



GCE AS MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2025

HISTORY - UNIT 2

DEPTH STUDIES 5–8: NON-BRITISH HISTORY

2100U50-1

2100U60-1

2100U70-1

2100U80-1

About this marking scheme

The purpose of this marking scheme is to provide teachers, learners, and other interested parties, with an understanding of the assessment criteria used to assess this specific assessment.

This marking scheme reflects the criteria by which this assessment was marked in a live series and was finalised following detailed discussion at an examiners' conference. A team of qualified examiners were trained specifically in the application of this marking scheme. The aim of the conference was to ensure that the marking scheme was interpreted and applied in the same way by all examiners. It may not be possible, or appropriate, to capture every variation that a candidate may present in their responses within this marking scheme. However, during the training conference, examiners were guided in using their professional judgement to credit alternative valid responses as instructed by the document, and through reviewing exemplar responses.

Without the benefit of participation in the examiners' conference, teachers, learners and other users, may have different views on certain matters of detail or interpretation. Therefore, it is strongly recommended that this marking scheme is used alongside other guidance, such as published exemplar materials or Guidance for Teaching. This marking scheme is final and will not be changed, unless in the event that a clear error is identified, as it reflects the criteria used to assess candidate responses during the live series.

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. **NB:** Both questions in this examination paper are compulsory.

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.

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.				

Stamps and annotations used for Assessment Objective 2

Stamp	Annotation	Meaning/use
	Copy from text	Where the candidate is copying or paraphrasing material and passing it off as analysis
	Correct	Where a correct point drawn from the source has been made
	Incorrect	Where the comment is incorrect in terms of the history or how the history has been (mis)understood, or where an unsupportable conclusion has been made
	Judgement	Used to note an emerging or not fully supported judgement
	Question mark	It is unclear what the candidate is referring to from the source
	Specific	Where the specific historical context of the source is being addressed
	Supported judgement	Used to note a clear and supported judgement. Also used for effective summative judgement
	Value to Historian	Where there is a specific – supported – comment on how the material is of value to an historian
	Wider	Where the wider historical context of the source is being addressed
	Underline	Use to underline contextual analysis
	Box	Used to box larger sections of contextual analysis
	Comment box	Used to provide a brief summative comment of the final mark awarded, drawing on terminology from the mark scheme

2100U50-1

Depth study 5: Religious reformation in Europe c. 1500–1564**Part 1: The outbreak and spread of the Reformation in Germany c. 1500–1533**

0 1 Using your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying criticisms of the Catholic Church between 1516 and 1521. **[30]**

Candidates will consider the value of the sources to an historian studying criticisms of the Catholic Church between 1516 and 1521. 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; however, the material is neither prescriptive nor exhaustive.

Source A Desiderius Erasmus, the humanist philosopher, in “Paraclesis” [Exhortation], the introduction to his translation of the *New Testament* (1516)

I am totally against those who do not want the Holy Scripture to be read by the laity in their vernacular, as if Christ had taught so obscurely that he can only be understood by a few theologians or as if the defence of the Christian religion depended on its not being known! Perhaps it is better if the secrets of kings are concealed, but Christ desires that his mysteries be known as widely as possible. I desire that everyone, including women, read the gospels. ... These ought to be translated into all languages so that not only the Scots and Irish but also the Turks could read and understand them. The first step is certainly to learn them in whatever manner. ... Thus, I would like the farmer to sing Scripture as he ploughs, the weaver to hum it as he weaves, the traveller to pass the boredom of his journey with such stories. Let the conversation of all Christians therefore relate to the Scripture.

Marking notes for Source A

The general context of the source is criticism of the Catholic Church before Luther’s revolt. The idea of helping people to understand Church beliefs for themselves was a part of the Devotion Moderna that Erasmus was a part of, and the idea of having a Bible in the vernacular had been part of the demands of previous challenges to the Church by reformers like Jan Hus. The specific context of the source is the publication of the new translation of the New Testament by Erasmus which becomes such an influential text that Luther and other reformers will base their vernacular translations on it. Rather than being based on the Catholic Church’s *Vulgate* this was drawn from a return to the original Greek text, an approach that had been common for non- religious texts amongst Renaissance scholars.

The source has value in that it was the purity of this text that was the reason why Erasmus was arguing that Christian faith should be based on the true scriptures as he is proclaiming in *Paraclesis*. As a member of the secular Devotio Moderna movement this textual purity was an important element of his attempt to find a purer

form of Christian worship, hence his decision to find the purest form of Christian text, the New Testament in the language in which it was originally written. This was in complete opposition to the official Catholic policy of all services being conducted in Latin and the only sanctioned religious text being the *Vulgate*. However, there are some limitations as while the views of humanists like Erasmus were familiar to scholars like Luther and Zwingli, they were not as well understood by ordinary people as more general anticlerical ideas.

This is in opposition to the arguments in Source B which are made based on the approved Vulgate version of the Scriptures.

2100U50-1

Source B Johann Tetzel, a monk who sold papal indulgences in Germany, in his pamphlet *Rebuttal against Luther's Sermon on Indulgences and Grace* (1518)

Luther's first Article is wrong and unfounded when it claims that that doing penance is not founded on Holy Scripture and on the ancient Christian teachers wherein truth resides. Scripture and many thousands of ancient and modern holy doctors maintain that Almighty God wishes to have repayment and satisfaction for sin. In the Gospel, Christ our Lord commands sinners "Bear fruit worthy of repentance". This is understood and interpreted by all the holy doctors of the whole world to mean satisfying penance. ...

Because of the Articles, many people will hold the jurisdiction of His Papal Holiness and the holy Roman See in contempt. ... People will no longer believe preachers and theologians. Everyone will want to interpret Holy Scripture according to his own whim.

Marking notes for Source B

The general context of the source is the selling of indulgences to raise money from churchgoers by offering them the chance to buy reduction of time in purgatory after death for themselves or their families. The specific context of the source is the publication of Luther's 95 Theses. Tetzel, the seller of the indulgences Luther is criticising, responding to Luther's criticisms that had been sent to Archbishop Albrecht of Mainz in October 1517.

The source has value in that Tetzel is criticising Luther's demand that Church practices should be sola scriptura and pours scorn on the idea of anyone being able to interpret the Scriptures any way they want, instead of having the Church explain things to them. Tetzel ends with a warning about the anarchy this approach could unleashing amongst churchgoers and emphasises that Luther's arguments are a threat to papal authority. However, there are some limitations as Tetzel is writing not just in defence of the Church and the Pope, but also to deflect criticism from himself. What is lacking here is a sense of how other members of the Church are reacting to the 95 Theses to determine how commonly held Tetzel's views were.

This source corresponds with Source A in that Luther's argument about the lack of scriptural support, which Tetzel is criticising, was backed up by Erasmus's translation of the New Testament.

2100U50-1

Source C

Lucas Cranach the Elder, an artist who supported Luther, depicts on the left, Christ washing the feet of the poor, and on the right, the Pope having his feet kissed, in two woodcuts from his satirical pamphlet *Passional Christi und Antichristi* [the Passion of Christ and the Antichrist] 1521).

Passional Christi und**Antichristi.****Marking notes for Source C**

The general context of the source is anti-papalism. In Germany, the Pope was seen as a foreigner interfering in local affairs for his own interests. This view had been prevalent for a while and was connected to other widely held ideas of corruption and anti-clericalism. The specific context of the source is that this source was created following Luther's excommunication in 1520 and the Diet of Worms at which Luther was condemned as a heretic and German princes were ordered to hand him over to face papal justice.

The source has value in that Cranach, a supporter of Luther, is criticising the domineering approach of the Papacy by contrasting the earthliness and secularity of the papal court to the humility of Christ himself. In particular he is contrasting how Jesus washed the feet of his disciples while the Pope is expecting people to kneel at his feet to get a blessing from him, behaving as if he was the Antichrist. However, there are some limitations. Given that the date of the source is after the proclamation of the Edict of Worms, and with Cranach being a supporter of Luther, this source is clearly taking sides in the battle between Luther and the Pope.

This source adds further criticisms of the running of the Church, namely papal corruption in comparison to the life led by Jesus in Scripture, to those already made in Sources A which is a criticism of the accuracy and efficacy of the Vulgate, and B which is a response to the criticism that practices like indulgences were not supported by Scripture.

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 attempts at reform in France between 1779 and 1789. [30]

Candidates will consider the value of the sources to an historian studying attempts at reform in France between 1779 and 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 Jacques Necker, the man in charge of French finances, writing to the King in his *Compte Rendu au Roi* [Report to the King] (January 1781)

I hasten in this moment to announce to Your Majesty, that the present state of finances is such that they exceed, at this moment, Your ordinary expenses, by ten million two hundred thousand livres. This is in spite of the deficit in 1776, in spite of the immense expenses of the war, and in spite of the interest on the loans made to support Your Majesty's ordinary revenues. It is the result of my efforts and the various reforms that You have allowed, as well as by the improvement of your revenues, or by their natural increase, and by the extinction of some annuities and some repayments.

Marking notes for Source A

The general context of the source is the concern prevalent among the elites of the First and Second Estate that Royal finances were in a very precarious position for reasons that are noted in the text. The specific context of the source is the American war of Independence which France had joined in order to gain revenge on the British for French territorial losses in the Seven Years War. Speculation was rife that government debt had ballooned in order to fund the country's military support for the American rebels. The source has value in that it is directly from the man in charge of French finances Jacques Necker. France did not have a budget as such, and the source is therefore valuable in giving us insight into the state of Royal finances. Yet the details contained in the source suggesting small surplus were considered by many to be incredulous as later events would show when the government declared itself bankrupt. The *Compte Rendu* was economical with the truth and in fact royal finances were in significant deficit.

2100U60-1

Source B Memorandum to Louis XVI from a group of royal princes known as the Princes of the Blood (12 December 1788)

The claim put forward by several sections of the Third Estate is that their estate should obtain two votes in the Estates-General while each of the two leading Estates continue to have only one.

The undersigned princes agree with the Assembly of Notables [that there would be injustice and danger if the composition of the Estates-General – and the form of summoning it – were changed]. ... If votes were counted by head and without distinction of Estates, the corruption of a few members of the Third Estate would compromise the interests of the Second Estate, which are well protected in the present constitution. It would lead to the destruction of the balance between the three Estates, which has been so wisely established, as well as their independence. It has been demonstrated to Your Majesty how important it is to preserve: the only form of summoning the Estates-General that is constitutional and which is upheld by law and custom; the distinction between the Estates; the right to deliberate in separate chambers; the equality of votes [between Estates], which are the unalterable foundations of the French monarchy.

Marking notes for Source B

The general context of the source is the attempt of Louis and his ministers to introduce a reform package that would tackle the issue of the deficit, which had become apparent. The favoured approach of the crown to secure broad support for its reform package was to summon a hand-picked body – ‘The Assembly of Notables’ yet this had not worked. The Specific context is the debate about the summoning the Estates General - a process which had last occurred in 1614. This decision underlined the gravity of the financial situation confronting royal government. The source has value in that it is a memo from the Princes of the Blood the most prestigious of the second estate in which they warn the king of the danger of summoning the Estates General and the way that proposed voting changes could seriously compromise and undermine the domination of the privileged estates when the Estates General is meets. Voting by head would benefit the Third Estate if their number are doubled.

2100U60-1

Source C A coloured print entitled *Réveil du Tiers État* [Awakening of the Third Estate] (c. July 1789). The image depicts a member of the Third Estate, wearing a Revolutionary cockade [knot of ribbons], breaking free of his chains and reaching for weapons as the nobility and the clergy jump back in horror.



Marking notes for Source C

The general context of the source is the summoning of the Estates General in the spring of 1789 and the increased power which the Third Estate now had and wielded, as its representation was doubled and was now equal to that of the combined deputies of the privileged First and Second Estates. The source has value in that it clearly suggests that the emerging power of the Third Estate is causing alarm among the Clergy of the First Estate and the Nobility of the Second Estate who are depicted as recoiling from the downtrodden figure of the Third Estate who had cast off his shackles. They were largely immune from the economic crisis gripping the nation. The fear that the Third Estate will adopt a violent approach to securing promoting and protecting its new-found power is evident in the depictions of the arms which are being grasped, and all is set against a background image of the Bastille whose storming on 14 July 1789 is acknowledged as marking the start of the French Revolution.

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 abolitionist movement between 1850 and 1860. [30]

Candidates will consider the value of the sources to an historian studying the abolitionist movement between 1850 and 1860. 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; however, the material is neither prescriptive nor exhaustive.

Source A Theodore Kaufman, a German artist painting in New York, depicts people who had once been enslaved being pursued and shot at by slave catchers in an illustration from the pro-abolitionist print “Effects of the Fugitive Slave Law” (September 1850).



2100U70-1**Marking notes for Source A**

The general context of the source is increasing support for abolitionism, a movement that had been gathering support and building momentum since the 1830s and which was particularly strong in the towns and cities of the northern states. The specific context of the source is abolitionist reaction to the 1850 Fugitive Slave Act. This law tried to undermine the process by which slaves escaped from their masters in the southern states and lived free lives in the northern states. It allowed slave owners to travel or send agents north to capture former slaves who had escaped and bring them back to work on the plantations they had escaped from in the southern states. The source has value in that the artist is trying to draw his viewer's sympathy towards the well-dressed former slaves in the foreground of the picture who are being shot at by the slave catchers who are pursuing them across the fields in the background of the picture. The artist is an abolitionist living in New York, a city where there were a number of black Americans but where there was no legal slavery in 1850. Prior to this Act, slaves had been able to escape from captivity in the South to live new lives as free people in the North. However, the Act gave their owners the right to send agents to return the slaves to them as they were still considered to be their property. It is the injustice of this that is being highlighted in this image. There are limitations, not the least of which is that this is a foreign artist working in a place closely associated with abolitionism, but almost certainly with no direct experience of slavery. The source corresponds with Source B where John Brown references unjust laws that undermine the rights of the enslaved and formerly enslaved.

2100U70-1

Source B John Brown, an abolitionist, in a speech to the court at his trial in Charlestown, Virginia, after being found guilty of treason (2 November 1859)

This court acknowledges, I suppose, the validity of the law of God. I see a book here which I suppose to be the Bible, or at least the New Testament. This book teaches me that whatsoever men can do to me, I can also do to them. It teaches me, further, to remember those that are in chains, as if I was kept in chains with them. I endeavoured to act up to that instruction. I believe that to have interfered as I have done – as I have always freely admitted I have done – on behalf of the despised poor was not wrong, but right. Now, if it is deemed necessary that I should forfeit my life and mingle my blood with the blood of my children and with the blood of millions in this slave country, whose rights are disregarded by wicked, cruel, and unjust laws, I submit. So let it be done!

Marking notes for Source B

The general context of the source is growing frustration of many abolitionists in the late 1850s as they saw first the Fugitive Slave Law and then the Supreme Court's Dred Scott ruling make the lives of the enslaved more and more circumscribed. The specific context of the source is John Brown's speech after his conviction over the Harper's Ferry incident for which he has just been found guilty of treason. John Brown's sons had died in his attempt to liberate weapons from the federal arsenal at Harper's Ferry to arm his planned insurrection against slavery.

The source has value in that Brown is using the Bible to justify his attack on the federal arsenal and to free its slaves, an act which he describes as being based on his strong sense of justice. As with many abolitionists, Brown is clearly motivated by very strong religious convictions, and in this case, he is demonstrating his support for the suffering of the slaves by sacrificing his own life, having already lost the lives of his sons during the Harper's Ferry attack. The source has some limitations, not the least of which is that as it was a speech made in court, in public, Brown was probably making it to achieve maximum publicity for his cause, hoping it would be widely reported to bring more people forward to continue the cause for which he had sacrificed himself and his family.

The source corresponds with Source A in that Brown is using the platform of his trial to highlight the injustices faced by enslaved Americans.

2100U70-1

Source C H Ford Douglas, a notable abolitionist and formerly an enslaved man, in his speech to the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society “I Do Not Believe in the Anti-Slavery of Abraham Lincoln”, published in *The Liberator*, an abolitionist newspaper (July 1860)

I know Abraham Lincoln, and I know something about his anti-slavery. I know the Republicans do not like this kind of talk, because, while they are willing to steal our thunder, they are unwilling to submit to the conditions imposed upon that party that assumes to be anti-slavery. They say that they cannot go as fast as you anti-slavery men go in this matter; that they cannot afford to be uncompromisingly honest, or so radical as you Garrisonians [supporters of William Garrison]; that they want to take time; that they want to do the work gradually. They say, “We must not be in too great a hurry to overthrow slavery; at least, we must take half a loaf, we cannot get the whole.” Now, my friends, I believe that the very best way to overthrow slavery in this country is to occupy the highest possible anti-slavery ground by getting ourselves elected.

Marking notes for Source C

The general context of the source is the arguments for and against abolition of slavery in the USA in the 1850s and the failure to find an effective compromise. The specific context of the source is the reaction to an abolitionist and former slave to the 1860 presidential election campaign of Abraham Lincoln, which was still being formed at this point. It was assumed by many that because Lincoln had criticised the institution of slavery in the years preceding this that it would be his policy to try to end slavery across the USA, although at this point the Republican platform had yet to be finalised.

The source has value in that H Ford Douglas is criticising Lincoln and the Republicans for saying that they are anti-slavery, at the same time as arguing that dealing with the slavery problem will have to be done gradually and will take time. Douglas is clearly frustrated by this hence his scepticism about whether Lincoln would ever do anything to help slaves. He is in fact arguing that the best way for the abolitionists to get the end of slavery is for them to get elected to office and to sort it out themselves. However, there are some limitations. This view is being promoted in an abolitionist newspaper, founded by William Garrison in the 1830s, without any idea of what Lincoln intended to do if elected. As the date is several months before the critical 1860 election party policies were still in the process of being formed and so a lot of assumptions about the Republican platform and Lincoln in particular are being made. As a former slave, and having witnessed the failure of the US political system to deal effectively with the issue of slavery in the 1850s, H Ford Douglas is clearly very sceptical of the ability of any US government to solve this problem.

The source corresponds with Source B in that it demonstrates frustration at the lack of action to help end the suffering of enslaved Americans.

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 economic challenges facing the Weimar Republic during the period from 1921 to 1932. **[30]**

Candidates will consider the value of the sources to an historian studying economic challenges facing the Weimar Republic during the period from 1921 to 1932. 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; however, the material is neither prescriptive nor exhaustive.

Source A Minutes of the British Cabinet discussing German reparations and war debts (22 December 1921)

The position [of the Cabinet] as regards German reparation was: that on 15 January and 15 February next, Germany would have to find 30 to 35 [pounds] million sterling, and it was pretty clear that the German Government could [only] produce 10 to 12 million. ...

Undoubtedly her inability to pay was due to her own action. As a result of the generous subsidies given by the German Government, the State Budget showed a deficit. The real fact was that the German Government was a very weak Government, in fear of Bolshevism on the one hand, and a revival of Prussianism on the other. The experts were unanimously of the opinion that if the Allies were to insist on Germany making considerably heavier payments than she could at present afford to make, she would collapse into a hopeless state of chaos.

Marking notes for Source A

The general context of the source is the Treaty of Versailles, the conflict within Germany at the end of the war and the widespread resentment across the political spectrum in Germany at the war guilt clause and the Allied insistence on reparations. The specific context of Source A is the German government's failure to meet its reparation payments, the political instability of the early republic and the persistent haggling between the German and Allied governments about reparations. The source has value in its analysis of problems at an early stage by a key great power. The British government was generally more sympathetic to the plight of Germany than the French. The view of the political situation in Germany is revealing: the dangers of political fragmentation in the Weimar Republic and the instability of its governments are already evident. The British cabinet is clearly concerned at the potential for chaos so soon after the Peace Conference. It is a formal record of a high-level discussion which is remarkably prescient. The source has limitations in that it is a formal record of a meeting, which tends to focus on outcomes rather than document argument or debate. It is also a perspective from one (albeit important) Great Power. The source corresponds with the revelations about the impact of Allied actions in Source B and the longevity of the issue revealed by Source C's reference to the Young Plan.

2100U80-1

Source B Betty Scholem, a resident of Berlin, in a letter to her son who had emigrated (15 October 1923)

Conditions have taken a catastrophic turn here. Notice that this letter cost 15 million marks. It will be 30 million beginning the day after tomorrow and this price will most likely last a mere two days at most. Now you can get things done only with billions. ... The bread ration card has been done away with, and a normal loaf of bread now costs 540 million; tomorrow surely twice as much. The streetcar fare is 20 million; tomorrow it'll be 50 million. ... If throughout the world there is such little understanding of our plight, how can we expect that anyone will come to our aid? It seems inevitable that we will lose the Rhine and the Ruhr, that Bavaria will break away and that Germany will once again fall apart into miniscule petty states.

Marking notes for Source B

The general context of the source is the continuing impact of the implementation of the Treaty of Versailles, the failure to maintain reparation payments and the French occupation of the Ruhr which did so much to debase the German currency. The specific context of Source B is the hyperinflation of 1923 and its dire consequences within Germany both economic and political. The source has value both for its immediacy and the exemplification of the personal experiences of inflation. Moreover, it highlights the fears of the break-up of the German state only 50 years after its creation: fears which were well grounded if the contemporary events in the Rhineland and Bavaria are considered. The source has limitations in that we do not know how well informed the author was about the international viewpoints she criticises. Although it is a private letter there is no reason to doubt its authenticity, and its evidence is still powerful. The source corresponds with the fears expressed in Source A.

2100U80-1

Source C Franz von Papen, the German Chancellor and conservative politician, in a speech to the Lausanne Conference (Summer 1932). This conference temporarily ended the payment of German reparations.

Nothing can prove more clearly the catastrophic upheaval that has occurred during this period than a comparison between the world as it was in 1929 and the situation today. In those days there existed a system of international credit that appeared to function without friction and an active and fruitful exchange of capital from one country to another. ... Every country was ready to welcome the goods of other countries in well-ordered exchanges. Industry worked at a profit. ... These were the characteristic features of the period during which the Young Plan was conceived.

What an abyss between the glowing optimism of those days and the pessimism and despair of today! In Germany this state of things has most strongly shaken the confidence of the masses in the good functioning of the capitalist system. ... What is particularly fatal is that an ever-growing number of young people have no possibility and no hope of finding employment. Despair and the political radicalisation of the youth of the population are the consequences of this state of things.

Marking notes for Source C

The general context is the short-lived recovery of 1924-9 and, as von Papen points out, the deteriorating political and economic situation in Germany after 1929. The specific context of Source C is the temporary cessation of reparations negotiated at Lausanne. Candidates should also highlight the considerable impact of the Great Depression on Germany in 1930-32, particularly the surge in unemployment which is highlighted in the source. von Papen is desperate for a foreign policy success to shore up his weak, short-lived government. The source has value in that this is a public statement from the German Chancellor at a crucial moment. Candidates can comment on von Papen's reliability and his political beliefs. The source has limitations in that von Papen's political bias must, to a degree, affect his judgement. Nonetheless, the source is valuable for its assessment of the political and economic situation in the summer of 1932. The source links with Source B in that it reflects upon the improvements after 1924 in Germany's economic position.

Marking guidance for examiners for Question 2

Summary of assessment objectives for Question 2

Question 2 assesses assessment objective 3. This assessment objective is a single element focused on the ability to analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted. The mark awarded to Question 2 is 30. Both questions in this examination paper are compulsory.

The structure of the mark scheme

The mark scheme for Question 2:

- An assessment grid advising which bands and marks should be given to responses that demonstrate the qualities needed in assessment objective 3.
- 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.

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.

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.			

Stamps and annotations used for Assessment Objective 3

Stamp	Annotation	Meaning/use
	Context	Where the candidate is offering contextual support for discussion of the interpretation
	Copy from text	Where the candidate is copying or paraphrasing material and passing it off as analysis
	Correct	Where a correct point drawn from the interpretation has been made
	Incorrect	Where the comment is incorrect in terms of the history or how the history has been (mis)understood, or where an unsupportable conclusion has been made
	Interpretation	Where the candidate is assessing how and – possibly – why an interpretation has been developed
	Judgement	Used to note an emerging or not fully supported judgement
	Question mark	It is unclear what the candidate is referring to from the interpretation
	Specific	Where one or both of the given interpretations is addressed
	Supported judgement	Used to note a clear and supported judgement. Also used for effective summative judgement
	Wider	Where an alternative interpretation is addressed
	Underline	Use to underline sections commenting on interpretation
	Box	Used to box larger sections commenting on interpretation
	Comment box	Used to provide a brief summative comment of the final mark awarded, drawing on terminology from the mark scheme

2100U50-1

0 2

Historians have made different interpretations about the role played by Luther. Analyse and evaluate the two interpretations together with your understanding of the historical debate to answer the following question:

How valid is the view that Luther's role in the Reformation has been exaggerated?

[30]

Candidates are expected to show an understanding of how aspects of the past have been interpreted in different ways. Answers 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 Luther's role in the Reformation has been exaggerated.

Some of the issues to consider may include the following; however, the material is neither prescriptive nor exhaustive.

Interpretation 1: Peter Marshall, in this extract from his book *1517: Martin Luther and the Invention of the Reformation* (2017), provides an interpretation that suggests the Reformation was unintended.

At the very least, the question of whether Luther's nailing of the Ninety-five Theses to the church door in Wittenberg did indeed happen is an invitation to reflect on whether there was anything inevitable, or even likely, about a permanent split in Western Christianity in the sixteenth century. It also questions the extent to which "the Reformation" is really anything more than a tidy retrospective label for an unpredictable sequence of messily accidental events.

Marking notes for Interpretation 1

This interpretation argues that Luther had wanted to prompt a debate about the practice of indulgences in 1517 but had never intended that this would lead to a permanent split in the Church. This fits with the argument that by posting his Theses Luther was only following standard theological practice of highlighting questions to be explored, leading to a new understanding of an issue. Marshall also argues, as many post-modern historians do, that the Reformation is nothing more than a convenient historical label applied retrospectively to explain what people at the time would only have experienced as a sequence of chaotic events as Luther and the Church authority reacted in increasingly extreme ways to each other, rather than engaging in the debate and discussions that Luther had intended. Written in 2017, this view was published in a year in which there was a lot of focus on Luther, but this book is arguing that Luther's actions 1517 were much less significant than others have argued.

2100U50-1

Interpretation 2: Lyndal Roper, in this extract from her book, *Martin Luther: Renegade and Prophet (2017)*, provides an interpretation that suggests Luther came to accept that he had caused the break with the Catholic Church.

For Protestants it is almost an article of faith that the Reformation began when Martin Luther, the shy monk, nailed his Ninety-five Theses to the door of the castle church in Wittenberg on 31 October 1517, the eve of All Saint's Day, and set in motion a religious revolution that shattered Western Christendom. For Luther's closest collaborator Philip Melanchthon ... the posting of these theses advanced the restoration of the "light of the gospel". Luther himself liked to celebrate the moment as the beginning of the Reformation and drank a toast to it with friends in later life.

Marking notes for Interpretation 2

This interpretation argues that the Reformation began with Luther's posting of the 95 Theses in Wittenberg in October 1517. This then set in motion a series of events from Luther's attempts to justify his views to the Augustinians to his excommunication and the public condemnation of him as a heretic at the Diet of Worms. Not only that, the Reformation Luther set in motion was a religious revolution that destroyed the unity of Christendom and the monopoly of the Papacy. Roper is also suggesting that Luther and his peers fully understood the significance of what he had done at the time. This is very much in line with the traditional Protestant view of Luther, as well as in line with the Great Man Theory of history as well. This is a view that seemed to dominate the 2017 celebrations of four hundred years of the 95 Theses, the year in which this book was published.

Wider debate

An alternative view could be a blending of these two views, as is more commonly represented in modern interpretations, that Luther began making academic points of correction but became more and more extreme as the Church reacted to what he had said until a full break with Rome became inevitable. Post modern views might also suggest it was the context rather than Luther himself that was important which is why he succeeded where Hus and others failed, or that his is less important if you take the view of the "long Reformation" rather than thinking of it as a revolution.

2100U60-1

0 2

Historians have made different interpretations about the causes of external conflicts in this period. Analyse and evaluate the two interpretations together with your understanding of the historical debate to answer the following question:

How valid is the view that the war broke out in 1792 to protect the revolution?
[30]

Candidates are expected to show an understanding of how aspects of the past have been interpreted in different ways. Answers 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 war broke out in 1792 to protect the revolution.

Some of the issues to consider may include the following; however, the material is neither prescriptive nor exhaustive.

Interpretation 1: TCW Blanning, in this extract from his book *The Origins of the French Revolutionary Wars* (1986), provides an interpretation that the French Legislative Assembly wanted war in order to protect the revolution.

The dominant party in the French Legislative Assembly was intent on, indeed desperate for, war [in order to protect the Revolution]. ... There was a general fear of royal treachery and counter-revolutionary conspiracy that the Brissotins played [encouraged] with ever increasing effect. It was the argument on which they built their ultimate solution to all of France's problems – war. The campaign for war was launched by Brissot in a speech on 20 October 1791. The main theme was the existence of a gigantic international conspiracy to restore the old regime.

Marking notes for Interpretation 1

This interpretation argues that war broke out in 1792 to protect the revolution by focusing on the bellicose stance adopted by Brissot and the Girondins (who was the key figure of the dominant party in the Legislative Assembly) in fomenting the pro-war sentiment. Within France and particularly the Legislative Assembly fear and suspicion of counter-revolutionary activity was rife. Many suspected Louis and Marie Antoinette of harbouring and supporting a so-called Austrian Party whose aim was to entice Austria to invade. In order to take the initiative in a pre-emptive way Brissot argued passionately in favour of war against the Habsburg Empire as a means of protecting the Revolution and the many gains made for the people of France.

2100U60-1

Who was the key figure of the dominant party

Interpretation 2: Norman Hampson, in this extract from his book *The French Revolution. A Concise History* (1975), provides an interpretation that Louis XVI wanted France to lose the war so that the power of the monarchy could be restored.

The Assembly voted for the deportation of priests who refused to take the oath to the Civil Constitution of the Clergy and demanded the death penalty for émigrés who refused to leave expeditionary forces that were gathering in Germany ... Both proposals were vetoed by the King ... By the spring of 1792, most influential opinion was in favour [of a war]. The King and Queen were confident that the Allied armies (of Austria and Prussia) would brush aside the French forces and restore the monarchy to its former power.

Marking notes for Interpretation 2

This interpretation argues that it was the provocative policies of the Austrians – particularly their support for the émigré armies, they and their allies were hosting – which riled politicians in the legislative assembly, although not all were drawn to the merits of a conflict. The role of the Austrians is crucial as they had issued a number of warnings to the French regarding their treatment of Louis. This level of interference in French internal politics was certainly considered by many to be unacceptable. Given the close family ties between France and Austria it was viewed by Louis that a disastrous war which France lost was a sure-fired way to seeing him restored to his former position of authority backed by Austrian bayonets.

Wider debate

Alternatively, candidates may refer to the validity of other interpretations as to why France went to war in 1792. It was argued that, in effect, the only way to preserve the Revolution was to spread its fundamental principles to the populations of other absolute monarchies. This approach of exporting the revolution as a sort of moral and political crusade was popular with many. However, not everyone among the Jacobins, most notably Robespierre, approved of this approach and argued that the forces unleashed by war could not be fully appreciated and could pave the way for the emergence of a military dictatorship.

2100U70-1

0 2

Historians have made different interpretations about the institution of slavery. Analyse and evaluate the two interpretations together with your understanding of the historical debate to answer the following question:

How valid is the view that slavery was primarily an economic institution in the US before the Civil War? [30]

Candidates are expected to show an understanding of how aspects of the past have been interpreted in different ways. Answers 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 slavery was primarily an economic institution in the US before the Civil War.

Some of the issues to consider may include the following; however, the material is neither prescriptive nor exhaustive.

Interpretation 1: Jill Lepore, in this extract from her book *These Truths – a History of the United States* (2019), provides an interpretation that suggests that slavery was an economic institution.

The first factories ... weren't in buildings housing machines powered by steam they were outdoors in the sugarcane fields of the Carolinas and in the tobacco fields of Virginia. Slavery was a kind of experiment, designed to save the cost of labour by turning human beings into machines ... [This] divided the American economy into two: an industrial North and an agricultural South ... Slavery wasn't an aberration in an industrialising economy; slavery was its engine. Factories had mechanical slaves; plantations had human slaves. The power of machines was measured by horsepower, the power of slaves by hand power.

Marking notes for Interpretation 1

This interpretation argues that slavery had a significant economic value to the Southern states. This was an argument that was supported by left wing historians from the early decades of the twentieth century but has continued to have supporters amongst Marxist historians ever since. Written in 2019, Lepore's economic interpretation describes slavery as a being part of the agricultural machinery of the southern states, enabling them to produce cotton and tobacco at a much lower cost than they would have been able to with ordinary waged labour. It was very effective at making the Confederacy rich, and the wealth of the planter class was entirely derived from slave labour. Lepore compares the importance of slavery in agricultural production to the importance of machinery in the factories of the northern states. Lepore also points out the link between the economic importance of slavery in the South and the wealth of northern industrialists who were making their money from selling products made from the materials being produced by slaves.

Interpretation 2: Steven Hahn, in this extract from his book *A Nation Without Borders: The United States and its World in an Age of Civil Wars, 1830–1910* (2016), provides an interpretation that suggests that the institution of slavery was preserved for political reasons.

Slaveholders had long been vigilant, not only about protecting their interest and ways of life, but also about expanding their power. How else to explain the remarkable success they had in fashioning a constitution that gave slavery a legal basis in every corner of the United States through the fugitive slave laws, and rewarded slaveholders with more political representation than any other group of Americans ... Slavery's defenders argued that slavery was the necessary basis of a republic and the best means of excluding those not fit to participate.

Marking notes for Interpretation 2

This interpretation argues that slavery was part of the political fabric of the republic of the United States of America. Slavery had been acknowledged in the original Constitution and the number of slaves helped to determine the number of representatives a state had for the House and with the Senate giving equal representation to every state no matter how many people lived there this magnified the power of the slave-owning states way beyond what the numbers of people they were representing should have had. The passing of the Fugitive Slave Act in 1850 then gave the federal government the role of protecting the property of slave owners, whether those slaves were working on plantations in the South or living in apparent freedom in the North. The federal government was also tasked with putting down slave rebellions and responding to acts of terror against the owning of slaves like John Brown's raid on Harper's Ferry. Written in 2016, this interpretation is in line with more modern and post-modern schools of thought which argue that politicians could not resolve the slavery issue because the two sides in the argument had become so deeply politically entrenched.

Wider debate

Alternative arguments could be made to say that it was the social status of slavery in Southern planter society that was its dominant characteristic and why they defended it so vigorously. This was an argument made at the time of the Civil War, and by many Southern historians ever since as a justification for trying to maintain the institution in the face of considerable opposition. A more modern view on this would be that the social supremacy of the rich planter class was maintained by keeping slaves as the lowest rung in society so that poorer white workers could feel superior to slaves and would be less likely to challenge the social status of the landowners.

2100U80-1

0 2

Historians have made different interpretations about domestic and foreign policy developments 1924–1929. Analyse and evaluate the two interpretations together with your understanding of the historical debate to answer the following question:

How valid is the view that the period from 1924 to 1929 was a Golden Age for the Weimar Republic? [30]

Candidates are expected to show an understanding of how aspects of the past have been interpreted in different ways. Answers 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 period from 1924 to 1929 was a Golden Age for the Weimar Republic.

Some of the issues to consider may include the following; however, the material is neither prescriptive nor exhaustive.

Interpretation 1: JAS Grenville, in this extract from his book *A World History of the Twentieth Century – Volume 1: 1900–1945* (1980), provides an interpretation that suggests the period from 1924 to 1929 was a “Golden Age” for the Weimar Republic.

Stresemann was realistic and accepted limits to German power. His Germany would be one of Europe’s great powers, not the only great power, and as such he determined to recover his country’s position and prestige. He succeeded in doing so until his untimely death in 1929. Despite the nationalistic patriotic clamour against the French and the diktat of Versailles, he recognised that Germany was only ruining her economic recovery at home and her reputation abroad. His policy was that of sweet reasonableness, a policy of ‘fulfilment’.

At home, too, this was a brief golden period for the Republic. The currency was stabilised and exports flourished. These were the brief years of prosperity and, had they continued, the German people might well have come to value more their new republican democracy.

Marking notes for Interpretation 1

This interpretation argues that Stresemann’s foreign policy and the economic recovery after 1924 were praiseworthy. This interpretation argues that Stresemann’s policies were not only successful in restoring prosperity but were also realistic in acknowledging Germany’s weak bargaining position in the 1920s. It therefore provides support for the Golden Age thesis. It makes the point that had this progress had a longer implementation period the Republic may well have survived. Candidates can use their contextual knowledge to evaluate this interpretation. This interpretation was written in 1980 and provides a broad assessment of the Weimar Republic in line with the prevailing view of Stresemann at this time.

2100U80-1

Interpretation 2: William Carr, in this extract from his book *A History of Germany 1815–1990* (1991) provides an interpretation that suggests the description “Golden Age” is an exaggeration.

Although Stresemann succeeded in removing all foreign troops from German soil, the demilitarised Rhineland remained as a reminder that Germany had not yet regained complete sovereignty over her own territory. ... It is sometimes said that Weimar Germany experienced boom conditions between 1924 and 1929 ... [but] the extent of the boom has been greatly exaggerated. Capital investment was already falling by 1929; unemployment ... was never less than 1.3 million and reached 3 million by February 1929. Contrasting sharply with the spectacular growth of heavy industry was the poor performance of agriculture and small industry, both starved of capital. ... The true position was disguised by the massive inflow of foreign capital and the extensive welfare system.

Marking notes for Interpretation 2

This interpretation takes issue with the Golden Age thesis, suggesting that there were limits to Stresemann’s foreign policy achievements and that shortcomings in economic policy were present well before the events of 1929–32. It suggests that the Golden Age was based on foreign capital and extensive welfare payments which disguised underlying economic problems. Again, candidates can use their contextual knowledge to assess the plausibility of Carr’s argument. This interpretation suggests that severe structural weaknesses in the economy doomed any prospect of responding successfully to the depression after 1929. This interpretation was written in 1991 and could take into account the significant revisionist work on the Weimar Republic and Stresemann in particular.

Wider debate

There are several alternative interpretations that provide opportunities for further discussion notably interpretations that stress the growing alienation of significant sections of German society by the late 1920s—the farmers, the middle classes, industrialists, the nationalist right and the disillusionment of German youth—all fertile breeding grounds for extremism. Other interpretations point to the deep-seated political problems of the Republic which were never resolved: the polarised nature of German society and politics, the defects of the Weimar constitution, the decline of liberalism and the fragmentation of the centre and the short-lived, weak governments that plagued the period—only 6 out of 23 governments had majority support in the Reichstag. Many believe the Weimar republic never put down strong enough roots to ensure its survival. Nevertheless, there is some support from historians for the argument that it was the crucial mistakes made after 1929 by Brüning, von Hindenburg, von Schleicher and von Papen that ensured the demise of the Republic and so, therefore, the years 1924–29 could indeed be seen as a Golden Age of promise and opportunity that was squandered by its successive leaders.