2 Read Source 1, Interpretation A and Interpretation B and answer the questions which follow:

Gladstone's Attitude to Social Reform 1868–1874

Source 1

Extract from a speech by William Gladstone in his Greenwich constituency, 28 October 1871.

Radical reformers are not your friends, but are in fact your enemies, teaching you to look to Parliament for the removal of the evils that damage human life. It is the individual mind and conscience, it is the individual character on which human happiness or misery mainly depends. The social problems which confront us are many and very challenging. The Government may labour to its utmost and Parliament may labour days and nights in your service; however, after they had achieved their very best, the question of whether the English father is to be the father of a happy family and the centre of a united home is a question which must depend mainly upon himself. Whoever promises those who live in towns and cities that every one of them shall have a house and garden in fresh air, with ample space, are attempting to deceive you with their fanatical ideas.

Sir Robert Peel and the Creation of the Modern Conservative Party 1833–1846

Interpretation A

Extract from D. Murphy, R. Staton, P. Walsh-Atkins and N. Whiskerd, *Britain 1783–1918*, published in 2003.

The career of Sir Robert Peel is a catalogue of betrayal and treachery. Traditional Tory values – such as the defence of the agricultural interest – were swamped by what the Ultras claimed was a weakening of party principles and a blatant bid for the votes of the newly enfranchised middle classes. While in office between 1841 and 1846, Peel's arrogance led to him acting as a traitor on a number of key party principles. Firstly, in the 1842 Budget he reintroduced income tax, a direct betrayal of the 1816 measure which Lord Liverpool had introduced to abolish it. Ultimately, the greatest act of betrayal occurred in the summer of 1846, when the cornerstone of party policy, the Corn Law, was repealed despite the fact that two-thirds of his own party voted against it. Peel's duty was to look after the interests of his party first. He may have set out to build a party but instead he split one.

Interpretation B

Extract from N. Gash, *Sir Robert Peel*, published in 1972.

Sir Robert Peel was a superb administrator and an outstanding parliamentary debater. Though he has an unchallenged place as founder of the modern Conservative Party, he regarded ministers of the Crown as servants of the state rather than as mouthpieces for party views. By insisting on fundamental changes in the national interest, he did much to preserve the continuity of aristocratic parliamentary government in an age of rapid industrial change. More than any other, he was the architect of the mid-Victorian age of stability and prosperity that he did not live to see. Though he founded the Conservative Party, Peel took the lead in developing a whole series of liberal measures in government, measures which characterised Liberal as well as Conservative politics in the nineteenth century. He thus helped to develop a governmental liberalism that unified much of the outlook of party politicians, who were otherwise divided on political lines.

- (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is Source 1 as evidence for an historian studying Gladstone's attitude to social reform in the period 1868–1874? You must use contextual knowledge in your answer. [20]
- (b) **Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B.** Historians have different views about particular issues. Using both interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of the role of Sir Robert Peel in the creation of the modern Conservative Party in the period 1833–1846 do you find more convincing? [30]

Option 4: Italy and Germany 1815–1871

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

Quality of written communication will be assessed in Question 1.

1 Either

- (a) Analyse the growth of liberal and nationalist ideas in the German states between 1815 and 1848. [10]

Or

- (b) Analyse the reasons for the poor relationship between Cavour and Garibaldi. [10]

2 Read Source 1, Interpretation A and Interpretation B and answer the questions which follow:

The Failure of the Revolutions in the Italian States 1848–1849

Source 1

Extract from a speech written by Niccolò Tommaseo. Tommaseo was a liberal who had been actively involved in the revolution in Venice in 1848. He intended to deliver his speech to the Venetian Assembly on 4 July 1848, but the Assembly did not allow him to speak.

Should Venice form a state of its own or join Piedmont? I think that it would be entirely wrong for Venice to form a state of its own. But I also see many disadvantages in joining forces with Piedmont. Until now, Piedmont did not even think of itself as being Italian. In addition, some regard Piedmont as being friendly with the Papacy. The privileged classes there have too big a role in public affairs. Moreover, Piedmont and the north of Italy should accept the superiority of the south in certain respects. Italy needs Piedmont to act generously towards the other states. Piedmont must respect past traditions in the other states, so it does not appear to be yet another form of foreign domination.

The Reasons for Prussia's Victory in the Franco-Prussian War 1870–1871

Interpretation A

Extract from J. Breuille, *The Formation of the First German Nation-State, 1800–1871*, published in 1996.

As is usually the case in wars, the losing side made the most mistakes. In other words, Prussia did not win the Franco-Prussian War; France lost it. At the beginning of the war, Napoleon III tried to construct an anti-Prussian alliance. However, his efforts were frustrated by the international situation, which was uniquely favourable to Prussia. There was no prospect of help from Britain, while Italy was of little use. France's best bet was Austria, but Prussia's early successes in the war extinguished any chances of Austrian intervention in support of France. The French took a long time to mobilise and were heavily outnumbered in their crucial defeat at the Battle of Sedan on 1 September 1870. After this defeat France mobilised over 500 000 soldiers but its early losses – dead, captured and wounded – deprived these soldiers of experienced leadership. Throughout the war, France's military leaders displayed indecision in both their strategy and tactics, while internal political divisions also helped to explain France's defeat.

Interpretation B

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

Prussian strength rather than French weakness determined the outcome of the Franco-Prussian War. Bismarck was the chief architect of Prussia's victory, demonstrating his skill as a diplomat to isolate his enemy. Prussia's economic and financial strength provided the military resources it needed to defeat France in 1870–71. The Prussian army improved immensely in the early 1860s, due to the efforts and ability of War Minister Roon. In the summer of 1870, the Prussian army mobilised quickly and by the beginning of August nearly 500 000 troops had been moved by train to the borders of Alsace. In fact, as many as six German railway lines ran to the Franco-German border. The Prussian soldiers were under the command of the brilliant General Moltke and the firepower of the Prussian Krupp artillery proved decisive in achieving its victories in the early battles in the French province of Lorraine.

- (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is Source 1 as evidence for an historian studying the reasons for the failure of the revolutions in the Italian states in 1848–1849? You must use contextual knowledge in your answer. [20]
- (b) **Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B.** Historians have different views about particular issues. Using both interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of the reasons for Prussia's victory in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870–1871 do you find more convincing? [30]

Option 5: Germany 1919–1945

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

Quality of written communication will be assessed in Question 1.

1 Either

(a) Analyse the key terms of the Weimar Constitution of 1919. [10]

Or

(b) Analyse the different groups in Germany who opposed and resisted the Nazi regime in the period 1939–1945. [10]

2 Read Source 1, Interpretation A and Interpretation B and answer the questions which follow:

The Media as a Means of Control in Nazi Germany 1933–1939

Source 1

Extract from a speech by Joseph Goebbels, Nazi Minister for Propaganda and Public Enlightenment, to German newspaper owners and editors, March 1933.

The newspapers are not only there to inform but must also instruct. In saying this, I am directing my remarks above all to the national newspapers. You will recognise that it is an ideal situation for the press to be a tremendously important instrument for influencing the masses. It is possible for the Government and newspaper editors to co-operate with one another based on mutual trust. I am aware of the significance of the press. I regard myself as the senior link between the Government and the press. I will make sure that contact is never interrupted and will introduce similar measures for other forms of the media. For this reason, you will be receiving not only information but also instructions at the daily press conference. You are to know not only what is happening but also the Government's view of it and how you can convey this view to the people most effectively.

The Impact of Nazi Economic Policies 1933–1936

Interpretation A

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

Despite the underlying economic difficulties caused by swift rearmament, there was a major economic recovery in Nazi Germany between 1933 and 1936. The most impressive aspect of the recovery was a sharp fall in unemployment, from six million in 1933 to less than two million by the end of 1936. This was hailed as an economic miracle at the time. The most important figure in the development of the Nazi economy was Dr Hjalmar Schacht, who came up with the idea of Mefo bills, which were used by the regime to place orders with industry for arms. Schacht produced a “New Plan”, which froze all interest payments on foreign debts and created a system of controlling imports according to the needs of the regime. Schacht’s actions had the desired effect as Germany’s economy quickly stabilised and brought increased support for Hitler and the Nazis.

Interpretation B

Extract from J. Noakes and G. Pridham, *Nazism 1919–1945: Volume 2*, published in 1984.

Schacht’s “New Plan” solved the balance of payments crisis in 1934 and in the following year there was a trade surplus. But during the second half of 1935 an unfavourable trend developed, and early in 1936 fears grew of an even worse balance of payments crisis than before. The “New Plan” had been unable to alter fundamentally the basic factors governing Germany’s balance of payments position. The basic problem was the conflict between “guns and butter”. There was a direct relationship between rearmament and the standard of living of ordinary people. The situation became critical in 1935, when a conflict of priorities developed between raw material imports required for rearmament and the import of foodstuffs. Hitler was reluctant to make a decision between the two and appointed Göring to settle the dispute.

- (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is Source 1 as evidence for an historian studying the media as a means of control in Nazi Germany in the period 1933–1939? You must use contextual knowledge in your answer. [20]
- (b) **Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B.** Historians have different views about particular issues. Using both interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of the impact of Nazi economic policies in the period 1933–1936 do you find more convincing? [30]

Sources

Option 1, Source 1.....Act of Parliament for the Renewing of Three Statutes made for the Punishment of Heresy, 1554.© Crown copyright

Option 1, Interpretation A.....Adapted from Henry VIII by Ben Johnson © Historic UK Ltd

Option 1, Interpretation B.....'Henry VIII', G.R. Elton, published for the Historical Association by Routledge & K. Paul; 1st ed edition, 1962

Option 2, Source 1.....© Adapted from 'Letters of King James VI & I' ed G.P.V. Akrigg (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London. University of California Press, 1984

Option 2, Interpretation A.....© Adapted from 'The Causes of the English Civil War' by Anne Hughes, Palgrave Macmillan (1991)

Option 2, Interpretation B.....© 'Century of Revolution, 1603-1714', Christopher Hill, Thomas Nelson & Sons Ltd; First edition, 1961

Option 3, Source 1.....Adapted from <https://www.historyhome.co.uk/polspeech/accompl.htm>

Option 3, Interpretation A.....© Adapted from Britain 1783-1918 by D. Murphy, R. Staton, P. Walsh-Atkins and N. Whiskerd, Collins Educational (2003)

Option 3, Interpretation B.....© Adapted from Sir Robert Peel by Norman Gash, Prentice Hall Press (1972)

Option 4, Source 1.....Adapted from Rome et le Monde by Niccolo Tommaseo. (ISBN: 9781167636035) Published by Kessinger Publishing, LLC. September 2010

Option 4, Interpretation A.....© Adapted from The Formation of the First German Nation-State, 1800-1871 by John Breuilly, Palgrave (1996)

Option 4, Interpretation B.....© Adapted from 'The Unification of Germany 1815-1919', 3rd edition by A. Farmer and A. Stiles, Hodder Education (2007)

Option 5, Source 1.....© Nazism 1919-1945, Vol.2, State, Economy and Society 1933-1939 by J Noakes & G Pridham, University of Exeter Press; 5Rev Ed edition (2000)

Option 5, Interpretation A.....© Adapted from 'Hitler and Nazi Germany' by Frank McDonough, Cambridge University Press (1999)

Option 5, Interpretation B.....© Adapted from 'Nazism 1919-1945: Volume 2' by J. Noakes and G. Pridham (1984)

THIS IS THE END OF THE QUESTION PAPER
