



Rewarding Learning

**ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education
2016**

History

Assessment Unit A2 2

[AH221]

WEDNESDAY 25 MAY, AFTERNOON

**MARK
SCHEME**

Level of response mark grid

This level of response grid has been developed as a general basis for marking candidates' work, according to the following assessment objectives:

- AO1a** recall, select and deploy historical knowledge accurately and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner;
- AO1b** present historical explanations, showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements;
- AO2** In relation to historical context:
- interpret, evaluate and use a range of source material;
 - explain and evaluate interpretations of historical events and topics studied.

The grid should be used in conjunction with the information on indicative content outlined for each assessment unit.

Level	Assessment Objective 1a	Assessment Objective 1b	Assessment Objective 2
	Answers at this level will:	Answers at this level will:	Answers at this level will:
1	recall, select and deploy some accurate factual knowledge and communicate limited understanding in narrative form. There will be evidence of an attempt to structure and present answers in a coherent manner.	display a basic understanding of the topic; some comments may be relevant, but general and there may be assertions and judgements which require supporting evidence.	limited recognition of the possibility of debate surrounding an event or topic.
2	be quite accurate, contain some detail and show understanding through a mainly narrative approach. Communication may have occasional lapses of clarity and/or coherence.	display general understanding of the topic and its associated concepts and offer explanations which are mostly relevant, although there may be limited analysis and a tendency to digress. There will be some supporting evidence for assertions and judgements.	an attempt to explain different approaches to and interpretations of the event or topic. Evaluation may be limited.
3	contain appropriate examples with illustrative and supportive factual evidence and show understanding and ability to engage with the issues raised by the questions in a clear and coherent manner.	display good breadth of understanding of the topic and its associated concepts. Analysis is generally informed and suitably illustrated to support explanations and judgements.	there will be an ability to present and evaluate different arguments for and against particular interpretations of an event or topic.
4	be accurate and well-informed and show ability to engage fully with the demands of the question. Knowledge and understanding will be expressed with clarity and precision.	display breadth and depth of understanding of the topic and its associated concepts. Explanations will be well-informed with arguments and judgements well-substantiated, illustrated and informed by factual evidence.	there will be appropriate explanation, insightful interpretation and well-argued evaluation of particular interpretations of an event or topic.

Option 1: England 1570–1603

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Answer question 1 and either question 2(a) or 2(b).

- 1 (a) **Consult all the sources and your knowledge of this period.** Which of the sources would an historian value most as evidence in a study of the relations between Elizabeth I and her Parliaments in the period 1570–1603?

This question targets AO2(a): the candidate's ability, as part of an historical enquiry, to analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers will paraphrase the content of each source and make assertions that are not fully supported. Source 1 mentions Parliament's concern regarding freedom of speech. Source 2 suggests that the Queen has granted liberal speech but with limitations. Source 3 highlights that Elizabeth's Parliament was unified by mutual self-interest and devotion to the Crown.

Level 2 ([4]–[7])

Answers will comment on the utility of the sources, using the content more fully. Source 1 is of value as it is an extract from a speech delivered by Peter Wentworth to the House of Commons. In it Wentworth outlines his concerns regarding the position of Parliament. He is reporting on a rumour he had heard that the Queen was unhappy about parliamentary discussions. He is also expressing his concern regarding freedom of speech and appears unhappy with the Queen's handling of Parliament. Source 2 is of value as it is an extract from a speech delivered by the Lord Keeper to the House of Commons in 1593. He is reminding the Commons that Elizabeth has given MPs some liberty of speech but with limitations. It would be unwise to discuss matters such as religion or the state of government. MPs are reminded that the Queen commands them to reply yes or no to legislation, with little discussion. Source 3 is of value as it is a later interpretation from Graves who suggests that Parliament was united through self-interest and devotion to the Queen. It argues that, although there may sometimes have been squabbles, these were few and of no great threat. On the whole Parliament carried out its legislative role adequately.

Level 3 ([8]–[11])

Answers will present a more sustained assessment of the value of each source and reach a credible conclusion. Answers at this level will discuss utility, not just for the information it provides, but also for the quality of the evidence – author, date and audience. Source 1 is of value as it is an extract from a speech given by one of Elizabeth I's Members of Parliament, Peter Wentworth. Wentworth was an outspoken MP who continually clashed with the Queen over a variety of issues. In this extract he is concerned about parliamentary freedom of speech. The speech was delivered in 1576 when relations between the Queen and Parliament had become strained. This is clear as Wentworth reports that there are rumours suggesting that the Queen is unhappy with Parliament. He is addressing the Speaker of the House of Commons, Elizabeth's representative, and the Commons itself. Source 2 is of value as it is a speech from the Lord Keeper who is speaking on behalf of Elizabeth I. He is addressing the Commons in 1593 when there

was some tension between it and the Queen. The tone is one of warning. He is assertively reminding MPs that the Queen granted them some freedom of speech but this has its limitations. She wishes to remind them that they may not speak as they please unless they wish to be punished for this. Source 3 is of value as it is a later interpretation by Graves. He suggests that Parliament was not a body of opposition but a series of meetings between the Queen and her loyal governing class. Unlike Sources 1 and 2, Graves does not suggest that relations were strained between Elizabeth I and her Parliaments. He recognises that there were episodes of friction but these were few and Graves believes that they in no way disrupted the work of Parliament. He suggests that due to self-interest and devotion to Elizabeth I, relations were generally good between the monarch and her Parliaments.

Level 4 ([12]–[15])

Answers will use a wide range of criteria to assess utility, commenting on the significance of the information provided, authorship, motive, viewpoint, audience and date. Contextual knowledge will be introduced to enhance the answer. Source 1 is of value as it is the opinion of a Member of Parliament, Peter Wentworth. Wentworth was outspoken and many regarded him as the Puritan leader within the Commons. On this occasion he is defending Parliament's right of freedom of speech. This was an area of tension since Elizabeth regarded this as a privilege which she granted and could therefore remove. Wentworth advocated that it was the right of MPs. By 1576 he is vocal in his opposition. Parliament has not met since 1572 when it ordered Elizabeth to deprive Mary, Queen of Scots of the right of succession. Elizabeth refused its demand and dissolved Parliament. Wentworth outlined in the first session of the 1576 Parliament that freedom of speech was a fundamental part of the constitution. This source suggests that relations were strained but Wentworth was not representative of all MPs. It is worth noting that after this the Commons, and not Elizabeth, removed him from the Chamber. He then spent one month in the Tower of London. Source 2 is of value as it provides us with an alternative view of relations between Elizabeth I and her Parliaments. Although this is a speech by the Lord Keeper, he has clearly been instructed by Elizabeth as to what direction the speech will take. He was used by Elizabeth as a tool to control Parliament. By 1593 there had been episodes of tension between the Queen and Parliament on such matters as Mary, Queen of Scots' succession and the Religious Settlement which are alluded to in this source. Elizabeth believed that she had given Parliament the privilege of speech and she was using the Lord Keeper as a tool to remind it that, just as a privilege is given, it can be easily taken away. By 1593 Elizabeth I was frustrated with some Members of Parliament and she had used various tactics to reinforce their loyalty towards her. She had attended debates or used her men, through patronage, to sway opinion to support her. Through this speech Elizabeth I warns her Parliament that there will be repercussions for disobedience. Previous MPs such as Strickland and Wentworth ended up in the Tower for questioning her in Parliament. This source suggests that relations were strained but Elizabeth I was able to manage this. Source 3 is of value as it is a later revisionist interpretation and gives a general view of relations between Elizabeth I and her Parliaments. As a revisionist, he suggests that relations were "good" and there was little conflict between Elizabeth I and her Parliaments. He recognises that there were areas of friction, possibly referring to the question of marriage and succession or reform to the Elizabethan Church Settlement,

but he implies that they did not threaten the political stability of the country. Parliament was called 13 times and on 11 of these occasions supply was granted. If the relationship had been one of tension, surely it would not have been so accommodating with finance? On no occasion did it directly threaten Elizabeth's position or threaten her rule. Legislation was implemented and they worked together to maintain stability and peace in England. This source suggests that relations were good and Parliament remained loyal. At this level candidates are expected to nominate a particular source as the most valuable. [15]

- (b) Use all the sources and other evidence you have studied.** How far do the sources support the view that there was tension between Elizabeth I and her Parliaments between 1570 and 1603?

This question targets AO2(a) and AO1(b): the candidate's ability, as part of an historical enquiry, to analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination **AO2(a)** and the candidate's ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[3]) AO2(a), ([0]–[3]) AO1(b)

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement **AO1(b)**. For example, the answer may give a general description of the tension between Elizabeth I and her Parliaments. Answers may rely on paraphrasing the sources or provide a narrative of the subject with little reference to the sources **AO2(a)**.

Level 2 ([4]–[5]) AO2(a), ([4]–[5]) AO1(b)

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement **AO1(b)**. For example, Source 1 suggests that there was tension regarding the question of freedom of speech. Source 2 also implies that there was tension over this issue. Source 3 suggests that in general relations were good between Elizabeth I and her Parliaments and there was little tension.

Level 3 ([6]–[7]) AO2(a), ([6]–[7]) AO1(b)

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgement are developed and substantiated. **AO1(b)**. For example, Source 1 suggests that there was tension between Elizabeth I and Parliament. This source refers to the issue of freedom of speech and parliamentary concerns regarding it. It mentions that there are rumours that Elizabeth I is unhappy with the activity of Parliament and the question of freedom of speech. It also suggests that there is tension as Wentworth implies that the Queen is at fault and she must be careful in her dealings with Parliament. Source 2 also implies that there was tension regarding the issue of freedom of speech. Through the Lord Keeper, Elizabeth I is reminding the Commons that it has liberty of speech but it is not unrestrained. There are limitations on what MPs are permitted to express in the House. The Lord Keeper also suggests that there has been tension regarding religion and this is reflected in the Puritans' attempts to alter the religious settlement through Parliament. However, Elizabeth I also

reminds MPs that they are not restrained from speaking according to their conscience and they should never be afraid to express their opinions. This would perhaps imply that there was little tension but merely misinterpretation of the role of Parliament. Source 3 suggests there was little tension due to self-interest and devotion to the Crown. “Frictions and squabbles” do not signify tension but minor disagreements. For most part Parliament was aware of its legislative role and administered the country efficiently **AO2(a)**.

Level 4 ([8]–[10]) AO2(a), ([8]–[10]) AO1(b)

Answers at this level will consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are very well developed and substantiated **AO1(b)**. Answers will interpret and evaluate the sources fully in relation to their historical context. Both aspects of the proposition should be addressed. For example, Sources 1 and 2 suggest that there was tension between Elizabeth I and her Parliaments, particularly concerning freedom of speech. Source 1 is the opinion of Peter Wentworth, a member of the Commons, and refers to the question of the rights of Parliament. He is unhappy as he believes Elizabeth I has been placing pressure on Parliament not to discuss certain issues. Candidates may address this issue and highlight that Elizabeth I was unhappy with Parliament discussing the issues of marriage and succession, the fate of Mary Queen of Scots and her religious settlement. Parliament had not been called since 1572 so there were areas which it wished to discuss. Sources 1 and 2 both suggest that there was tension between Elizabeth I and her Parliaments over the question of freedom of speech. This was an area of conflict, as Elizabeth I believed that MPs had privileges, whereas they demanded their rights of freedom of speech. Source 1 warns Elizabeth I that not to allow freedom of speech could prove dangerous to her, whereas Source 2 warns Parliament that completely free speech could lead to ruin. Indeed, the author of Source 1 was imprisoned in 1587 for such an act. Source 2 suggests that there were other areas of tension, including religion and the state of government. At this time there were some Puritans within the Commons, such as Cope and Field, who wished to alter the Elizabethan Church Settlement through legislation. They were removed from the Commons for such “foolish” talk. Source 3 contradicts the other sources. It suggests that Parliament was a unified body and that this was due to its own self-interest and loyalty to the Queen. Candidates may discuss sixteenth century politics and the importance of patronage. Each MP was more concerned with his own promotion than attacking the Queen. Throughout her reign Elizabeth I managed her Parliaments through loyalty, demanding this and rewarding in return. Source 3 suggests that for the most part Parliament carried out its main function of passing legislation and efficient administration, offering the Queen little advice. Further study of her Parliaments confirms this; supply was granted, religion was never altered and Elizabeth I never married. However, it is worth noting that on occasions Parliament did take the lead. At the end of her reign Elizabeth I submitted and compromised over the question of monopolies **AO2(a)**. [20]

35

- 2 (a) How far would you agree that Elizabeth I's policy towards France between 1570 and 1603 was inconsistent? Use relevant evidence you have studied including contemporary and later interpretations to support your answer.

This question targets AO1(b) and AO2(b): the candidate's ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)** and the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways **AO2(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[5]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([0]–[3]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. Answers at this level may be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. For example, they may give a narrative account of Elizabeth I's relationship with France. There will be little or no awareness of either contemporary or later interpretations of this subject. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([6]–[10]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([4]–[7]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level will select and deploy historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. Responses may provide a more detailed account of Elizabeth I's policy towards France but fail to address the proposition. Answers may mention that France had always been England's traditional enemy and this was intensified with the Reformation and Elizabeth I declaring that England was a Protestant nation. This was also heightened by Mary, Queen of Scots, who had close links with France. For many Mary was the rightful legitimate heir to the English throne and she believed this herself. Relations were strained in 1572 with the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre, when approximately 3000 Huguenots were murdered. Pressure was placed on Elizabeth I to support the Huguenots but she refused to do so. Instead, she offered them unofficial help. The question of marriage also dominated Anglo-French relations. Negotiations began in 1570 and some believed that an Anglo-French marriage was a real possibility. In the end this failed to materialise. There will be some awareness of either contemporary or later interpretations of the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development. For example, contemporary opinion suggests that Elizabeth I was seriously considering this marriage. Later interpretations would suggest that Elizabeth I never intended to marry. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to illegibility, inaccurate spelling, punctuation or grammar; at times, the style of writing will be inappropriate. There may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([11]–[15]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([8]–[11]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. Answers should identify some inconsistencies in Anglo-French policy. France was a Catholic country and the Elizabethan Church Settlement declared England a Protestant country. In 1570 Elizabeth I was excommunicated from the Roman Catholic Church, making her a heretic in the eyes of Catholic countries. However, this is not reflected in

Anglo-French policy. In 1572 both countries signed a defensive treaty, the Treaty of Blois, creating an alliance against Spain. In 1572, when France massacred over 3000 Huguenots on St. Bartholomew's Day, Elizabeth I refused to officially help fellow Protestants. Instead she sent unofficial aid. This reflects inconsistency with her Religious Settlement and her eventual involvement in the Netherlands. Despite religious differences, by 1572 Elizabeth I was prepared to consider a marriage to the Duke of Anjou. She seriously considered this proposal until she reluctantly declined in 1581. The people and Court of England would not accept a French marriage. This reflected an inconsistency as Elizabeth I had declared that she would never marry, yet she was prepared to marry Anjou. During this period Elizabeth I also held Mary, Queen of Scots, a previous Queen of France, captive. Rumours circulated that plots surrounding the release of Mary had some French support. Elizabeth eventually executed Mary. This suggests inconsistency as it appears that for most of this period relations with France were good. In 1584 France signed the Treaty of Joinville, a pro-Catholic alliance with Spain and an aggressive alliance against Elizabeth I. This suggests inconsistency as now France and Spain were allied against England. On the one hand, Elizabeth I was willing to marry the French heir, yet on the other France was prepared to ally with Spain against England. There will be a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject **or** a partial evaluation of **both**. Contemporary interpretations could include, for example, members of Elizabeth I's Court and their attitude towards France and the question of marriage. They may mention the attitude of William Cecil and Elizabeth I herself. Historians' interpretations could include, for example, the traditional school of thought which believed that Elizabeth I's relations with France were reactive and lacked a clear direction. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

Level 4 ([16]–[20]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([12]–[15]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis are very well developed and substantiated. Answers will attempt in a more definite and sustained way an assessment of Anglo-French relations and question whether Elizabeth I's policy was inconsistent. France had been a traditional enemy of England and was one of the most powerful Catholic countries in Europe. England was emerging as a great Protestant power in Europe so this would suggest that the two would become enemies. Elizabeth's aim throughout her reign was internal stability and avoiding war at all costs. Above all else Elizabeth I guarded the safety of her kingdom and her foreign policy was aimed at preventing invasion. This is reflected in her policy towards France. Although she was a religious enemy, Elizabeth I wished to maintain cordial relations with France. This is reflected in the Anjou marriage proposals. While Elizabeth I was allowing Anjou to court her, she was unofficially supporting Protestant Huguenots in France. Elizabeth I also wished to avoid war with Spain and both England and France feared Spain. This is reflected in the Anglo-French Treaty of Blois in 1572. Both countries agreed to defend each other against a Spanish attack and France agreed to no longer support Mary Stuart's claim to the English throne. This is consistent with the Anjou proposal as a marriage would strengthen defence against Spain. Elizabeth I also wished to weaken the "auld alliance" between

France and Scotland. The Treaty of Blois and the marriage proposal achieved this in spite of the execution of Mary, Queen of Scots. Elizabeth I was also concerned with control of and trade with the Netherlands. She used relations with France to hinder Spanish control of the Netherlands. She encouraged French involvement in the Netherlands. Elizabethan policy towards France may appear erratic and inconsistent but Elizabeth I was consistent in her aims. She wished to avoid religious confrontation and invasion; and in that sense her policy can be viewed as consistent. Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of this subject. Contemporary interpretations could include, for example, members of her Court, Privy Council and Parliament. Historians' interpretations could include, for example, revisionist opinion, such as Doran, who suggests that Elizabeth I's relations with France were consistent. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate; there is very good organisation and use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. [35]

- (b) To what extent would you agree that the arrival of Jesuit priests in England posed the greatest Catholic threat to Elizabeth I in the period 1570–1603? Use relevant evidence you have studied including contemporary and later interpretations to support your answer.

This question targets AO1(b) and AO2(b): the candidate's ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)** and the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways **AO2(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[5]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([0]–[3]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. Answers at this level may be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. For example, they will give a superficial account of who the Jesuit priests were and when they arrived in England. There will be little or no awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject. Meaning may not always be clear because of inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([6]–[10]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([4]–[7]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level will select and deploy historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. It will have supporting evidence. For example, the response may mention that Jesuit priests began arriving in England in 1580 and by the end of her reign their number had increased to around 300. Leading Jesuits, such as Robert Parsons and Edmund Campion, had high connections with Catholics in England, Spain and Rome. They took direct orders from the Pope and were viewed as a very significant threat to Elizabeth I as they were a direct challenge to the Church of England. They were also a great threat as they produced pamphlets with a secret printing press and help from old Marian priests. Elizabeth's response was to legislate against them in the 1581 and 1585 Parliaments,

implying that they were a grave threat to her. There will be some awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development. For example, the answer may mention some contemporary members of the Jesuit order, such as Southwell or Campion. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to illegibility, inaccurate spelling and punctuation or, at times, the style of writing will be inappropriate. There may be occasional flaws, with defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([11]–[15]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([8]–[11]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. Answers will focus on the threat posed by the Jesuits and begin to assess whether this was the most significant Catholic threat. The Jesuits took their orders directly from the Pope and when they arrived in 1580 they were a direct challenge. Campion publicly condemned the Elizabethan Church and urged all to reconvert to Catholicism. Priests embarked on missionary tours of England and were supported by the gentry and nobility. Elizabeth I's response suggests that she regarded them as a significant threat. Between 1581 and 1585, 64 Jesuits were executed. In 1581 Campion was tortured and subsequently executed. Legislation was passed in 1581 and 1585 against the Jesuits. However, there is much to suggest that they were not that significant a threat. By 1580 the Catholic threat in England had diminished and it appears that the Jesuits could not ignite this. By the end of Elizabeth I's reign there were fewer than 20 Jesuit priests. Few Catholics in England supported them as many regarded them as too extreme. During the Armada there was no support for the Catholic Spanish invasion. There will be a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject **or** a partial evaluation of **both**. Contemporary interpretations could include comments from Members of Parliament and Court. Later interpretations could include the traditional school of thought which viewed the Jesuits as a significant threat. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

Level 4 ([16]–[20]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([12]–[15]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis are very well developed and substantiated. Answers will attempt in a more definite and sustained way an assessment of whether the arrival of the Jesuits was the greatest Catholic threat to Elizabeth in the period 1570–1603. They had connections with the great European Catholic powers of Spain and Rome. There was Catholic dissent already present in England and the Jesuits would be able to build upon this support. However, it could be argued that other Catholic threats were more dangerous to Elizabeth I. The plots surrounding Mary, Queen of Scots could be viewed as much greater. They were a direct attack on Elizabeth I and these plots had an alternative heir prepared to take the throne from Elizabeth I. They were supported by members of the English nobility and gentry, as well as Spain. There were four plots in total and each one proved more dangerous. The Spanish Armada of 1588 could also be viewed as a more significant threat. This was a direct invasion against Elizabeth I with an army. This invasion hoped to build on Catholic support within England and Ireland. Since peace

was signed in 1604 after Elizabeth I's death, this threat continued to be active until the end of her reign. The same cannot be said of the Jesuits who rapidly diminished in influence and numbers. Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of this subject. Contemporary opinion may include communication between Philip II of Spain and his ambassadors. It may also include comment from Elizabeth I's Parliament and the Court with regard to Mary, Queen of Scots. Later interpretations may include the traditional opinion that the Jesuits were a significant threat. It may also include revisionist opinion that they were of little threat. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate; there is very good organisation and use of specialist vocabulary. [35]

Option 1

AVAILABLE MARKS	
	35
	70

Option 2: Ireland 1607–1691

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Answer question 1 and either question 2(a) or 2(b).

- 1 (a) **Consult all the sources and your knowledge of this period.** Which of the sources would an historian value most as evidence in a study of the policies of James II in England in the period 1685–1688?

This question targets AO2(a): the candidate's ability, as part of an historical enquiry, to analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers will paraphrase the content of each source and make assertions that are not fully supported.

Level 2 ([4]–[7])

Answers will comment on the utility of the sources, using the content more fully. Source 1 is valuable because it refers to one of James's major policy initiatives. Source 2 is another contemporary account by those directly affected by James II's religious policies. Source 3 is also of value because it is written by an historian from an objective perspective.

Level 3 ([8]–[11])

Answers will present a more sustained assessment of each source in relation to its value, and reach a credible conclusion. Answers at this level will note that all three sources provide an insight into the policies of James II in England from differing perspectives. James himself in Source 1 demonstrates how important the Declaration of Indulgence is to him in furthering his policy of toleration. In contrast, the Petition of the Seven Bishops in Source 2 calls into question the legality of the King's action, since the dispensing power that has been employed by the Crown has previously been prohibited by Parliament. David Cody, in Source 3, makes reference to the controversy surrounding the Declaration of Indulgence and the resulting trial of the Seven Bishops, the authors of Source 2, but gives a wider perspective on James's reign, noting in particular the growth of the standing army.

Level 4 ([12]–[15])

Answers will use a wide range of criteria to assess utility, commenting on the significance of the information provided, authorship, motive, viewpoint, audience and date. Contextual knowledge will be introduced to enhance the answer. Answers may note that a significant strength of Sources 1 and 2 is their dates – both from the final year of James II's reign, 1688, and therefore at a time when James's policies were well established. This is evidenced by the reference in Source 2 to the dispensing power. Contextual knowledge might be applied here to point out that James had been using this device since the aftermath of the Monmouth rebellion to arguably circumvent the constitution with regard to his appointment of Catholics to civil and military positions, which is referred to in Source 3. Furthermore, the matter had been the subject of legal proceedings in the *Godden v Hales* case of 1686. Candidates, however, might reasonably argue that the first two sources are limited by the narrowness of their focus – on the single issue of the

Declaration of Indulgence of 1688. The counter-argument here is that this is one of James II's major policy initiatives in pursuit of his objective of religious toleration, causing both controversy and opposition, particularly from the hierarchy of the Church of England. This line of analysis could be developed with reference to Source 3, which notes that the Second Declaration of Indulgence (Source 1) led not only to the opposition of Archbishop Sancroft and six of his colleagues (Source 2) but to their arrest, trial and ultimate acquittal – a major setback for the King. Source 3 has the added value of also highlighting James's establishment and augmentation of a standing army, and candidates might make the contextual point that, to many of the population, this development smacked of the beginnings of continental-style absolutism. At this level, candidates would be expected to nominate a particular source as the most valuable, and there is much scope for candidates to make a strong case for any one of the sources. Source 1 is a policy announcement by the King himself, though candidates might well question the veracity of its content. Source 2 demonstrates arguably the most high-profile opposition to Crown policy that James II had faced up to this point in his reign. Source 3, by David Cody, provides both an objective and incisive assessment of James II's policies. [15]

- (b) **Use all the sources and other evidence you have studied.** How far do the sources support the view that James II's conflict with the Church of England was the main reason for the failure of his policies in England in the period 1685–1688?

This question targets AO2(a) and AO1(b): the candidate's ability, as part of an historical enquiry, to analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination **AO2(a)** and the candidate's ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[3]) AO2(a), ([0]–[3]) AO1(b)

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement **AO1(b)**. For example, there may be a general reference to James II's undermining of the Church of England by his policy of religious toleration. Answers may rely on paraphrasing the sources or provide a narrative of the subject with little reference to the sources **AO2(a)**.

Level 2 ([4]–[5]) AO2(a), ([4]–[5]) AO1(b)

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement relating to James II's conflict with the Church of England **AO1(b)**. For example, all three sources make explicit reference to aspects of James's policies that had a direct impact on his relationship with the Church, especially in relation to the issuing of the Second Declaration of Indulgence and the consequences arising from that action **AO2(a)**.

Level 3 ([6]–[7]) AO2(a), ([6]–[7]) AO1(b)

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgement are developed and substantiated **AO1(b)**. For example, it could be argued that

James's deteriorating relationship with the Church of England was central to the failure of his policies in England, and indeed his ultimate loss of the throne, particularly in light of the pledge he had made at the start of his reign to uphold and protect the constitution that he had inherited – and the Church's place within that constitution. Yet, despite that commitment, the policy of Catholicisation that James began to pursue before the end of 1685 – appointing Catholics to senior positions in both the army and civil administration – was an implicit if not explicit assault on the Church of England's privileged position in relation to positions of service to the state. This was exemplified by the rise of the Catholic Earl of Sunderland at court, appointed as Lord President of the Council and Secretary of State, and the related decline in influence of the Protestant Earl of Rochester, who was dismissed as Lord Treasurer in January 1687. A much more blatant challenge to the Church came in July 1686, when James created the Commission for Ecclesiastical Causes – a revival of the type of Royal prerogative court that Parliament had banned in 1641. One of the first things that the Commission did was to expel the Fellows of Magdalen College, Oxford, for refusing to accept the King's nominee for college president – the Catholic Anthony Farmer. In 1687, the College was turned into a Catholic institution. Answers will address the sources, noting that, although the King presents his religious policy in a positive light and gives the impression that it is widely supported (Source 1), the Petition drawn up by the Archbishop of Canterbury and six other Anglican bishops (Source 2) is evidence that by May 1688 James had lost the support of the Church of England. The King then compounded his weakened position by putting these seven Church leaders on trial – in which they were acquitted – effectively creating martyrs for the anti-Catholic cause in England (Source 3) **AO2(a)**.

Level 4 ([8]–[10]) AO2(a), ([8]–[10]) AO1(b)

Answers at this level will consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are very well developed and substantiated in relation to the proposition that it was James's conflict with the Church of England that was the main reason for the failure of his policies in England **AO1(b)**. For example, candidates might argue that the alienation of the Church of England had begun with the issuing of the First Declaration of Indulgence in 1687, which suspended the application of the Penal Laws against Catholics, but was officially presented – like the Second Declaration – as a genuine attempt to grant religious toleration in the kingdom. Many Anglican clergy, however, and indeed much of the general population, suspected that this was really a move to restore Catholicism as the official religion of the state. Such fears were only likely to have been heightened by the actions of James's close ally at this time, Louis XIV of France, who in 1685 had withdrawn religious toleration for French Protestants by revoking the Edict of Nantes. Nonetheless, despite the creeping Catholicisation that seemed to lie behind the policies of James II in England, and the disaffection this fostered in the Church of England, leading ultimately to the stand taken by the Seven Bishops, good answers will appreciate that there were other factors involved in the failure of these policies. Militarily, James had raised fears that he was preparing to introduce absolutist rule by first maintaining a standing army after the Monmouth rebellion of 1685 and then increasing its size in subsequent years. The King's handling of the rebellion itself – in particular the excessive punishment meted out by Judge Jeffreys in

what was called the “Bloody Assizes” – had effectively ended James’s “honeymoon period” with his new kingdom just six months after he had succeeded to the throne. Constitutionally, the King was also perceived to have transgressed by his legally dubious application of the suspending and dispensing powers – despite winning the test case of *Godden v Hales* in 1686 – which began to alienate the Tory establishment who now saw signs of a Catholic tyranny in the making. Furthermore, James’s first – and as it turned out, only – Parliament had been prorogued as early as November 1685 because of criticism of the King’s appointment of Catholics to the army. In the summer of 1687, James formally dissolved his Parliament and began canvassing officials across the country regarding their support for the formal repeal of the Test Acts. The information was used to begin a purge of corporations, aimed at producing a pliable Parliament which would agree to the King’s wishes. This attempt to subvert the legislature served to unite Tories, Anglicans and Whigs (who had never wanted a Catholic King in the first place) against James II, ensuring the failure of his policies and in the end his loss of the crown. Answers will interpret and evaluate the sources fully in relation to their historical context. For example, while Source 1 is apparently focused on the King’s religious objectives, the reference to a future Parliament could be interpreted as evidence of a related hidden agenda, namely the “packing” of Parliament to make it compliant to the King’s will. Similarly, Source 2, while on the surface apparently focused on the Declaration of Indulgence, in fact also raises constitutional issues, specifically the use of the dispensing power, which can be related to the growing fear of a Catholic absolutist monarchy emerging. Source 3 can be cross-referenced with Source 1 on the significance of the Second Declaration of Indulgence, and with Source 2 on the stand taken by Archbishop Sancroft and his ecclesiastical colleagues against James II’s policies, arguably encouraging Protestant opposition that would eventually produce the Glorious Revolution and the downfall of James. Source 3 also highlights the King’s lack of political nous as fundamental to James’s failure by 1688 AO2(a). [20]

35

- 2 (a) To what extent did the unofficial plantation of Antrim and Down influence the planning and execution of the official Plantation of Ulster by the Crown? Use relevant evidence you have studied including contemporary and later interpretations to support your answer.

This question targets AO1(b) and AO2(b): the candidate’s ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)** and the candidate’s ability to analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways **AO2(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[5]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([0]–[3]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. Answers at this level may be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. For example, there may be a general reference to the Plantation of Ulster or the unofficial plantation of Antrim and Down. There will be little or no awareness of either contemporary or later interpretations of the subject. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling,

punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Level 2 ([6]–[10]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([4]–[7]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level will select and deploy historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. It will have supporting evidence. For example, it may note that the unofficial plantation preceded the official Plantation of Ulster and was generally successful. There will be some awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development. For example, a view from one of the planters might be deployed, while, in terms of later interpretations, Jonathan Bardon's detailed study of the Ulster Plantation may be used. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to illegibility, inaccurate spelling, punctuation or grammar; at times, the style of writing will be inappropriate. There may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([11]–[15]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([8]–[11]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. Answers may focus on the fact that the plantation of Antrim and Down had a head-start on the official Plantation of Ulster by some four years, and most importantly had demonstrated that plantation in this part of Ireland could be successful, despite the failure of a number of Irish colonisation schemes under the Tudors in the preceding century. The key figures involved in what was essentially a private initiative were the Scottish Lowland nobles, Hugh Montgomery and James Hamilton. In particular, Montgomery's friendship with James I was useful to him in laying the foundation of the settlement in Antrim and Down in 1606. Looking for an opportunity for advancement, Montgomery came into contact with the wife of Con O'Neill, a landowner in Ulster, who was imprisoned at Carrickfergus Castle for instigating rebellion against the Crown. Montgomery and Con O'Neill's wife made a deal that the O'Neills would give half of their land to him if he could free Con and secure for him a royal pardon. At this point, James Hamilton interfered with the negotiations with the King, securing for himself a share of the land in question, with the resultant shares being one-third each for Hamilton, Montgomery and O'Neill, who gained his pardon. Montgomery also secured for his brother George appointment as Bishop of Derry and Raphoe. Montgomery and Hamilton recruited Scots of many families and trades to populate their settlement and in May 1606 the first wave of settlers arrived. Montgomery settled at Newtownards and soon established a trade route between Donaghadee in north Down and Portpatrick in Scotland. There will be a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject **or** a partial evaluation of **both**. Contemporary opinion might include the views of James I or key Crown figures such as Lord Deputy Chichester, while later interpretations might be provided by the likes of Gillespie or Canny. Candidates will also begin to weigh up the influence of the plantation in Antrim and Down against other factors that had a bearing on the official plantation. For example, while candidates may acknowledge that, though developments in Antrim and Down undoubtedly were an encouragement to the planners of the official plantation, arguably more important was the Flight of the Earls in 1607, which not only gave the Crown the opportunity to seize

the abandoned lands of the Gaelic earls of Tyrone and Tyrconnell, and make them available for British settlement, but also made plantation an imperative in order to fill the power vacuum that now existed in Ulster. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

Level 4 ([16]–[20]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([12]–[15]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis are very well developed and substantiated. Answers will attempt in a more definite and sustained way an assessment of the influence of the unofficial plantation of Antrim and Down on the planning and execution of the official Plantation of Ulster by the Crown. Hamilton and Montgomery advertised their Ulster lands at enticingly low rents to the lowland, and largely Presbyterian, Scots, and thus the Ards and north Down area became populated by thousands of Scots, bringing their own culture and language. Ruined abbeys, churches and houses were restored, and new farms, harbours, villages and towns sprang up. Hamilton's tenants built towns like Bangor, where he constructed his first house on the site of Bangor Castle, Groomsport, Holywood, Dundonald and Killyleagh. Montgomery restored the ruined Newtownards Priory and built towns like Newtownards, Greyabbey and Donaghadee. Candidates might argue that the success of the unofficial plantation encouraged the planners of the official plantation to be more ambitious and over-reach themselves in terms of the scale of the colonisation planned, which would eventually fall well short of expectations, particularly in terms of the proposed displacement of the native Irish. Furthermore, the colonisation of Antrim and Down had indicated that the Scots were well equipped for the task of plantation, and would be seen as the remedy to the high drop-out rate of English settlers from the official plantation. Nonetheless, it is reasonable to argue that the Plantation of Ulster of 1610 had its own rationale and dynamic. Planning for the Ulster Plantation got underway shortly after the Flight of the Earls in September 1607. As the Earls of Tyrone and Tyrconnell were expected to seek to return to their lands, bringing foreign military assistance, time was of the essence. The planning and implementation of the Ulster Plantation was carried out as a matter of military urgency. Sir Arthur Chichester, the Lord Deputy of Ireland, only intended a fairly limited scale of Protestant settlement, but Sir Cahir O'Doherty's rebellion in 1608 convinced James I to opt for a much more radical project supported by Sir John Davies, the Irish Attorney General, and Sir Francis Bacon. In addition to defence considerations, there were also clear economic and commercial motives behind the Crown Plantation, namely to develop the economic infrastructure of Ulster in order to stimulate trade and thereby increase royal revenue, as evidenced by the role of the London companies in the project. Politically, the Ulster Plantation was intended to increase Protestant representation in the Irish Parliament, and establish both the Reformed faith and British culture in Ulster. Arguably, these objectives would have pertained with or without the Scottish settlement in Antrim and Down, but the very success of that settlement was not unnoticed by the Crown planners or by James I, a Scot himself of course. Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of this subject. Contemporary opinion might include that of the aforementioned Sir John Davies, or of some of the principal figures involved in the Antrim and Down plantation. A later and perhaps wider

perspective on James's policy mistakes could be provided by the likes of Robinson, Perceval-Maxwell or Fitzpatrick. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate; there is very good organisation and use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. [35]

- (b) "The Battle of Aughrim was the only military engagement that mattered in the Williamite Wars." To what extent would you agree with this statement? Use relevant evidence you have studied including contemporary and later interpretations to support your answer.

This question targets AO1(b) and AO2(b): the candidate's ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)** and the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways **AO2(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[5]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([0]–[3]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. Answers at this level may be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. For example, there may be a general reference to the Battle of Aughrim bringing the Williamite Wars to an end. There will be little or no awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([6]–[10]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([4]–[7]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level will select and deploy historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. The answer will have supporting evidence. For example, there may be an appreciation that the Battle of Aughrim was the bloodiest battle in the Williamite Wars, but that there were also significant Jacobite defeats at the Boyne and in the Siege of Derry. There will be some awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development. For example, contemporary interpretation may take the form of an eyewitness account of one of the military engagements, while in terms of later interpretations, reference might be made to McNally. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to illegibility, inaccurate spelling, punctuation or grammar; at times, the style of writing will be inappropriate. There may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([11]–[15]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([8]–[11]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. Answers may focus on the Battle of Aughrim and its significance in the Williamite Wars in greater detail, noting in particular that this engagement was both the costliest in terms of the loss of life (an estimated 7000 dead) and that it secured a final victory for the

Williamites in Ireland. The Jacobite position in the summer of 1691 was a defensive one, having retreated behind the River Shannon, from where they hoped to receive military aid from Louis XIV of France via the port towns and eventually be in a position to re-take the rest of Ireland. Ginkell, the Williamites' Dutch general, had breached this line of defence by crossing the Shannon at Athlone. The Marquis de St Ruth, the French Jacobite general, moved too slowly to save Athlone. Ginkel marched through Ballinasloe, on the main road towards Limerick and Galway, before he found his way blocked by St Ruth's army at Aughrim on 12 July 1691. Both armies were about 20 000 men strong. The turning point in the battle itself was the death of St Ruth, decapitated by a cannon ball. At this point, the Jacobite position collapsed very quickly. Their horsemen, demoralised by the death of their commander, fled the battlefield, leaving the left flank open for the Williamites to funnel more troops into and envelop the Jacobite line. The Jacobites on the right, seeing the situation was hopeless, also began to melt away, although Sarsfield did try to organise a rearguard action. This left the Jacobite infantry on Killcommadan Hill completely exposed and surrounded. They were slaughtered by the Williamite cavalry as they tried to get away, many of them having thrown away their weapons in order to run faster. There will be a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject **or** a partial evaluation of **both**. In terms of contemporary interpretation, reference might be made to the eyewitness account of George Storey, or others associated with the campaign. A later interpretation might be provided by the likes of Childs or Simms. Candidates will also begin to assess the importance of Aughrim in comparison to the other principal engagements in the Williamite Wars, particularly the Battle of the Boyne and Siege of Derry. For example, the Boyne brought James and William into direct confrontation, while the successful defence of Derry in 1688–1689 boosted Williamite morale at the beginning of the conflict in Ireland. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

Level 4 ([16]–[20]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([12]–[15]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis are very well developed and substantiated. Answers will attempt in a more definite and sustained way an assessment of the Battle of Aughrim as the only military engagement that mattered in the Williamite Wars. There is indeed a strong argument to be made in support of the proposition in the light of Jacobite losses and the consequences of the battle. Estimates of the two armies' losses vary. It is generally agreed that about 7000 men were killed during the battle. Some recent studies put the Williamite dead as high as 3000, but they are more generally given as between 1000 and 2000, with 4000 Jacobites killed. Many of the Jacobite dead were officers, who were very difficult to replace. On top of that, another 4000 Jacobites either deserted or were taken prisoner. What was more, they had lost the better part of their equipment and supplies. The city of Galway surrendered without a fight after the battle, on advantageous terms, and the Jacobites' main army surrendered shortly afterwards at Limerick after a short siege. Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of this subject. For example, contemporary interpretation might be drawn from one of the Jacobite commanders engaged in the Battle of Aughrim or a participant in or witness of one of the other major battles,

for example the Reverend George Walker’s account of the Siege of Derry. Later interpretations might include the views of Kinross, while an overview of the Williamite campaign could be provided by Beckett or Doherty. An argument in support of the proposition is likely to focus on the fact that the victory at Aughrim led directly to the Treaty of Limerick and confirmation that the Jacobite campaign was over. A possible counter-argument would be that the earlier engagements in the Williamite Wars had effectively laid the foundations for the final victory in 1691. The Siege of Derry had certainly been of great symbolic value to the Williamite cause, inspiring the later campaign that would be waged successfully in the battles of the Boyne and Aughrim, but it was also important militarily. A Jacobite victory at Derry might well have resulted in a different outcome to the Williamite Wars in Ireland. At the very least, the time scale of the war would have been dramatically different. The fall of Derry would also almost certainly have meant the fall of Enniskillen and have made a landing by William III in the north extremely problematical. Candidates might also reasonably argue that, while Aughrim did indeed deal the final blow to Jacobite hopes, their fate had effectively been sealed a year earlier at the Battle of the Boyne. The Boyne had been a much bigger battle – William commanding an army of some 36 000 men, while James’s force numbered around 25 000 – and the Williamite victory resulted not only in James II abandoning Ireland (never to return), but also Williamite control of all territory east of the Shannon. Arguably it was now simply a matter of time until the Jacobite cause could be finally eradicated. Better candidates may also argue that other engagements in the Williamite Wars – such as at Enniskillen, Newtownbutler, Galway, Cork and Kinsale – should also be taken into account, if only for the cumulative effect they had in wearing down Jacobite resistance. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate; there is very good organisation and use of appropriate specialist vocabulary.

[35]

Option 2

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

35

70

Option 3: Ireland 1775–1800

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Answer question 1 and either question 2(a) or 2(b).

- 1 (a) **Consult all the sources and your knowledge of this period.** Which of the sources would an historian value most as evidence in a study of the passing of the Act of Union?

This question targets AO2(a): the candidate’s ability, as part of an historical enquiry, to analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers will paraphrase the content of each source and make assertions that are not fully supported.

Level 2 ([4]–[7])

Answers will comment on the utility of the sources, using the content more fully. Source 1 is valuable because it is a speech by a member of the British government. Source 2 is another contemporary source from a debate in the British House of Commons on the proposed Act of Union. Source 3 is also of value because it is written by an historian from an objective perspective.

Level 3 ([8]–[11])

Answers will present a more sustained assessment of the value of each source, and reach a credible conclusion. Answers at this level will note that both Sources 1 and 2 are apprehensive about the security threat posed to Ireland by France, although Source 1 does not explicitly refer to that country, instead talking about “our enemies”. Source 2 also alludes to French involvement in the recent United Irish Rebellion of 1798 as an argument against any delay in addressing the subject of Union. However, both these sources are dated January 1799, when the Union Bill had just been introduced, and are therefore unable to provide an insight into how the debate developed in both the British and Irish Parliaments, and indeed how the Union was pursued by the government employing extra-parliamentary means. Candidates might argue that Source 3 has a clear advantage over the other sources in terms of its wider focus. Furthermore, Source 3 makes reference to Pitt, the Prime Minister, who is the architect of the Union plan and whose agenda is clearly motivated by more than the urgency of the security situation of 1798–1799.

Level 4 ([12]–[15])

Answers will use a wide range of criteria to assess utility, commenting on the significance of the information provided, authorship, motive, viewpoint, audience and date. Contextual knowledge will be introduced to enhance the answer. Answers may note that a significant shortcoming of the first two sources, aside from their date which is from the early stages of the debate about the Union, is that they give only a British parliamentary perspective on the passing of the Act of Union. However, a counterbalancing factor that adds value to the sources is that their respective authors are both well placed to speak informatively on the subject matter. Indeed, by cross-referencing Source 1 with Source 3, we can see that the author of Source 1 – the Secretary of State for War, Henry Dundas – is, as Jonathan Bardon informs us, one of the three principal figures tasked with making the Union

project a reality, alongside Pitt and Grenville. Furthermore, good answers might make a link between the emphasis on the continuing threat posed to Ireland – and by extension, to Britain – by France, which is the core content of the first two sources, and the fact that Pitt has delegated management of the Union proposal in the British Parliament to his Secretary of State for War and his Foreign Secretary, as revealed by Source 3. Arguably this is an indication that it is the state of the war with France that is in fact driving the Union project, and why there is a note of urgency in the speeches of Dundas (Source 1) and Canning (Source 2). Members of the British House of Commons would be very aware that only the previous summer, a French expedition under the command of General Humbert had actually landed in the west of Ireland and for a time threatened to revive the general rebellion, while a second and larger expedition in September had only just been driven off by the Royal Navy. There is therefore a logic to the approach taken by the government spokesmen in the first two sources which gives them value in a study of the passing of the Act of Union. However, Source 3 crucially provides a wider perspective on the passing of the Act of Union, noting not only the strategy employed by the government at Westminster but the role of Cornwallis and Castlereagh in steering the Union Bill through the Irish Parliament. Source 3 is also the only one of the three sources to highlight the critical figure in the whole affair, William Pitt, the Prime Minister. At this level, candidates would be expected to nominate a particular source as the most valuable, and there is indeed a case to be made for Source 3 because of its wider focus and perhaps also because of the objectivity of its author. The merits of Sources 1 and 2 are nonetheless not to be discounted, as their contemporary nature and the position held by their respective authors provide an historian with a valuable insight into the view of the British government and its determination to protect Ireland in order to secure Britain against the threat posed by France. Having said that, candidates may pick up on the first sentence of Source 3, and develop it with their own contextual knowledge, to argue that the Union proposal was not just a response by Pitt to the crisis of 1798. [15]

- (b) **Use all the sources and other evidence you have studied.** How far do the sources support the view that the main reason for the passing of the Act of Union was the possibility of further French intervention in Ireland?

This question targets AO2(a) and AO1(b): the candidate's ability, as part of an historical enquiry, to analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination **AO2(a)** and the candidate's ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[3]) AO2(a), ([0]–[3]) AO1(b)

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement **AO1(b)**. For example, there may be a general reference to the involvement of the French in the 1798 Rebellion. Answers may rely on paraphrasing the sources or provide a narrative of the subject with little reference to the sources **AO2(a)**.

Level 2 ([4]–[5]) AO2(a), ([4]–[5]) AO1(b)

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement in relation to the possibility of further French intervention in Ireland being the main reason for the passing of the Act of Union **AO1(b)**. For example, the first two sources make either an implicit (Source 1) or explicit (Source 2) reference to British anxiety about the continuing French threat. Source 3, however, gives an alternative perspective on the passing of the Union **AO2(a)**.

Level 3 ([6]–[7]) AO2(a), ([6]–[7]) AO1(b)

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgement are developed and substantiated **AO1(b)**. For example, it could be argued that the British government was not engaging in scaremongering in relation to the threat posed by France to both Ireland and Britain, as the events of the summer of 1798 were all too fresh in the memory. For a brief period in late August 1798, there appeared a prospect that the rebellion, which had seemed to be over, would flare up again. On 22 August, a French force of some 1100 men, under the command of General Humbert, waded ashore at Kilcummin Strand, near Killala, County Mayo. Humbert scored a striking victory at Castlebar, but then his campaign ran out of steam. It soon became clear that the victory at Castlebar was a success on which the small force could not build. On 8 September at Ballinamuck, County Longford, the French force, vastly outnumbered, laid down its arms. However, on 12 October 1798, a larger French force consisting of 3000 men, and including Wolfe Tone, attempted to land in County Donegal near Lough Swilly. They were intercepted by a larger Royal Navy squadron, and finally surrendered after a three-hour battle without ever landing in Ireland. Answers will address the sources, noting that Source 1 is very much focused on the need for Britain and Ireland to unite in the face of “our enemies” and that time is of the essence in the matter. Canning is much more explicit in Source 2, but largely reiterates the urgent call to action of Source 1, even concluding with a similar reference to the British Empire. Source 3, while making no overt mention of the French factor in relation to the passing of the Act of Union, does note that the two principal aides designated by Pitt to guide the Union proposal onto the statute book were his War Secretary and Foreign Secretary, the two key figures in overseeing the war against France. Bardon, however, also acknowledges that the Union was something Pitt had been considering before the present crisis of the war and rebellion, and some candidates may begin to explore other factors behind the passing of the Act of Union **AO2(a)**.

Level 4 ([8]–[10]) AO2(a), ([8]–[10]) AO1(b)

Answers at this level will consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are very well developed and substantiated in relation to the proposition that the main reason for the passing of the Act of Union was the possibility of further French intervention in Ireland **AO1(b)**. For example, in addition to the two expeditions sent by France to support the United Irishmen in the 1798 Rebellion, the links between Irish and French revolutionaries went back almost to the start of the war in the mid-1790s. Driven underground, the United Irishmen had reconstituted themselves as a secret, oath-bound organisation, dedicated to the pursuit of a republican form of government in a separate and independent Ireland. This was to be

achieved primarily by direct French military intervention. The plan came closest to success following the arrival of a French invasion fleet, carrying some 14 000 soldiers, off the southern coast of Ireland in December 1796. Adverse weather conditions, however, prevented the French from landing, and the fleet was forced to make its way back to France. From this point on, Britain was alert to the French threat to Ireland, and this remained a pertinent point throughout the political campaign to pass the Act of Union. Nonetheless, despite the importance of the possibility of further French intervention in Ireland as a factor, good answers will appreciate that there are other factors in explaining the passing of the Act of Union. In this respect, no figure is more important than William Pitt, who may have conceived the idea of the Union as early as 1784, when his commercial proposals were rebutted by the Irish Parliament. It was Pitt's drive and determination that ultimately ensured that the Union would be passed, especially after a further demonstration of the waywardness of the Irish Parliament in the Regency crisis of 1788–1789. For the Prime Minister, the 1798 Rebellion and the French threat of further intervention in Ireland may have provided a plausible cover for something he had planned to do at some point anyway. When the Union proposal was initially rejected by the Irish Parliament in January 1799, Pitt set to work. For the remainder of the year the government had to work unremittingly to build a decent majority for the union. This task fell primarily to Lord Castlereagh, appointed Chief Secretary in November 1798, and to the viceroy, Lord Cornwallis. Parliamentary seats were bought and attention was concentrated on major borough owners and particularly those who had abstained in the January voting. Pensions, places (jobs for MPs and peers and their relatives), promotions in the peerage, and other enticements were promised. This lavish use of patronage was denounced in later times as "bribery and corruption" but it was legal and (just about) within the conventions of the time. What was illegal was Pitt's diversion of secret service funds, unknown even to members of the cabinet, to support newspapers and pamphlets favourable to the union. Generous compensation for boroughs which would no longer be represented helped to weaken opposition to the Union. Compensation totalled £1 260 000 and was paid to supporters and opponents alike – the Marquis of Downshire, against the Union, got £57 000 for seven seats he controlled. Answers will interpret and evaluate the sources fully in relation to their historical context. For example, while Henry Dundas in Source 1 is ostensibly relaying the views of the King in relation to the proposed Union between Britain and Ireland, good answers may argue that the views expressed, while no doubt supported by George III, are in fact those of William Pitt, and are carefully drafted to appeal to British MPs at a time of national crisis. The similarity between the content of Source 1 and Source 2, and the fact that Canning is another, though junior, member of the government, suggests a carefully choreographed campaign to convince the Westminster Parliament that a Union is an urgent necessity if both partners and the Empire as a whole are to remain safe. A different strategy was required in Ireland and this is neatly summarised by Bardon in Source 3, noting that Irish legislative independence was an experiment that had failed – at least from a British perspective – and an indulgence that Pitt's government could no longer permit in the midst of a war **AO2(a)**.

[20]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

35

- 2 (a) To what extent were the achievements of the Volunteers between 1778 and 1783 due to their alliance with the Patriots in the Irish Parliament? Use relevant evidence you have studied including contemporary and later interpretations to support your answer.

This question targets AO1(b) and AO2(b): the candidate's ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)** and the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways **AO2(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[5]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([0]–[3]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. Answers at this level may be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. For example, there may be a general reference to the role of the Volunteers in securing Free Trade from the British government. There will be little or no awareness of either contemporary or later interpretations of the subject. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([6]–[10]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([4]–[7]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level will select and deploy historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. It will have supporting evidence. For example, candidates might note that the Irish economy was suffering because of trade restrictions imposed by Britain and that the Volunteer campaign was important because it was their first foray into politics, while at the same time the Patriots led the campaign for the lifting of commercial restrictions in the Irish Parliament. There will be some awareness of either contemporary or later interpretations of the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development. For example, a contemporary opinion might be provided by a Patriot MP such as Henry Grattan, while a later interpretation could be gleaned from the likes of J. C. Beckett. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to illegibility, inaccurate spelling, punctuation or grammar; at times, the style of writing will be inappropriate. There may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([11]–[15]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([8]–[11]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. Answers may focus on the emergence of the Volunteer movement in Ulster in the spring of 1778, with a membership growing to over 40 000 by late 1779, in response to the threat of French invasion during the American War of Independence. They became a potent political force as the invasion threat began to recede and an informal alliance was formed with the Patriot group in the Irish Parliament. The government measures for suppressing Irish trade had produced great distress and discontent all over the country, and arguably, the rank and file of the Volunteers were the very people who felt the prevailing distress most. Without being in any sense disloyal, they were bitterly hostile to the

government, and their political sentiments were clearly expressed when holding public demonstrations, such as that in Dublin on 4 November 1779, where placards demanding Free Trade were displayed. The transformation of the Volunteers from a defence militia into an extra-parliamentary pressure group was facilitated by the fact that there was a significant overlap in membership between Patriots and Volunteers, including the likes of Grattan, Flood and Charlemont. Candidates have much scope to argue that the eventual granting of Free Trade by the British government in 1779–1780 was the product of the Patriot–Volunteer alliance, and that this success encouraged both groups to press for a major revision in the relationship between Ireland and Britain that was manifested in the Constitution of 1782. There will be a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject **or** a partial evaluation of **both**. Contemporary opinion might include the views of Volunteer leaders such as Lord Charlemont or the Duke of Leinster, while candidates might draw on the comments of Bartlett or Smyth for later interpretations. Candidates will also begin to consider that the achievements of the Volunteers between 1778 and 1783 were not simply due to their alliance with the Patriots in the Irish Parliament, but also to the weakness of Lord North’s British government in the context of a war that was not going well in America. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

Level 4 ([16]–[20]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([12]–[15]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis are very well developed and substantiated. Answers will attempt in a more definite and sustained way an assessment of the extent to which the achievements of the Volunteers between 1778 and 1783 were due to their alliance with the Patriots in the Irish Parliament. Candidates could reasonably argue that the Volunteer–Patriot success in December 1779 paved the way for the greater success of the Constitution of 1782. Indeed, it could be argued that Volunteer influence in Irish affairs continued to grow after 1779, as they became more politicised with the winding down of the war in America, which to all intents and purposes ended in 1781. The campaign for legislative independence had stalled in the Irish Parliament, where the government was able to secure a majority by a skilful and plentiful distribution of patronage – pensions, places, promotions, titles and other such inducements. In the end, Grattan, despairing of making progress in Parliament, determined to outflank the government by again using the Volunteers. Under the management of Lord Charlemont, the Commander in Chief of the Volunteers, Flood and himself, a convention of delegates from the Volunteer corps of Ulster was summoned for 15 February 1782 at Dungannon. Some 242 delegates from 143 Volunteer corps assembled. They passed 13 resolutions, of which the most important were that the King, Lords and Commons of Ireland alone had the right to legislate for the country; that Poyning’s Law was unconstitutional and a grievance, and should be revoked; and that military forces in Ireland should be under the control of the Irish Parliament. The resolutions of the Dungannon Convention were adopted by all the Volunteer corps of Ireland and were eventually to form the basis of the Constitution of 1782, conceded by the Whig government following the collapse of Lord North’s administration. Arguably, this is the zenith of the Volunteer–Patriot alliance and as the Volunteers

became more radical in their aims, so the alliance with the Patriots began to wane. The final Volunteer “victory” was arguably the passing of the Renunciation Act in January 1783 – to remedy the supposed deficiencies in the simple repeal of the Declaratory Act – but it was ominous for the future of the reform movement that this issue saw two of the leading Volunteer and Patriot figures, Flood and Grattan, take opposing sides. Like Grattan, not all Patriots were convinced of the necessity for this piece of legislation, and many were determined that this would be the last indulgence granted to their extra-parliamentary allies. Candidates might argue that the Volunteers never really recovered from the defeat of their proposals for reform of the Irish Parliament in November 1783, which effectively ended the Volunteer–Patriot alliance that had been fundamental to their rise and their success in helping win Free Trade (1779) and legislative independence (1782). Without the backing of the Patriots in Parliament, the Volunteers became politically isolated and went into steady and terminal decline. Parliamentary reform was therefore the last straw for the Patriots, who were on the whole satisfied with what the Constitution of 1782 had delivered, and who were wary to say the least of further constitutional experimentation. Many Presbyterian radicals, who were well represented in the Volunteers, especially in Ulster, where the movement had originated, now sought the extension of the franchise to Nonconformists, and possibly Catholics. The issue of Catholic Emancipation not only widened the gulf between the Volunteers and the Patriots, but split the Volunteers themselves. For example, Henry Flood was a champion of reform of Parliament, but would not countenance granting the vote to Catholics, while his great Patriot and Volunteer rival, Henry Grattan, supported emancipation. Better answers may well conclude that, while the Volunteer objectives remained relatively moderate, as in the case of Free Trade and legislative independence, the Patriots remained supportive and success was achieved. But when the Volunteers’ political agenda became more radical, as in the pursuit of parliamentary reform and Catholic Emancipation, the Patriots parted company and the Volunteers were emasculated politically. Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of this subject. A contemporary opinion might be garnered from the parliamentary debates of the period, while later interpretations could be provided by the likes of Elliott or Stewart. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate; there is very good organisation and use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. [35]

- (b) How far did the involvement of the Defenders contribute to the failure of the United Irishmen in the 1798 Rebellion? Use relevant evidence you have studied including contemporary and later interpretations to support your answer.

This question targets AO1(b) and AO2(b): the candidate’s ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)** and the candidate’s ability to analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways **AO2(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[5]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([0]–[3]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with

limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. Answers at this level may be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. For example, there may be a general reference to the alliance between the Defenders and the United Irishmen. There will be little or no awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([6]–[10]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([4]–[7]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level will select and deploy historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. The answer will have supporting evidence. For example, it may be noted that the alliance with the Defenders alienated many Presbyterians from the United Irishmen because of their sectarian stance, thus weakening the movement by 1798. There will be some awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development. For example, a contemporary interpretation might be provided by one of the founder members, while a later interpretation could be drawn from the likes of Beckett. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to illegibility, inaccurate spelling, punctuation or grammar; at times, the style of writing will be inappropriate. There may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([11]–[15]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([8]–[11]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. Answers may focus on the birth of the Defenders in the mid-1780s, established by Catholics in response to the failure of the authorities to take action against the Protestant Peep o' Day Boys. They launched nighttime raids on Catholic homes under the pretence of confiscating arms which Catholics were prohibited from possessing under the terms of the Penal Laws. Beginning as independent local groups, defensive in nature, the Defenders had merged by 1790 into a widespread secret oath-bound fraternal organisation consisting of lodges, associated to a head lodge led by a Grand Master and committee. The Society of United Irishmen had identified the Defenders as potential allies, and leading members such as James Hope had regularly travelled throughout the country, organising cells and distributing propaganda such as the *Northern Star* newspaper. Defender cells were easily transformed into United Irish cells and those who held dual membership were often referred to as being "up and up". The precise role of the Defenders as an organisation during the rebellion is therefore hard to assess but Colonel Foote, commander of the British force and one of its few survivors of the Battle of Oulart Hill, referred to the victorious rebels as "Defenders" as opposed to United Irishmen in his official account of the defeat. However, while the Defenders turned the United Irishmen into a mass movement with revolutionary potential, this potential was arguably never realised as the alliance came at a price – alienating many Protestants from the movement and diluting the French revolutionary ethos of the United Irishmen by introducing a nakedly sectarian agenda. There will be a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject **or** a partial evaluation of **both**. Contemporary opinion might include that of prominent United Irishmen

figures such as Henry Joy McCracken, while later interpretations might include the views of McBride or Bartlett. Candidates will also begin to weigh up the extent to which the involvement of the Defenders contributed to the failure of the United Irishmen in the 1798 Rebellion against other factors involved, such as the lack of coordination during the rebellion, with separate risings occurring in Wexford, Antrim and Down. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

Level 4 ([16]–[20]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([12]–[15]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis are very well developed and substantiated. Answers will attempt in a more definite and sustained way an assessment of how far the involvement of the Defenders contributed to the failure of the United Irishmen in the 1798 Rebellion. The Defenders were arguably more of a liability than a help to the United Irishmen. Although there were as many as 50 000 of them in Antrim and Down alone, they were ultra-Catholic and anti-Protestant, paying at best only lip service to the non-sectarian ideals of the United Irishmen. Perhaps more critical was their failure to support the rising when it broke out in 1798. The Defenders of County Down withdrew support before the United Irish defeat at the Battle of Ballynahinch on 12 June 1798, as their leader John Magennis had received good local information on the size and position of the British forces. Magennis had also suggested a night attack which Munro would not allow. The Defenders were also absent as a group from the earlier Battle of Antrim. However, better candidates will move beyond, or challenge, the proposition, to consider other factors in the failure of the United Irishmen in the 1798 Rebellion. Here, it would be reasonable to give more focus to the sectarian nature of the rising in the south-east of Ireland, where, for example, civilian Protestants were massacred at Scullabogue, which had a negative impact on the planned insurrection in the north, discouraging many United Irishmen from taking up arms. Candidates may also contend that the abortive French expedition of 1796, and the failure to strike in 1797, gave the Crown forces, assisted by the Yeomanry and Militia, an opportunity to ruthlessly disarm the United Irishmen in the interim, as evidenced in particular by General Lake's pacification of Ulster. Coupled with a highly effective network of informers who penetrated the revolutionary movement, resulting in the arrest of the Leinster Directory of the United Irishmen on 12 March 1798, it could be argued that the fate of the planned insurrection was sealed before it had begun. When hostilities did break out, there is no doubt that the strength of the British forces was a major factor in the defeat of the United Irishmen. Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of this subject. Tone is an obvious potential source of contemporary comment, as is his biographer Marianne Elliott in terms of later interpretation. Contemporary and later interpretations might be further supplemented by referring to the views of the likes of William Drennan and A.T.Q. Stewart. Whatever balance might be struck in response to the proposition, better candidates may note a fundamental contradiction in the impact of the Defenders on the fortunes of the United Irishmen in 1798: without the numbers they brought to the movement, a rising would not have been feasible, yet because of their nature and their ultimate abandonment of the revolutionary cause when the revolution was

attempted, the rising was doomed to failure. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate; there is very good organisation and use of appropriate specialist vocabulary.

[35]

Option 3

AVAILABLE MARKS
35
70

Option 4: Partition of Ireland 1900–1925.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Answer question 1 and either question 2(a) or 2(b).

- 1 (a) Consult all the sources and your own knowledge of this period. Which of the sources would an historian value most as evidence in a study of Ulster Unionist resistance to Home Rule in the period 1911-1914?

This question targets AO2(a): the candidate's ability, as part of an historical enquiry, to analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers will paraphrase the content of each source and make assertions that are not fully supported. For example, there may be some reference to the attitudes outlined in the anti-Home Rule Declaration and to the use of force in Hackett Pain's memorandum, but any argument will lack substance and development.

Level 2 ([4]–[7])

Answers will comment on the value of the sources, using the content more fully. Source 1 is valuable because it reveals the attitudes of the Ulster Unionists towards Home Rule. The value of Source 2 lies in the fact that it reveals the extent to which the Ulster Unionists have armed themselves, with some reflections as to the circumstances in which these arms should be used. Source 3 discusses some of the methods used by Ulster Unionists to resist Home Rule in the period 1911-1914.

Level 3 ([8]–[11])

Answers will present a more sustained assessment of the value of each source and reach a credible conclusion. Answers at this level will examine the authorship and content more closely. The authorship of Source 1 enhances its value, since it is widely representative of Unionist opinion in Ulster at that time. The content is of great value, as not only does it indicate aspects of Ulster Unionist motivation in opposing Home Rule and a partial indication of how Home Rule is to be resisted, but its tone suggests a firmness of resolution which was to be endorsed by subsequent events. Source 2 also benefits from its authorship, since it is a confidential communication from a senior member of the UVF regarding the sensitive issue of possible confrontation with Crown forces. The content is significant as it reveals how concerned the leadership of the UVF was regarding the circumstances in which the organisation would engage in armed conflict. Source 3 provides a wider perspective on the opposition of Ulster Unionists to Home Rule from an historian, Patrick Buckland. He reveals how wide-ranging and sophisticated Ulster Unionist resistance was, involving the organisation of demonstrations, the formation of the UVF, the creation of a Provisional Government, the raising of substantial funds and the potential of civil disobedience in the form of non-payment of taxes. Source 3 clearly substantiates the mood and resolve of Source 1. In summation, the sources reveal the attitudes of Ulster Unionists towards Home Rule, and the steps they would take to resist it.

Level 4 ([12]–[15])

Answers will use a wide range of criteria to assess value, commenting on the significance of the information provided, authorship, motive, viewpoint, audience and date. Contextual knowledge will be introduced to enhance the answer. Source 1 reflects the traditional feelings of Ulster Unionists towards Home Rule, and indicates their determination to resist Home Rule by the creation of a Provisional Government in Ulster. This Declaration came in the context of a deepening sense of crisis, as the Liberals had formed a government with Irish Parliamentary Party support following the General Elections of January and December 1910, while the passing of the Parliament Act in August 1911 meant that the Lords' veto, the existence of which had been a source of assurance to the opponents of Home Rule, was now replaced by a two year suspensory mechanism. While there is an aspiration to resist Home Rule in Ireland, Ulster emerges as the focus of resistance in Source 1, marking an early sign of the subsequent attraction of the exclusion of Ulster as a compromise. Source 2 reveals that, in spite of the success of the Larne gun-running, both in material terms and in propaganda value, there is caution about the circumstances in which their arms and ammunition should be used. Good answers may comment that, in spite of the verbal menace in the form of highly publicised rhetoric engaged in by Craig, Carson and notably Bonar Law, which Asquith referred to as the "New Style", Unionist leaders were concerned about the implications of any outbreak of violence. Belfast had already witnessed sectarian clashes in July and September 1912. While Carson and Bonar Law publicly associated themselves with the Larne gun-running, Carson was concerned that this episode increased the likelihood of sectarian violence in the north, something he was anxious to avoid because of the negative impact such a development would have on public opinion in Britain. Source 3 addresses many of the themes which were manifest in Ulster Unionist resistance to Home Rule. The Balmoral demonstration in April 1912, several days before the introduction of the actual Home Rule Bill, was but one of many rallies designed to put pressure on the government. The organisation of the UVF and its support units testifies to Unionist success in attracting experienced soldiers from the British Army, and to their success in fundraising, with notable contributions coming from the Belfast business community, as well as prominent sympathisers in England. At this level candidates are expected to nominate a particular source as the most valuable. [15]

- (b) Use all the sources and other evidence you have studied.** How far do the sources support the view that the most significant feature of Ulster Unionist resistance to Home Rule in the period 1911–1914 was a willingness to use force?

This question targets AO2(a) and AO1(b): the candidate's ability, as part of an historical enquiry, to analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination **AO2(a)** and the candidate's ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[3]) AO2(a), ([0]–[3]) AO1(b)

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement **AO1(b)**. For example, Source 1 refers to an early Ulster Unionist response to Home Rule,

while Source 2 reveals that they were armed. Source 3 gives additional information about how the UVF was organised. Answers may rely on paraphrasing the sources or provide a narrative on the subject with little reference to the sources **AO2(a)**.

Level 2 ([4]–[5]) AO2(a), ([4]–[5]) AO1(b)

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement **AO1(b)**. Source 1 suggests that the establishment of a political framework in the form of a Provisional Government was the most singular Unionist response to Home Rule. Source 2 reveals a cautionary reflection on the actual use of force by the UVF **AO2(a)**.

Level 3 ([6]–[7]) AO2(a), ([6]–[7]) AO1(b)

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgement are developed and substantiated **AO1(b)**. Answers will address the sources in relation to the question, and perhaps confine their analysis to either concurring with or refuting the proposition. Source 1 disagrees with the proposition, since the creation of a Provisional Government is the dominant theme in the Declaration. Source 2 indicates reluctance on the part of the UVF to utilise its recently acquired arms. Source 3 debates the diverse and peaceful nature of Unionist resistance to Home Rule, with a notable emphasis on commercial aspects **AO2(a)**.

Level 4 ([8]–[10]) AO2(a), ([8]–[10]) AO1(b)

Answers at this level will consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are very well developed and substantiated **AO1(b)**. Answers will interpret and evaluate the sources fully in relation to their historical context **AO2(a)**. Both aspects of the proposition should be addressed, with answers indicating the significance of the willingness to use force, as well as other factors. Source 1 can be employed to support both sides of the proposition. The intention to establish a Provisional Government to rule Ulster in the event of Home Rule being passed indicates a political rather than forceful response. In fact, the Declaration makes two references to the theme of a Provisional Government. However, the exhortation to Unionist leaders to “take any steps they consider necessary” to “resist” Home Rule gives credence to the interpretation that a willingness to use force was either contemplated or at least was not being ruled out. Moreover, the determination in Source 1 to “solemnly pledge” that they will “under no circumstances” recognise any form of Home Rule government in Ireland suggests that a willingness to use force was under consideration. Indeed, answers may reflect that a Provisional Government for Ulster would have to be maintained by forceful means to resist Crown forces or subdue dissenting nationalists. Source 2 can similarly be utilised to vindicate both sides of the proposition. By May 1914, unmistakable signs of a willingness to use force emerge. Having established the Ulster Volunteer Force, arms and ammunition have been procured, while Hackett Pain is advising UVF staff officers on how they should respond to any attempt by the authorities to seize their arms and ammunition. However, the cautionary tone and the nature of his guidance indicate that a willingness to use force by the UVF was not to be undertaken lightly. In the “first instance” the UVF should use

“force of numbers” to resist the authorities’ attempts to seize arms. The authorities are to be informed – or warned – about the “consequences” of their actions, though there is vagueness as to by what means or by whom the authorities are to receive this advice. Finally, the comment that “intelligence should be obtained” from sympathetic policemen suggests that confrontation can be avoided if the UVF is forewarned. Source 3 both supports and refutes the proposition. The creation of a committee of businessmen to advise on the “commercial problems” involved in resisting Home Rule, the possible “non-payment of taxes” and the establishment of a “Defence Fund” indicate a form of passive resistance, and endorse the sentiment in Source 1 to “take any steps” to resist a Home Rule government and to refuse to “obey its laws”. However, forceful means are implied by Buckland’s references to medical and nursing units, and a fund of “over one million pounds” presumably reinforces the military capacity of the UVF. The historical context in which the sources are addressed may take various forms. Source 1 came against the background of great tension among Ulster Unionists over the prospects of Home Rule. The Liberals had emerged victorious in both of the General Elections of January and December 1910, and with the Irish Parliamentary Party holding the balance in the House of Commons, a Home Rule Bill was imminent. Moreover, the removal of the Lords’ veto following the passing of the Parliament Act undermined in Unionist eyes the final bulwark against Home Rule. The prominence given to the proposed Provisional Government in Source 1 echoed Carson’s much publicised speech to Unionists at Craigavon two days before. Moreover, the tone and content of this declaration are portentous of the Solemn League and Covenant on 28 September 1912. Source 2 reflects the potency of the UVF to resist Home Rule, yet is noteworthy in that it demonstrates the caution and restraint with which its newly acquired arms should be used. The amount of rifles and ammunition successfully smuggled into Ulster in April was largely due to the role of Fred Crawford, who used his influence as the director of ordnance in the UVF to persuade the Unionist leadership to back his plan for a large importation of arms in a single shipment. The successful importation of the huge consignment of arms and ammunition at Larne came shortly after the Curragh Mutiny, an event which made it unrealistic for the government to use the British Army to enforce Home Rule against the UVF. Yet Hackett Pain, perhaps aware of shortcomings in the UVF’s military capability and conscious of British public opinion, is determined to clarify the circumstances under which Unionists should actually use force. Source 3 illustrates the sophistication of the Unionist resistance to Home Rule, and the emphasis on financial aspects alluded to the role of financial support which the Ulster Unionists procured. Members of the British League for the Support of Ulster and the Union Defence League raised funds, with many public figures such as Rudyard Kipling making notable contributions. [20]

35

- 2 (a) “The downfall of the Irish Parliamentary Party in the period 1914–1918 was primarily due to circumstances beyond its control”. How far would you agree with this verdict? Use relevant evidence you have studied including contemporary and later interpretations to support your answer.

This question targets AO1(a) and AO2(b): the candidate’s ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(a)** and the candidate’s ability to analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways **AO2(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[5]) AO1 (b) Knowledge, ([0]–[3]) AO2 (b) Interpretations

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. Answers at this level may be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. For example, there may be comment that the Irish Parliamentary Party (IPP) was unfortunate in that it suffered from the impact of the First World War. There will be little or no awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and /or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([6]–[10]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([4]–[7]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level will select and deploy historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. The response will have supporting evidence. For example, there may be a limited focus on the misfortunes experienced by the Irish Parliamentary Party in the immediate aftermath of the outbreak of the war. The war postponed Home Rule indefinitely, thus depriving the IPP of a clear sense of purpose. There will be some awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject but this will be limited and in need of further development. For example, there may be some contemporary opinion from one of the leading figures in the IPP such as John Dillon, who was deputy leader. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to illegibility, inaccurate spelling, punctuation or grammar; at times, the style of writing will be inappropriate. There may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([11]–[15]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([8]–[11]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgement are developed and substantiated. Answers may argue that the IPP itself was responsible for its downfall, rather than being the victim of “circumstances beyond its control”. Redmond’s speech at Woodenbridge in September 1914, pledging the unequivocal support of nationalists for the war effort, proved to be a serious error of judgement, as it brought about a split in the Irish Volunteers, which was exploited by the Irish Republican Brotherhood (IRB) in order to stage a revolt at Easter 1916. The IPP permitted its electoral machinery under the United Irish League (UIL) to decline. Redmond’s acceptance of what he believed to be an offer of temporary partition at the Lloyd George talks in July 1916 not only damaged his prestige in the eyes of many IPP supporters but also undermined the Party’s traditionally strong relationship with the Catholic hierarchy. Redmond’s unpublished memorandum of January 1917, intended for his Party colleagues, in which he acknowledged that the loss of the North Roscommon seat to Sinn Féin could signal the end of the Home Rule Party, was indicative of a leader who had lost the will to fight. There may be a limited analysis of the proposition that circumstances beyond the control of the IPP played a key role in its declining fortunes. For example, the war continued for longer than Redmond could have imagined, which meant that the IPP was committed to supporting a war effort that was daily bringing more casualties with little prospect of imminent victory. The formation of a coalition wartime government in May

1915, consisting of many of the staunchest opponents of Home Rule, further weakened the position of the IPP at Westminster. There will a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject **or** a partial evaluation of **both**. Contemporary interpretations could include comments from John Redmond about the political fortunes of his party. Later interpretations could include assessments from historians such as Lyons, whose biography of John Dillon gives insights into the decline of the IPP after 1914, or from Meleady, whose recent biographical account of John Redmond examines the misfortunes and misjudgements which impacted on the party. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

Level 4 ([16]–[20]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([12]–[15]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis are very well developed and substantiated. Answers will provide a more sustained assessment of whether the downfall of the IPP was due to “circumstances beyond its control.” Redmond’s Woodenbridge speech resulted in the gradual depletion of the strength of the National Volunteers, as the continuous casualty figures meant that when the war was over this body would be of little use as a force of pressure to ensure that Home Rule was granted on terms acceptable to nationalists. Redmond’s approaches to the War Office for greater recognition of the National Volunteers’ war effort, by being granted their own division, complete with their own officers, failed to recognise the longstanding culture in the British Army in which officers were largely of Protestant and Unionist origin. Redmond received the unanimous support of his Party when he refused a seat in the wartime coalition government, yet his absence from the cabinet further diminished his capacity to influence government actions regarding Ireland. Redmond’s frequent sojourns at his family home at Aughavanagh in Wexford resulted in his being isolated from his most senior colleagues at a time of sustained political crisis, a point frequently noted by his deputy, John Dillon. While 300 new UIL branches were created after 1915, the IPP was largely represented by elderly men, and the Party was unable to match the youthful enthusiasm of Sinn Féin at key by-elections such as South Longford and East Clare. A notable feature of Redmond’s response to de Valera’s dramatic victory at East Clare was his almost total indifference to it, as he threw the remainder of his declining energy into the Irish Convention. The absence of Sinn Féin and the unwillingness of the Ulster Unionists to fully co-operate proved fatal to the Convention’s prospects. However, “circumstances beyond its control” did play a key role in the decline of the IPP. After 1916 Redmond was in a state of continuous poor health, made worse by the death of his sister in America in 1917, the loss of his brother in the war, and the constant anxiety about his son who was also at the front. The main IPP newspaper, the *Freeman’s Journal*, lost its premises and machinery during Easter Week, and while it recovered to a circulation of 20 000 copies a week, it failed to counter the 120 000 circulated by the hostile *Irish Independent*. Kitchener at the War Office displayed an attitude of ingratitude towards the contribution of nationalists, a factor which contributed to the sharp decline in the number of troops who enlisted after the summer of 1915. The IPP suffered the consequences of government actions, creating an anti-British sentiment which played into the hands of Sinn Féin. Actions such as the

manner of the executions of the leaders of Easter 1916, the deaths of Sheehy-Skeffington and Thomas Ashe, the imposition of martial law and the conscription crisis alienated moderate nationalist opinion and created the circumstances for the newly emerging Sinn Féin to prosper. In addition, Sinn Féin itself skilfully manipulated the opportunities which came its way after 1916, for example, by contesting by-elections with candidates closely linked to the Rising, manipulating the funeral of Ashe and exploiting the German plot and conscription crisis. Answers will provide a good analysis of contemporary **and** later interpretations of this subject. Contemporary interpretations could include, for example, comment from any of the main personalities involved in the downfall of the IPP, such as T. P. O'Connor or Joseph Devlin, or critical comment from the Party's political rivals, Sinn Féin. Historians' interpretations could include opinions from Kee and Rees about the circumstances which undermined the IPP or from Fanning about the impact of government policy after 1916. [35]

- (b) "A realistic response by the British Government to Ireland's problems, but unpopular with all in Ireland who were affected by it." How far would you agree with this assessment of the Government of Ireland Act of 1920? Use relevant evidence you have studied including contemporary and later interpretations to support your answer.

This question targets AO1(b) and AO2(b): the candidate's ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgement **AO1(a) and** the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways **AO2(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[5]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([0]–[3]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answers are in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis or judgement. Answers at this level may be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. For example, there may be some comments about the main terms of the Government of Ireland Act. There will be little or no awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([6]–[10]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([4]–[7]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level will select and deploy historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. It will have supporting evidence. For example, there may be a limited focus on the motivation behind the 1920 Act, with some brief generalised comment as to how it was received. There will be some awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development. For example, there may be reference to a contemporary opinion of the 1920 Act, for example from A. J. Balfour. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to illegibility, inaccurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; at times, the style of writing will be inappropriate. There may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([11]–[15]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([8]–[11]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgement are developed and substantiated. There will be a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of either contemporary or later interpretations of this subject **or** a partial evaluation of **both**. Answers may provide a limited account of the intentions of the British Government regarding the 1920 Act, along with a partial focus on how the Act was received by those groups who were affected by it. The 1920 Act attempted to bring about a political solution to the government of Ireland during the Anglo-Irish War. Deeming an all-Ireland parliament unworkable, the Act proposed the establishment of two parliaments, one for six counties of Ulster, and the other for the rest of Ireland. The powers of each parliament were to be limited so as to ensure that there would be no threat to either the unity of the British empire or Britain's security. Confident that Sinn Féin would reject the Act, the British Government hoped that world opinion, especially in America, would acknowledge that republicans had rejected a reasonable political offer, and that the conflict would continue without Britain being on the receiving end of a hostile public opinion. A partial assessment of how far the Act was “unpopular” with those affected by it should be attempted. The Act appeared to solve the “Ulster question” by giving the majority of Ulster Unionists a guarantee of remaining under Westminster rule and not from Dublin. This realistic assessment was further emphasised by the expectation that the Act would take “Ulster”, however defined, out of Irish politics and take Ireland out of British politics. Ulster Unionists welcomed the 1920 Act, especially after Sir James Craig persuaded the government to define the excluded area of Ulster as the six county area over which Unionists could dominate both in population size and in political composition. Captain Charles Curtis Craig captured the mood of his fellow Unionists by declaring that the creation of a parliament for the new six county state would reinforce Unionist security in the permanence of the new arrangements. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

Level 4 ([16]–[20]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([12]–[15]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis and judgements are very well developed and substantiated. Answers will attempt in a more definite way an assessment of the Government of Ireland Act by assessing the reaction of a wide range of groups who were affected by it. Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of this subject.

The attitude of the **Ulster Unionists** to the Government of Ireland Act refutes the proposition because most of them supported this measure. They had won the battle for the more “ethnographic” six county bloc as against the original nine county split envisaged by the drafting committee under Walter Long. Ulster Unionists feared that a nine county excluded area would be too precarious, and a number believed that within a few years a growing Catholic population would outvote them into an all-Ireland state. In fact, Carson had identified the six county area as a compromise in 1913. The establishment of a separate parliament in Belfast reassured Ulster Unionists, on the grounds that this would add greater permanency to their new position and serve as a bulwark against potential threats from Westminster. The

Ulster Unionists generally regarded the role of the Northern Ireland Senate as harmless and were reassured that the Northern parliament had the right to abolish Proportional Representation within three years. Even though Craig was dissatisfied with the Council of Ireland, he had successfully lobbied for a limitation of its powers and so prevented any moves for future unity. However, the Government of Ireland Act was not popular with all Ulster Unionists. For some it represented a defeat for Carson, who had led the Ulster resistance to Home Rule in order to preserve the Union intact. Unionists in Cavan, Monaghan and Donegal were very bitter at what they saw as their abandonment by the UUC and a betrayal of their Covenant commitments of 1912. There were some 70 000 Unionists in the three abandoned counties which contained 200 000 nationalists, and no Unionists had been returned for any constituency in these three counties in the recent general election. It was argued that North Monaghan, with a 35% Unionist population, and East Donegal, with a 40% Unionist population, had greater concentrations of Unionists than some areas of the six county state. Candidates might include an observation from an Ulster Unionist delegate in Cavan, Monaghan or Donegal.

The Government of Ireland was extremely unpopular with **Southern Unionists**. While the Council of Ireland at least superficially implied some mechanism for Irish unity, its diminished powers and the suspicion with which Ulster Unionists regarded it meant that it quickly fell into disuse. In spite of the opposition of Southern Unionists to the bill in the House of Lords, the Act came into operation in May 1921. Permanent partition appeared to have been established, and Southern Unionists feared an uncertain future in a hostile state where they were an isolated and scattered minority. The Act provided few safeguards for the minority in the south and west of Ireland and, in particular, there was no provision for a nominated second chamber. The Irish Unionist Alliance (IUA) was dismayed by the readiness with which Ulster Unionists embraced the Act. Answers might refer to the views of Southern Unionists, such as Lord Midleton and Maurice Dockrell. The Government of Ireland Act was unpopular with both **IPP** and Sinn Féin supporters in Ulster. It brought about the 'permanent partition' which had caused so much outrage among Ulster nationalists during the Lloyd George talks of 1916. Some 34 per cent of the population of Northern Ireland was Catholic and nationalists comprised a majority in two of the six counties, Tyrone and Fermanagh. In terms of contemporary interpretations, candidates might refer to the views of Joseph Devlin.

Sinn Féin refused to recognise the 1920 Act because it failed to concede the party's demands for an all-Ireland republic. The elections held in the 26 county state in May 1921 were contested by Sinn Féin to establish a second Dáil, not as a Southern Home Rule parliament. In this respect Sinn Féin was satisfied by winning 124 out of 128 seats, thereby reinforcing its popular mandate. The Anglo-Irish War continued until the truce in July 1921. When the Treaty talks began in October, the Sinn Féin delegates found that the 1920 Act was used to stifle their demands for an all-Ireland republic: the Northern state was a reality which could not be ignored.

Responses at the top of this level will contain some discussion of whether the Government of Ireland Act represented 'a realistic response by the British Government to Ireland's problems'. Whatever conclusion candidates reach, they should acknowledge the difficulties in reconciling the conflicting demands of the two communities which had fundamentally different objectives. The Act represented an attempt to reconcile the demands of constitutional nationalists for Home Rule with the strident opposition of

Ulster Unionists to such a solution. Candidates might refer to the opinions of historians such as Jonathan Bardon, Alvin Jackson and Eamon Phoenix in discussing whether the Government of Ireland Act was unpopular with all who were affected by it. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate; there is very good organisation and use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. [35]

Option 4

AVAILABLE MARKS
35
70