

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2015 series**

**9769 HISTORY**

**9769/58**

Paper 5h (Special Subject: Gladstone and Disraeli,  
1867–1886), maximum raw mark 60

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2015 series for most Cambridge IGCSE<sup>®</sup>, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>58</b>

### **Special Subjects: Document Question**

*These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2, 3 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.*

#### **Introduction**

This question is designed largely to test skills in the handling and evaluation of source material but it is axiomatic that answers should be informed by and firmly grounded in wider contextual knowledge.

Examiners should be aware that the topic on which this question has been based has been notified to candidates in advance who, therefore, have had the opportunity of studying, using and evaluating relevant documents.

The band in which an answer is placed depends upon a range of criteria. As a result, not all answers fall obviously into one particular band. In such cases, a 'best-fit' approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.

In marking an answer examiners should first place it in a band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the band have been met.

#### **Question 1 (a)**

##### **Band 1: 8–10**

The answer will make full use of both documents and will be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues will be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and, possibly, as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation.

##### **Band 2: 4–7**

The response will make good use of both documents and will pick up the main features of the thrust of the argument (depending upon whether similarity or difference is asked) with some attention to the alternative. Direct comparison of content, themes and issues is to be expected although, at the lower end of the band, there may be a tendency to treat the documents separately with most or all of the comparison and analysis being left to the end. Again, towards the lower end, there may be some paraphrasing. Clear explanation of how the documents agree or differ is to be expected but insights into why are less likely. A sound critical sense is to be expected especially at the upper end of the band.

##### **Band 3: 0–3**

Treatment of the documents will be partial, certainly incomplete and possibly fragmentary. Only the most obvious differences/similarities will be detected and there will be a considerable imbalance (differences may be picked up but not similarities and vice versa). Little is to be expected by way of explanation of how the documents show differences/similarities, and the work will be characterised by largely uncritical paraphrasing.

<b>Page 3</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>58</b>

## **Question 1 (b)**

### **Band 1: 16–20**

The answer will treat the documents as a set and will make very effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It will be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material will be handled confidently with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge will be demonstrated. The material deployed will be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument will be well structured. Historical concepts and vocabulary will be fully understood. Where appropriate, an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected. English will be fluent, clear and virtually error-free.

### **Band 2: 11–15**

The answer will treat the documents as a set and make good use of them although, depending on the form of the question, not necessarily in equal detail. There may, however, be some omissions and gaps. A good understanding of the question will be demonstrated. There will be a good sense of argument and analysis within a secure and planned structure. Supporting use of contextual knowledge is to be expected and will be deployed in appropriate range and depth. Some clear signs of a critical sense will be on show although critical evaluation of the documents may not always be especially well developed and may well be absent at the lower end of the band. Where appropriate, an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations may be expected. The answer will demonstrate a good understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary and will be expressed in clear, accurate English.

### **Band 3: 6–10**

There will be some regard to the documents as a set and a fair coverage, although there will be gaps and one or two documents may be unaccountably neglected or, especially at the lower end of the band, ignored altogether. The demands of the question will be understood at least in good part and an argument will be attempted. This may well be undeveloped and/or insufficiently supported in places. Analysis will be at a modest level and narrative is likely to take over in places with a consequent lack of focus. Some of the work will not go beyond paraphrasing. Supporting contextual knowledge will be deployed but unevenly. Any critical sense will be limited; formal critical evaluation is rarely to be expected; use of historical concepts will be unsophisticated. Although use of English should be generally clear, there may well be some errors.

### **Band 4: 0–5**

The answer will treat the documents as a set only to a limited extent. Coverage will be very uneven; there will be considerable omissions with whole sections left unconsidered. Some understanding of the question will be demonstrated, but any argument will be undeveloped and poorly supported. Analysis will appear rarely, narrative will predominate and focus will be very blurred. In large part the answer will depend upon unadorned paraphrasing. Critical sense and evaluation, even at an elementary level, is unlikely whilst understanding of historical concepts will be at a low level. The answer may well be slight, fragmentary or even unfinished. English will lack real clarity and fluency and there will be errors.

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>58</b>

## Special Subject Essays

*These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.*

### Introduction

- (a) The banding definitions which follow reflect, and must be interpreted within the context of, the following general statement:

Examiners should give their highest marks to candidates who show a ready understanding of the relevant material and a disciplined management of the discussion the question provokes. They should be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit should be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of perhaps unremarkable material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners should use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It should go without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners are also asked to bear in mind, when reading the following, that analysis sufficient for a mark in the highest band may perfectly legitimately be deployed within a chronological framework. Candidates who eschew an explicitly analytical response may well yet be able, by virtue of the very intelligence and pointedness of their selection of elements for a well sustained and well grounded account, to provide sufficient implicit analysis to justify a Band 2 mark.
- (e) The band in which an essay is placed depends on a range of criteria. As a result, not all essays fall obviously into one particular band. In such cases a 'best-fit' approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners should first place it in a band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the band have been met.

### Band 1: 25–30

The answer will be sharply analytical in approach and strongly argued. It will show that the demands of the question have been fully understood and that a conscious and sustained attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. It will be coherent and structured with a clear sense of direction. The focus will be sharp and persistent. Some lack of balance, in that certain aspects are covered less fully or certain arguments deployed less strongly than others, need not preclude a mark in this band. The material will be wide-ranging and handled with the utmost confidence and a high degree of maturity. Historical explanations will be invariably clear, sharp and well developed and historical concepts fully understood. Where appropriate, there will be conscious and successful attempts to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material critically and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. Use of English will be clear and fluent with excellent vocabulary and virtually error-free.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the other criteria for this band, limited or no use of such sources should not preclude it from being placed in this band.

<b>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>58</b>

### **Band 2: 19–24**

The answer will be characterised by an analytical and argued approach, although there may be the occasional passage which does not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been very well understood and that a determined attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. The essay will be coherent and clearly structured and its judgements will be effectively supported by accurate and relevant material. Some lack of rigour in the argument and occasional blurred focus may be allowed. Where appropriate, there will be a conscious and largely successful attempt to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. The material will be wide-ranging, fully understood, confidently deployed and well controlled with high standards of accuracy. Historical explanations will be clear and well developed and there will be a sound understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary. Use of English will be highly competent, clear, generally fluent and largely error-free.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to at least some relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the criteria for this Band, very limited or no use of these sources should not preclude it from being placed in this band.

### **Band 3: 13–18**

The answer will attempt an analytical approach, although there will be passages which do not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in large part, and that a conscious attempt has been made to respond to them. There will be an effective focus on the terms of the question and, although in places this may break down, standards of relevance will be generally high. Although it may not be sustained throughout the answer, or always fully supported, there will be a recognisable sense of argument. The material will be clearly understood, with a good range, and organisation will be sound. There will be a conscious attempt to draw conclusions and form judgements and these will be adequately supported. Some understanding of differing and competing interpretations is to be expected and some evaluation of sources may be attempted but probably not in a very sophisticated form. Historical explanations and the use of historical concepts and vocabulary will be generally sound but some lack of understanding is to be expected. Use of English will be competent, clear and largely free of serious errors.

Use of relevant primary sources is a possibility. Candidates should be credited for having used such sources rather than penalised for not having done so.

### **Band 4: 7–12**

The answer may contain some analysis but descriptive or narrative material will predominate. The essay will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in good part, and that some attempt has been made to respond to them. It will be generally coherent with a fair sense of organisation. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be uneven and there will be a measure of irrelevance. There will be some inaccuracies in knowledge, and the range may well be limited with some gaps. Understanding of the material will be generally sound, although there will be some lack of tautness and precision. Explanations will be generally clear, although not always convincing or well developed. Some attempt at argument is to be expected but it will lack sufficient support in places and sense of direction may not always be clear. There may be some awareness of differing interpretations and some attempt at evaluating source material, but this is not generally to be expected at this level and such skills, where deployed, will be unsophisticated. Some errors of English will be present but written style should be clear, although lacking in real fluency.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

<b>Page 6</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>58</b>

### **Band 5: 0–6**

The answers will respond in some measure to the demands of the question but will be very limited in meeting these. Analysis, if it appears at all, will be brief and undeveloped. If an argument is attempted it will be lacking in real coherence, sense of direction, support and rigour. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be very uneven; unsupported generalisations, vagueness and irrelevance are all likely to be on show. Historical knowledge, concepts and vocabulary will be insufficiently understood and there will be inaccuracies. Explanations may be attempted but will be halting and unclear. Where judgements are made they will be largely unsubstantiated, whilst investigation of historical problems will be very elementary. Awareness of differing interpretations and the evaluation of sources is not to be expected. The answer may well be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Significant errors of spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax may well hamper a proper understanding of the script.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is highly unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	58

- 1 (a) How far are the views given in Document A concerning the need for legislation on alcohol licences challenged by Document B? [10]

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be sharply aware of similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues should be made across the documents, rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other and/or differ, and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation. Candidates should make use of the content of the headings and attributions, as well as the text, of the documents.

Good candidates should see that, although both documents discuss the need for fresh licensing on the drink question, the emphasis and the reasons for discussing legislation are quite different. A presents a case for legislation based largely on evidence that drink abuse by women is now becoming prevalent since they can buy alcohol in grocers' shops, whereas they would generally fear to go into public houses. By contrast, in B, licensee representatives are anxious to see regulation of the trade extended to grocers' shops, the strong inference being that their objective is to ensure what they would see as fair competition. B ignores the 'deplorable moral and physical results' of excessive alcohol consumption asserted in A. Similarly, A refers to the 'well-meant and conscientious attempt' to deal with a growing social problem. By contrast, the last sentence of B confirms what for some perceptive candidates will have been the growing impression that its authors are libertarians who seem to dislike almost any kind of legislative interference in their affairs – unless, perhaps, its purpose was to prevent any activity threatening to 'destroy' their 'livelihood'.

In explaining the extent of corroboration, it is legitimate for candidates to employ skills of source evaluation. Here, the requirement will be to make effective inferences both from the content of the sources and from their provenance. The difference in provenance is important. Most candidates will presumably note that both are from newspapers with a regional readership. However, A is an 'opinion piece' aiming to win support for the interventionist case whereas B reports a meeting of representatives of the licensed victualling trade, who were not natural interventionists. Good candidates should be able to work out that the Sheffield and Rotherham paper gives reasons why support for the Liberals' legislative proposals is needed. Some candidates may link this with general comment about the strength of nonconformity in many northern industrial towns and especially the link between nonconformity and alcoholic abstinence. Good candidates might note that B reports a meeting which was aiming at damage-limitation. If legislation of some kind were inevitable, then pressure should be exerted to ensure that, in its final form, the legislation was less damaging for the drink trade than its opponents would wish. B is reportage and, although some candidates may infer a degree of support for the victuallers' position, the reporting is not obviously loaded.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	58

- (b) How convincing is the evidence presented by this set of documents for the view that the Liberals lost the general election of 1874 because their domestic policy was unpopular with the electorate?

In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E). [20]

The answer should treat the documents as a set and should make effective use of each one, although not necessarily in the same detail. Good candidates should show that they have fully understood the focus of the question and can make effective use of the documents by selecting with confidence in order to offer a valid, supported, argument and an effective overall analysis. This question requires candidates to make an overall judgment about the extent to which its domestic legislation adversely affected the Liberal party's chances of victory in the general election of 1874.

Candidates should see that the question requires them to offer a reasoned judgement about the relative importance of a broad selected factor (domestic policy) in explaining an important outcome – the Liberal defeat. Each document offers evidence relating in one way or another to the focus of the question and good candidates should see that the use of cross-reference between the documents will enable effective use of the documents as a set. A presents evidence for seeing the Licensing Bill as 'necessary' not least to deal with what the author sees as the danger for women of excessive availability of alcohol in grocer's shops. B argues for equal opening hours in all places where alcohol is sold, but candidates can infer that this is a fall-back position if self-regulation of hours is not achievable. Although C is pro-Liberal, its author acknowledges that many charge the Liberals with 'plundering and blundering' while the evidence about income tax proposals and licensing legislation shows how the Conservatives have been making political capital out of these issues on the grounds that they are unpopular with the electorate. C also provides evidence of the importance of support from the publicans and licensing trade for the Conservative party. D describes the Liberal measures as 'just' and 'necessary', though alarming to 'timid minds'. It also implies that promoting policies designed to reduce the burden of local taxation had helped the Conservative cause. E offers an entirely different explanation for the Liberals' defeat. Gladstone asserts that Liberal supporters disagree about the importance of a number of local issues. This disagreement often made agreement on which Liberal candidates might field in a general election difficult. Rather than make politically wise compromises, local Liberal organisations allow more Liberal candidates to stand than the number of parliamentary seats available. The Conservatives reap the benefit by winning one of the seats available in two-member constituencies, despite voting patterns which would have given the Liberals both seats if they had fielded only two candidates.

Candidates can draw on considerable contextual knowledge to support, qualify or challenge the judgement in the question. Good candidates will add information and comment about the unpopularity of Liberal measures. In addition to licensing, there is likely to be concentration on how education reform failed to satisfy nonconformist Liberals, while failing to enthuse the Whigs. Similar differences are revealed over issues relating to church reform and, albeit to a lesser extent, the army and universities. Good candidates should argue about the necessity of these measures and the degree of unpopularity they engendered. They might also comment on perceptions of unpopularity discussed in the documents.

Weaker candidates are likely to produce unbalanced answers. Some will be unbalanced responses, offering stronger evidence relating to 'necessary', for example, than on 'unpopular'. Others may have little, or even no, contextual knowledge in support of, or qualifying, an argument. Some will be deficient in both knowledge and analysis. Weaker candidates are also likely to mine the documents for information, progressing only in a limited



Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	58

way beyond straightforward comprehension, when they should be using the sources as a set to construct arguments grounded in evidence.

Where appropriate, an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected. Candidates might know about recent work on the divided nature of Liberal support. Some historians argue that simple distinctions between urban, and more radical, radical Liberalism and landed, aristocratic Whiggery are over crude, if not entirely misleading. This line of argument supports the historians who argue that it was not intrinsic division between two clearly identifiable ‘wings’ of the party which cost the Liberals dearly in 1874 (and, of course, more dearly yet in the mid-1880s) but the nature of Gladstone’s increasingly idiosyncratic and ‘driven’ leadership. For some historians, Gladstone himself was the prime cause of the problems facing the Liberal party even as soon as the early 1870s.

**2 Was support for the Church of England or support for the Monarchy the more important in the development of Disraeli’s political ideas in the period 1868–74? [30]**

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the development of Disraeli’s political ideas about the Church of England and about the role and significance of the monarchy. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required and selection of appropriate information will be a strong indicator of the candidate’s ability to argue on the basis of detailed and valid evidence.

On the Church of England, candidates should know that Disraeli, although a member of the Anglican Church and a regular church-goer, came from an intellectual Jewish background. Personally, he considered support for the Church as essential to his credibility as Conservative leader. More broadly, and more politically, he saw the Church as a focal point for rural society, especially in the south of England, although considerable anti-Catholic voting helped shore up the Conservative position in some urban areas during the 1868 general election, which otherwise went badly for his party. After 1868, Disraeli’s ideas about the Church had a sharper focus. He saw support for the Church as a vote-winner among those who resented the incursions made by nonconformity and Roman Catholicism. Support for the Church of England became an important aspect of the national identity which Disraeli believed would play well with the enlarged post-1867 electorate.

On monarchy, Disraeli got to know the Queen better as a result of his brief prime ministership in 1868. Emphasising Victoria as a national, and increasingly an imperial, symbol also helped focus Disraeli’s ideas on presenting the Conservatives as a national party. Disraeli’s used both charm and flattery in his relations with Victoria. The Queen had previously regarded Disraeli with suspicion both as an outsider and because of his campaign to bring down Peel. Victoria increasingly responded to Disraeli’s ‘personal management’ and increasingly favoured him over Gladstone. Disraeli’s was instrumental in rebuilding the Queen’s image in the late 60s and early 70s after her period of lengthy, duty-neglecting, mourning for Albert. Disraeli also believed that enhancing Victoria’s profile was integral to the UK’s unwritten constitution since it emphasised an important residual role for the monarchy. Disraeli attempted to enhance the role of the Royal Family in the public life of the nation.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgment about the relative importance of the Church of England and the monarchy in the development of Disraeli’s political ideas. Using information such as that identified in AO1 above, good candidates are likely to emphasise the political significance of Disraeli’s support for the Church of England, which became part of Disraeli’s strategy for

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	58

rebuilding Conservative fortunes in opposition. Disraeli was suspicious of High Church Anglicanism because of its close doctrinal and liturgical links with the ‘Church of Rome’. Candidates might argue that support for the Church helped to solidify political support in the Tory party’s heartlands. On support for the monarchy, good candidates are likely to discuss: Disraeli’s increasingly warm relations with Victoria; the risk of compromising Victoria’s constitutional duty to be politically impartial (not that she worried much about such constitutional niceties anyway); attempts to focus on the Royal Family as a powerful national and imperial symbol and how this offered Disraeli and the Conservatives some tempting targets when attacking the Liberal government. Many Liberal radicals were suspicious of how royal power was being deployed, if not actively republican in sympathy. They may also discuss Disraeli’s belief that the monarchy could be made into a powerful national symbol – and thus an important aspect of the ‘circuses’ in ‘Bread and Circuses’. Disraeli also believed that patriotism, which encompassed support for a high-profile monarchy – could be marketed as a distinctively pro-Conservative emotion. Candidates may, of course, argue that either one of these alternatives was the more important, but good candidates will focus on relative importance throughout. Weaker candidates are likely to discuss the Church and monarchy separately and may be insufficiently precise in the selection and/or deployment of material. They are unlikely to sustain a comparative perspective as demanded by the question.

Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Here, some candidates may be aware of reappraisals of Disraeli’s developing political ideas, the emphasis given to the residual importance of his Jewish origins and his limited attention to detail in the formulation of policy.

**AO3** – candidates are not required to use and evaluate documents. However, such use and evaluation, where appropriate, could enhance the quality of responses. Where these skills occur, they should be rewarded under AO2.

Attention is drawn to the rubric: *Where appropriate, your essay should make use of any relevant documents you have studied as well as contextual knowledge.*

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

**3 What best explains why government policies in the period 1867–86 failed to ‘solve’ the Irish question? [30]**

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge both of the nature of the so-called ‘Irish question’ and of British government policies in this period. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required and selection of appropriate information will be a strong indicator of the candidate’s ability to argue on the basis of detailed and valid evidence. Here, candidates should know about the dimensions of the Irish problem, including:

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	58

On British government policies, candidates should know about Irish Church Reform, including disestablishment and disendowment of the Church of Ireland (1869), the Land Acts of 1870 and 1881 and their impact on tenants' right and holdings; Gladstone's conversion to Home Rule and the crisis of 1885–6; government response to agricultural disturbances and boycotts, including the passage of coercion Acts; the Kilmainham Treaty (1882) and attempts at conciliation. On developments in Ireland: the growth of Nationalism, the Home Rule League, the Land League and the leadership of Butt and Parnell (to 1886); growing Nationalist political representation at Westminster from early 1870s (58 Irish nationalists elected in 1874; 85 elected in 1885); Nationalists' parliamentary tactics as their parliamentary influence grew.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement.

Here, the focus is on reaching a judgment about why the Irish question had not been resolved by the end of the period under study. Using information such as that identified in AO1, good candidates will discuss the relative importance of factors such as: reluctance in Parliament to go beyond radical land reform; perception that Irish nationalism could never be sated short of full Home Rule for which there was no majority at Westminster; the importance of nationalist leadership and divergent British policies, sometimes conciliatory, sometimes repressive; the divisive impact of violence – on both 'sides'; the importance both of growing Nationalist representation in Westminster and the development of tactics which were successful in ensuring that Ireland was never far from the top of the political agenda; the extent to which these tactics increased the intransigence of MPs – in both Houses – opposed to Home Rule. Good candidates will weigh the respective importance of such factors and present a reasoned argument on what 'best explains'. Weaker candidates are likely to produce overly descriptive accounts and, when discussing causes, offer brief lists rather than weighing the relative importance of several linked causal factors. They may also be insufficiently precise in the selection and/or deployment of material.

Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses, but are not required. Here, some candidates may be aware of recent debates about Gladstone's attempt to achieve a parliamentary majority for Home Rule and the strength of the opposition arrayed against him, not least from within his own party.

**AO3** – candidates are not required to use and evaluate documents. However, such use and evaluation, where appropriate, could enhance the quality of responses. Where these skills occur, they should be rewarded under AO2.

Attention is drawn to the rubric: *Where appropriate, your essay should make use of any relevant documents you have studied as well as contextual knowledge.*

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 12	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	58

**4 ‘The objectives of British foreign policy under Gladstone in 1868–74 were entirely different from those under Disraeli in 1874–80.’ Were they? [30]**

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge about the foreign policy objectives of both Gladstone and Disraeli. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required and selection of appropriate information will be a strong indicator of the candidate’s ability to argue on the basis of detailed and valid evidence.

Candidates should know about the key elements of Gladstone’s policy and are likely to include: the Alabama incident and British payment of compensation to the USA; the British/US Treaty of 1871 and its importance; the criticism of Gladstone for weakness; Gladstone anxious to condemn Prussian aggression in 1870 but not supported by the Cabinet; the charge that Britain was increasingly an impotent observer of events in northern Europe which threatened the balance of power. On Disraeli, many candidates will concentrate on the Russo–Turkish conflict leading to British intervention to buttress the Ottoman Empire, the Treaty of Berlin (1878) and what Disraeli claimed as ‘peace with honour’. Other aspects of Disraelian foreign policy include: the purchase of Suez Canal shares and the commercial and reputational consequences of Britain’s ability to expand its trading links in Asia; the increasing emphasis on Empire as both a commercial resource and a symbol of Britain’s strength as a great power; and, the Imperial Titles Act (1876) as giving a specific focus to this development.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement.

Here, the focus is on reaching a judgment about the extent of the difference between Gladstone and Disraeli’s objectives as prime ministers in the years 1868–80. Using information such as that identified in AO1, good candidates will discuss the overall foreign policy objectives of the two party leaders and also, as appropriate, their foreign secretaries. They will select specific evidence enabling them to identify both similarities and differences. Some candidates will emphasise similarities, arguing that Britain continued to wish, and plan, for sustaining the European balance of power established in 1815. Both Gladstone (especially in respect of the newly united Germany in the North) and Disraeli (especially in respect of Russia in the South East) attempted to isolate potentially ‘over-mighty’ nations, although most would argue that Disraeli had much the greater short-term success. Others will emphasise differences, notably over Britain’s willingness to go to war under Disraeli to block Russian expansion when Gladstone was presenting himself as the defender of Christianity and the scourge of brutality in the Turkish Empire; on the Empire, Disraeli may be presented as much the more ‘imperialist’, although the extent to which Disraeli extended the Empire (as opposed to using it as a propaganda tool separating Britain from other European nations) is easily exaggerated. Albeit in very different contexts and with different priorities, both Gladstone and Disraeli avoided war in either Europe or the Americas. Many good candidates are likely to conclude by arguing that the objectives of the two men showed more difference than similarity. Some, however, will argue the case that, especially on the big strategic issues, similarity is more striking than difference.

Weaker candidates are likely to produce overly descriptive accounts of foreign policy with only limited discussion of the extent of difference between Gladstone and Disraeli. They may also be insufficiently precise in the selection and/or deployment of material. They are unlikely to sustain a comparative perspective as demanded by the question.

Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Here, some candidates may be aware of recent debates about the role of Empire in fashioning broader foreign policy priorities.

<b>Page 13</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>58</b>

**AO3** – candidates are not required to use and evaluate documents. However, such use and evaluation, where appropriate, could enhance the quality of responses. Where these skills occur, they should be rewarded under AO2.

Attention is drawn to the rubric: *Where appropriate, your essay should make use of any relevant documents you have studied as well as contextual knowledge.*

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.