

**Published Mark Schemes for  
GCE A2 History**

**Summer 2010**

Issued: October 2010



# NORTHERN IRELAND GENERAL CERTIFICATE OF SECONDARY EDUCATION (GCSE) AND NORTHERN IRELAND GENERAL CERTIFICATE OF EDUCATION (GCE)

## MARK SCHEMES (2010)

### Foreword

#### *Introduction*

Mark Schemes are published to assist teachers and students in their preparation for examinations. Through the mark schemes teachers and students will be able to see what examiners are looking for in response to questions and exactly where the marks have been awarded. The publishing of the mark schemes may help to show that examiners are not concerned about finding out what a student does not know but rather with rewarding students for what they do know.

#### *The Purpose of Mark Schemes*

Examination papers are set and revised by teams of examiners and revisers appointed by the Council. The teams of examiners and revisers include experienced teachers who are familiar with the level and standards expected of 16- and 18-year-old students in schools and colleges. The job of the examiners is to set the questions and the mark schemes; and the job of the revisers is to review the questions and mark schemes commenting on a large range of issues about which they must be satisfied before the question papers and mark schemes are finalised.

The questions and the mark schemes are developed in association with each other so that the issues of differentiation and positive achievement can be addressed right from the start. Mark schemes therefore are regarded as a part of an integral process which begins with the setting of questions and ends with the marking of the examination.

The main purpose of the mark scheme is to provide a uniform basis for the marking process so that all the markers are following exactly the same instructions and making the same judgements in so far as this is possible. Before marking begins a standardising meeting is held where all the markers are briefed using the mark scheme and samples of the students' work in the form of scripts. Consideration is also given at this stage to any comments on the operational papers received from teachers and their organisations. During this meeting, and up to and including the end of the marking, there is provision for amendments to be made to the mark scheme. What is published represents this final form of the mark scheme.

It is important to recognise that in some cases there may well be other correct responses which are equally acceptable to those published: the mark scheme can only cover those responses which emerged in the examination. There may also be instances where certain judgements may have to be left to the experience of the examiner, for example, where there is no absolute correct response – all teachers will be familiar with making such judgements.

The Council hopes that the mark schemes will be viewed and used in a constructive way as a further support to the teaching and learning processes.



## CONTENTS

|      | <b>Page</b> |
|------|-------------|
| A2 1 | 1           |
| A2 2 | 37          |



New  
Specification



*Rewarding Learning*

**ADVANCED  
General Certificate of Education  
2010**

---

## **History**

**Assessment Unit A2 1**

**[AH211]**

**WEDNESDAY 26 MAY, MORNING**

---

# **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.



| <b>Level</b> | <b>Assessment Objective 1a</b>   | <b>Assessment Objective 1b</b>   | <b>Assessment Objective 2</b>   |
|--------------|--|--|---|
|              | Answers at this level will:  | Answers at this level will:  | Answers at this level will:   |
| <b>1</b>     | 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.   |
| <b>2</b>     | 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.                             |
| <b>3</b>     | contain appropriate examples with illustrative and supportive factual evidence and show understanding and ability to engage with the issues raised by the question 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.           |
| <b>4</b>     | 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: ANGLO-SPANISH RELATIONS 1509–1609

AVAILABLE  
MARKS

(Answer **one** question)

- 1 This question asks candidates to consider the impact of marriage or failed marriage proposals on Anglo-Spanish relations. An explanation of the relations between the countries is multi-causal and better answers will demonstrate that other factors influence relations greatly. Answers should show that religious, political and economic influences were the driving force in relations but that marriage had the ability to affect policy rather than just rubber stamp agreements. Candidates should be able to identify a change in Anglo-Spanish relations after 1558 and will be able to link this to marriage.

Answers may deploy some of the following knowledge:

### Level 1 ([0]–[7])

Limited in detail to one perspective or period of time, mainly narrative.

### Level 2 ([8]–[15])

Knowledge which draws from examples from across the period; exhibits some lapses in clarity, with some narrative.

### Level 3 ([16]–[22])

Information is drawn from all parts of the period with clarity and focus.

### Level 4 ([23]–[30])

Accurate knowledge from across the period, with clarity and precision.

(a) The Catherine of Aragon marriage:

- the marriage demonstrates the fulfilment of the Treaty of Medina del Campo of 1489. This treaty sought alliance between England and Spain to improve trade and strengthen the new Tudor dynasty and a unified Spain. The death of Arthur in 1502 had caused difficulty, but a determination to cement good relations saw Henry VII marry Catherine in 1509
- divorce – candidates might focus on the clash of Henry VIII and Charles V over this issue. Poor Anglo-Spanish relations resulted in the 1530s and so marriage might be used as a reason for deterioration on the relationship
- religion – the English Reformation after 1532 was caused by Henry VIII's need for a divorce which Rome was unable to offer, due to Charles V's opposition. It might be argued that the relationship was damaged as religious differences became an issue between the countries
- politics – difficulties in the Anglo-Spanish alliance were obvious in the 1520s, prior to the divorce issue. In the late 1530s and 1540s Spain's need for allies in its conflict with France put divorce in the background.

- (b) Edward VI – good relations continued with the maintenance of an Anglo-Spanish alliance. England's conflict with Scotland and France made Spain a useful ally. Edward aimed to marry Mary Stuart so marriage cannot be said to have influenced relations during his reign.
- (c) Mary I – marriage was desired by Charles V and by Mary, if not by Philip. Mary's strong desire to marry her Spanish cousin overrode English concern once Parliament placed limitations on Philip. Parliament was concerned that England would be drawn into the Habsburg-Valois dynastic war and this fear was confirmed in 1557. On this occasion it was marriage that drove policy rather than the reverse.
- (d) Elizabeth I
- the possibility of marriage was an important factor in Anglo-Spanish relations until the mid 1560s. Philip acted as a restraining influence on the Papacy due to his hopes for marriage. Only when Philip was certain that marriage was unattainable did relations decline. It is possible that future events were coloured by Elizabeth's shunning of Philip
  - religion – the difference in religion was a driving factor in poor relations, yet despite this difference relations remained good in the 1560s. Elizabeth's fear of a Catholic crusade against England drove her policy. Elizabeth's support for the Netherlands after the Treaty of Joinville between Spain and the French Catholic League emphasises this fear. Elizabeth's pro-Protestant ministers pushed Elizabeth to support their co-religionists in the Netherlands
  - politics – the decline of France after 1560 due to the Wars of Religion removed a unifying factor and allowed poor relations to develop. Spain's peace with the Turks in the late 1570s allowed a focus on Northern Europe and the difficulties of the Dutch revolt. England's fear of the Spanish presence in the Netherlands was a defining factor and once the English signed the Treaty of Nonsuch with the Netherlands, war with Spain was inevitable
  - trade – conflict in the Netherlands damaged English trade and increased conflict with Spain. The ceasing of Genoese silver ships in 1568 increased conflict and led to economic reprisals from both countries. Conflict in the Americas was trade based and damaged relations.

Candidates should conclude that marriage was an element which at times drove policy. It might be argued that a marriage was a symbol of relations which were more affected by other elements.

Answers may deploy some of the following contemporary and later interpretations:

#### **Level 1 ([0]–[5])**

An awareness of contemporary or later interpretations but the answer may focus only on one interpretation.

**Level 2 ([6]–[10])**

An awareness of contemporary or later interpretations about the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development.

**Level 3 ([11]–[15])**

There is a satisfactory evaluation of either contemporary or later interpretations of the subject or a partial evaluation of both.

**Level 4 ([16]–[20])**

A well-informed and insightful evaluation of contemporary and later interpretations of the subject.

[50]

50

- 2 The key to understanding why rivalry was more a feature of the second half rather than the first half of the century is to be found in consideration of wider factors influencing Anglo-Spanish relations. Candidates should attempt to consider whether the statement in the question is correct.

Answers may deploy some of the following knowledge:

**Level 1 ([0]–[7])**

Limited in detail to one perspective or period of time, mainly narrative.

**Level 2 ([8]–[15])**

Knowledge which draws from examples from across the period; exhibits some lapses in clarity, with some narrative.

**Level 3 ([16]–[22])**

Information is drawn from all parts of the period with clarity and focus.

**Level 4 ([23]–[30])**

Accurate knowledge from across the period, with clarity and precision.

- (a) Marital and dynastic links were important in both binding and unravelling Anglo-Spanish relations. Henry VIII was married to Catherine of Aragon and Mary was the daughter of this union. Mary married Philip II but later in the century Elizabeth refused such a marriage.
- (b) There was a common enemy in France in the early part of the century. Charles and Henry allied to conquer France in 1521, 1525 and the 1540s. During the course of the century the role of France in shaping Anglo-Spanish relations changed. In the first half of the century France was a common enemy that united the two countries but when France was consumed by the wars of religion each side interfered in France to further their own interests and this increased tension. For example, Elizabeth interfered in France with the intention of inducing France to interfere in the Netherlands against Spain. Money was given to the Duke of Anjou and troops were sent to the aid of Henry of Navarre for this purpose.
- (c) The Spanish Netherlands was vital for trade for England. In the early part of the century it was deemed prudent to stay on the right side of its rulers. England was also concerned for the security of its traditional

markets, for export, in the Netherlands. Antwerp was the European centre for the Merchant Adventurers who controlled the wool trade. When the Spanish military presence increased in the Netherlands, Elizabeth became nervous.

- (d) The Reformation brought a major redefinition of Anglo-Spanish relations. Philip II saw himself as “the sword” of the Catholic Reformation while England saw itself as an “Elect nation”. Both countries believed that they had a divine mission to further God’s will and work. Philip II supported the Papal excommunication of Elizabeth.

Candidates should consider to what extent the changing environment of the 16th century brought Anglo-Spanish conflict closer. In general terms the question is correct in its conclusion about the growth in hostility. Closer examination shows conflict in the early part of the century. Difficulties with marriage in 1509 and between 1528–1533 saw conflict increase. Political conflict saw Anglo-Spanish clashes in the 1510s and 20s. Religious differences were obvious during the reign of Edward VI when the Anglo-Spanish alliance was hard to maintain. During the marriage of Mary and Philip II opposition was clear from Parliament and during Wyatt’s rebellion of 1554. The early part of Elizabeth’s reign was characterised by good relations with Spain and decline only began 10 years into her reign.

Answers may deploy some of the following contemporary and later interpretations:

**Level 1 ([0]–[5])**

An awareness of contemporary or later interpretations but the answer may focus only on one interpretation.

**Level 2 ([6]–[10])**

An awareness of contemporary or later interpretations about the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development.

**Level 3 ([11]–[15])**

There is a satisfactory evaluation of either contemporary or later interpretations of the subject or a partial evaluation of both.

**Level 4 ([16]–[20])**

A well-informed and insightful evaluation of contemporary and later interpretations of the subject.

[50]

**Option 1**

50

50

## Option 2: CROWN AND PARLIAMENT IN ENGLAND 1603–1702

AVAILABLE  
MARKS

(Answer **one** question)

- 1 The relationship between Crown and Parliament changed considerably throughout the course of the seventeenth century. Answers that reach the highest level should consider the extent to which the relationship changed and identify the decisive moments when it did. The Constitutional Revolution, the execution of Charles I, the Restoration Settlement, the Glorious Revolution, and particularly the reign of William and Mary, saw the power and position of Parliament fluctuate. However, the seventeenth century should not be seen as a simple victory of Parliament over the King. Candidates might argue that while the relationship between Crown and Parliament certainly changes during the period in question it is debatable if the actual prerogative power of Parliament was substantially altered.

Answers may deploy some of the following knowledge:

### **Level 1 ([0]–[7])**

Limited in detail to one perspective or period of time, mainly narrative.

### **Level 2 ([8]–[15])**

Knowledge which draws from examples from across the period; exhibits some lapses in clarity, with some narrative.

### **Level 3 ([16]–[22])**

Information is drawn from all parts of the period with clarity and focus.

### **Level 4 ([23]–[30])**

Accurate knowledge from across the period, with clarity and precision.

#### **(a) The Relationship between Crown and Parliament in 1603.**

In early Stuart England, Parliament's role involved obtaining the consent of the Kingdom's representatives and maintaining contact between the monarch and his subjects. It was responsible for providing the King with advice and supply, and passing bills. The Crown could appoint officials, advisors and bishops; make foreign policy and control the armed forces; summon, prorogue and dissolve Parliament; obstruct legislation; dispense individuals from or suspend law; issue proclamations and vary customs duties. As Parliament was an irregularly occurring event rather than an annual institution and was entirely dependent on the monarch for its existence, it had limited status and influence in early Stuart England. It was further weakened by the predominance of factions rather than political parties with shared ideals and stated aims. Parliament's main strength was in its power to help the monarch change law and its control of the country's, and consequently the monarch's, purse strings.

While the reign of James I (1603–1625) saw some significant clashes between King and Parliament, notably over monopolies and foreign policy, there was little significant change to their relationship. Good candidates may note that the Monopoly Act placed a limitation upon the monarch and Parliament's impeachment of Cranfield marked a significant challenge to the King's power to choose his own ministers.

**(b) The “Constitutional Revolution” of 1640–1641**

During this period a number of successful attempts were made to impose limits on royal power and secure an increased and more permanent role for Parliament. The Triennial Act and the Act Against Own Dissolution were designed to prevent the monarch employing personal rule in the future and increase the co-dependency of their relationship. This “revolution” saw the abolition of the Crown's prerogative financial devices increasing the need for monarchy to rely upon finance from Parliament. The abolition of the prerogative courts restricted the King's independence in the legal system.

However, there were limits to what was actually achieved by Parliament in this period. It failed to secure the right to choose the King's ministers and Charles refused to allow them to lessen his control of the Anglican Church. The King retained his right to collect customs duties and to become financially independent if his revenues increased due to an expansion of trade. The control of the armed forces also remained a royal prerogative. Despite these limitations there is no doubt that the period 1640–1641 marked a significant change in the relationship between Crown and Parliament even if it is debatable if it deserves to be termed a “revolution”.

**(c) The Execution of Charles I, 1649.**

There is no doubt that the execution of Charles I and the creation of an English republic marked a total breakdown in the relationship between King and Parliament, although arguably the breakdown had occurred before the Civil War began. Good candidates will note that the execution of the King was not supported by all of Parliament, noting the significance of Pride's Purge or even how the country had been divided during the Civil War. While the execution certainly created a radical change in the government of England the restoration of Charles II, in 1660, suggests that the change was only temporary.

**(d) The Restoration Settlement and the reign of Charles II, 1660–1688.**

The Restoration Settlement confirmed all the reforms passed by Parliament up to the end of the 1641 session and ensured that the impact of the Constitutional Revolution would be long lasting. The prerogative taxation and courts of Charles I's reign remained illegal and the King could no longer collect taxes without Parliament's consent. The King's permanent revenue was set at a level, £1.2M, which was

designed to ensure the need for Parliament to meet and vote additional supply. The Clarendon Code and the later Test Acts would reassert the supremacy of Parliament over the Church. Despite these significant changes to the relationship, the position and prerogative power Charles II inherited in 1660 remained almost the same as that which his father had received in 1625. Charles II's Cavalier Parliament further strengthened his position by making it treason to imprison or restrain the King, censoring the press and passing a weakened Triennial Act. By the end of his reign Charles was financially independent of Parliament due to the customs boom from the trade revolution and subsidies he received from France. Good candidates may note that it was during the Exclusion Crisis that political parties emerged for the first time in England. The Whigs and Tories enabled a new form of politics to develop with an emphasis on policy rather than local or family interests.

**(e) The Glorious Revolution and The Revolution Settlement 1688–1689.**

The relationship between James II and his Tory-dominated Parliament had initially been good but was ruined by his retaining of a standing army after the Monmouth Rebellion and particularly his promotion of Catholic officers. His desire to secure political and religious equality for Catholics and his attempt to pack Parliament with supporters of reforming the penal laws resulted in a complete breakdown in his relationship with the gentry and ultimately his removal in the Glorious Revolution. While these clashes did not alter the prerogative power of the Crown they did pave the way for a new style of monarchy under the joint leadership of William and Mary. Good answers will examine the changing prerogative power of the monarchy as a result of the new Coronation Oath, the Bill of Rights, the Mutiny Act, the Toleration Act and the revised financial arrangements. For example, in the Bill of Rights of 1689 Parliament insisted that the monarch had to be Protestant. The new monarchs certainly enjoyed a different style of relationship with Parliament even if the actual powers of monarchy had not been significantly altered. The real changes in the relationship between Crown and Parliament were to occur in the reign of William III but not at its outset.

**(f) Changes to the role and status of Parliament during the reign of William III.**

At the end of the century, Parliament asserted itself more decisively in the realm of finance achieving royal dependence and accountability through the Commission of Accounts and Civil List. The Act of Settlement achieved the independence of the judiciary, determined the religion of the monarch and the succession to the throne, and a new Triennial Act established the duration of a Parliament as three years. To fund his European conflict William was willing to allow Parliament a say in how the subsidies it granted were spent. This new style of government gave Parliament a permanency that allowed it to become



more efficient and effective in its operation. Candidates may note the emergence of political parties rather than factions and the impact this had upon the changing role and nature of Parliament. By 1700 the Crown was coming under pressure to appoint ministers who could command a majority in the House of Commons, although even at this late stage there was no legal obligation to do so and Parliament still had no authority over the appointment of the monarch's ministers. Parliament also clarified its role in foreign affairs. Parliament was upset when it was not shown the Partition Treaties of 1698 and 1699 and The Act of Settlement of 1701 dictated that the Crown could not go to war in defence of its foreign dominions without Parliamentary support. In 1701 William thought it best to ask Parliament's approval for his Treaty of Grand Alliance

By the end of the seventeenth century the relationship between Parliament and the King had changed considerably. Parliament now met almost annually and had become a permanent and integral part of central government. The Commons had supplanted the Lords as the true seat of power and political parties were now the norm. Parliament had also expanded its range of powers being able to determine the King's income through the Civil List and having established its right to levy all taxation. The King had lost a degree of financial independence even if his supply from Parliament had in fact increased. Parliament had also been able to determine the succession and religion of the monarch. Even foreign policy was now part of Parliament's sphere of influence.

Answers may deploy some of the following contemporary and later interpretations:

**Level 1 ([0]–[5])**

An awareness of contemporary or later interpretations but the answer may focus only on one interpretation.

**Level 2 ([6]–[10])**

An awareness of contemporary or later interpretations about the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development.

**Level 3 ([11]–[15])**

There is a satisfactory evaluation of either contemporary or later interpretations of the subject or a partial evaluation of both.

**Level 4 ([16]–[20])**

A well-informed and insightful evaluation of contemporary and later interpretations of the subject.

Examples of contemporary interpretations could include, e.g.:

- the views of Parliamentarians such as Pym during the Constitutional Revolution
- Clarendon's views on the execution of Charles I and the Restoration of Charles II
- the views of the King and his ministers on issues of prerogative power and the role of Parliament
- William of Orange's attitude towards war in Europe and his willingness to compromise with Parliament.

Examples of later interpretations could include, e.g.:

- the "Whig myth" interpretation of the seventeenth century as a period of the gradual, inexorable rise of Parliament
- the revisionist analysis of the Restoration Settlement as a strengthening of monarchy
- historian's opinions on the significance of the Constitutional Revolution
- views on the importance of the final decade of the century in transforming the relationship between Crown and Parliament. [50]

50

- 2 Answers that reach the highest level should consider the ways in which the Glorious Revolution might be considered the most important event in weakening the power of monarchy in the seventeenth century. Having examined this proposition, the best answers will suggest alternative events which were significant, such as the "Constitutional Revolution" 1640–1641, the Civil Wars and execution of Charles I, the Restoration Settlement or the reign of William III (c1690–1702). A candidate may choose to argue that the Glorious Revolution actually strengthened rather than weakened monarchy and that while it may have been fatal for the reign of James II it was not so damaging for the Crown itself.

Answers may deploy some of the following knowledge:

**Level 1 ([0]–[7])**

Limited in detail to one perspective or period of time, mainly narrative.

**Level 2 ([8]–[15])**

Knowledge which draws from examples from across the period; exhibits some lapses in clarity, with some narrative.

**Level 3 ([16]–[22])**

Information is drawn from all parts of the period with clarity and focus.

**Level 4 ([23]–[30])**

Accurate knowledge from across the period, with clarity and precision.

**(a) The Glorious Revolution and The Revolution Settlement 1688–1689.**

The pro-Catholic and absolutist policies of James II resulted in his loss of power and the creation of a joint monarchy. Good answers will examine the changing prerogative power of the monarchy as a result of the new Coronation Oath, the Bill of Rights, the Mutiny Act, the Toleration Act and the revised financial arrangements. For example, in the Bill of Rights of 1689 Parliament insisted that the monarch had to be Protestant. Despite the fact that Parliament had played a prominent role in the creation of new monarchs and a new style of monarchy, in reality, the Crown retained its power and resources. It is arguable that the period does not deserve the title “revolution” and that little had changed in the role and status of either monarchy and Parliament. This would suggest that the event was most important for its impact upon James himself rather than upon the institution of monarchy itself. Alternatively, candidates may argue that the Glorious Revolution created the circumstances for the hugely significant changes to the prerogative power of the Crown which were to occur in the next decade. It was the reign of William III and, in particular, his foreign policy that were instrumental in creating the conditions for real changes to be made to the power of the monarch. Without the Glorious Revolution such changes would not have been possible.

**(b) The “Constitutional Revolution” of 1640–1641.**

It is arguable that the “Constitutional Revolution” was the most critical event in changing the power of monarchy in the seventeenth century. During this period a number of successful attempts were made to impose limits on royal power and secure an increased and more permanent role for Parliament. The Triennial Act and the Act Against Own Dissolution ensured that Parliament was to be called on a more regular basis and should have prevented the monarchy employing personal rule in the future. This “revolution” saw the abolition of the Crown’s prerogative financial devices increasing the need for monarchy to rely upon finance from Parliament. The abolition of the prerogative courts helped protect the nobility from the King’s abuse of the judicial system. The execution of the King’s favourite, the Earl of Strafford, following an Act of Attainder represented a major challenge to the King’s authority.

However, there were limits to what was actually achieved by Parliament in this period. The demand that the appointment of royal ministers should be subject to Parliamentary approval was never agreed by the Crown. The Root and Branch petition, that proposed the abolition of the episcopacy, was never implemented. Parliament did not insist on a general election if it was still in session. There was also nothing to prevent a monarch from becoming financially independent if his revenues increased due to an expansion of trade. There was no widespread acceptance that the armed forces of the state should be subject to Parliament rather than the King. Nevertheless, Parliament had challenged the King’s prerogative power and achieved a number of significant concessions.

**(c) The Execution of Charles I, 1649.**

It could be argued that England was never the same after the execution of the King in 1649 and that the status of Parliament reached its pinnacle at this point in the seventeenth century as it became the ruling political force in the country. There is no doubt that the power of monarchy was at its lowest point while Charles II remained in exile and the country declared itself a republic. However, good candidates will note that the execution of the King had not been supported by the majority of his subjects. More significantly the change in political power in the nation was to prove to be temporary with monarchy fully restored by 1660.

**(d) The Restoration Settlement 1660–c.1665.**

The Restoration Settlement confirmed all the Bills passed by Parliament up to the end of the 1641 session and suggests that the King was restored on Parliament's terms. The prerogative taxation and courts of Charles I's reign remained illegal and the King could no longer collect taxes without Parliament's consent. Furthermore, the King's permanent revenue was limited to £1.2M p.a. to ensure he was dependent upon Parliament for supply. This analysis of the Restoration as damaging to the power and position of monarchy is, however, misleading. Charles II had been restored with most of his prerogative powers intact and very much on his own terms. His Cavalier Parliament further strengthened his position by making it treason to imprison or restrain the King, censoring the press and passing a weakened Triennial Act. Far from weakening the monarchy the Restoration Settlement actually strengthened the Crown's hand. Charles was able to end his reign in personal rule as a trade explosion and his links with France allowed him to survive financially without having to call Parliament.

**(e) The reign of William III.**

William's desire to defend his homeland from the expansionism of Louis XIV committed England to a costly war in Europe. He was willing to enter into a partnership with the gentry to ensure a regular supply in return for a regular Parliament, with a direct involvement in how subsidies were to be spent. This new style of government gave Parliament a permanency that allowed it to become more efficient and effective in its operation. It also ensured that the monarch was dependent upon calling an annual Parliament to attain the supply necessary for war. This allowed Parliament to play a more direct role in forming policy, even in foreign affairs. William was prepared to enter into a co-dependent relationship with the English Parliament because it suited his European ambitions. By the end of the century, Parliament asserted itself more decisively in the realm of finance achieving royal dependence and accountability through the Commission of Accounts and Civil List. The Act of Settlement achieved the independence of the

judiciary, determined the religion of the monarch and the succession to the throne, and a new Triennial Act established the duration of a Parliament as three years. By 1700 the Crown was coming under pressure to appoint ministers that could command a majority in the House of Commons although even at this late stage there was no legal obligation to do so and Parliament still had no authority over the appointment of the monarch's ministers. The Act of Settlement of 1701 dictated that the Crown could not go to war in defence of its foreign dominions without Parliamentary support.

There is little doubt that the reign of William III saw a weakening of the prerogative power of the monarchy as he bargained with Parliament. Candidates may argue, however, that, despite a loss of independence, in some ways monarchy had actually been strengthened. After all the Civil List and creation of the Bank of England had enabled William to lead England into a major war in Europe. It could even be argued that the compromises made with Parliament in the 1690s laid the foundations for the British Empire and even helped prevent the revolutions which affected more absolutist monarchies in the following century.

Answers may deploy some of the following contemporary and later interpretations:

**Level 1 ([0]–[5])**

An awareness of contemporary or later interpretations but the answer may focus only on one interpretation.

**Level 2 ([6]–[10])**

An awareness of contemporary or later interpretations about the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development.

**Level 3 ([11]–[15])**

There is a satisfactory evaluation of either contemporary or later interpretations of the subject or a partial evaluation of both.

**Level 4 ([16]–[20])**

A well-informed and insightful evaluation of contemporary and later interpretations of the subject.

Examples of contemporary interpretations could include, e.g.:

- views of Parliamentarians and Royalists on the Constitutional Revolution and on the execution of the King
- the views of the King and his ministers on the Restoration Settlement
- MPs attitudes towards the political changes of the 1690s.

Examples of later interpretations could include, for e.g.:

- the Whig interpretation of 1688 as a “Glorious Revolution”
- the revisionist analysis of the Restoration Settlement as a strengthening of monarchy rather than a weakening
- opinions on the most significant event for changing the power of monarchy
- views on the importance of the final decade of the century in transforming the relationship between Crown and Parliament. [50]

**Option 2**

AVAILABLE  
MARKS

50

**50**

### Option 3: LIBERALISM AND NATIONALISM IN EUROPE 1815–1914

AVAILABLE  
MARKS

(Answer **one** question)

- 1 This question expects a survey and analysis of the whole period between 1815 and 1914, including some treatment of the economic dimension. A basic answer will see little progress for liberalism before 1850, with failure of 1848 as a particular low point, followed by widespread acceptance of the ideology in the years leading up to the Great War. More nuanced answers will note a few exceptions to the lack of progress in the earlier period, while commenting on the setbacks suffered by liberalism late in the period as well as its undoubted achievements.

Answers may deploy some of the following knowledge:

**Level 1 ([0]–[7])**

Limited in detail to one perspective or period of time, mainly narrative.

**Level 2 ([8]–[15])**

Knowledge which draws from examples from across the period; exhibits some lapses in clarity, with some narrative.

**Level 3 ([16]–[22])**

Information is drawn from all parts of the period with clarity and focus.

**Level 4 ([23]–[30])**

Accurate knowledge from across the period, with clarity and precision.

1815 represented a defeat for the liberal cause, the statesmen of Vienna associating liberalism with the excesses of the French Revolution. The Treaty restored ancien regime despotism with the consolidation of the old Empires, and Metternich's Austria took the lead in the enthusiastic suppression of liberalism wherever and however it expressed itself. Thus the German states were encouraged to pass the repressive Carlsbad Decrees and the Six Acts; in the name of the Troppau Protocol, Austrian armies put down revolution in Piedmont, Naples, Modena and the Papal States; while within the borders of the Empire, Metternich operated a strict regime of censorship. The Russian Decembrists were crushed in 1825, while in France Charles X showed contempt for the spirit of the Charter under which he was supposed to rule, and his successor Louis Philippe, through his favouritism and reluctance to extend the franchise, gave liberalism a bad name. Before 1850 liberalism was a minority taste, confined largely to the middle classes and intelligentsia, and even when it found itself in the ascendancy in 1848, with wider support than was the norm, failed to consolidate and frittered away its advantage through a combination of indecision, wariness of the proffered working class support, and naiveté.

Better answers will also point out, however, that liberal stirrings, however ineffective, continued throughout the period 1815–1848. South West Germany, in particular Baden, enjoyed and maintained a genuinely liberal constitution, while the French Charter of 1814 and its successor of 1830, for

all their limitations, were proper constitutions. Despite the best efforts of the secret police, foreign ideas continued to penetrate the Habsburg Empire, and the United Kingdom, most notably in the Whig Decade, conceded what was at the very least a power-sharing arrangement with the middle classes. Those classes continued to grow across the Continent as industrialisation proceeded, increasing the natural constituency for liberalism. Perhaps linked to this increase in economic activity, free market doctrines made considerable gains in Britain, thanks to the efforts of Huskisson and Peel, and in Germany, where the popularity of the Prussian-inspired Zollverein led to its rapid growth across the northern states of the Confederation.

The events of 1848 may attract some extended coverage: if so the emphasis should be on the endemic weaknesses of liberalism and its reluctance to supplant the old regimes which led to its eventual defeat after the promise of the spring and early summer of that year. Everywhere on mainland Europe, except Piedmont, where the constitution won in 1848 was retained, the liberals met with ignominious defeat, yet the paradox remains that from that moment on liberalism began to achieve its aims of greater personal freedoms, an extended franchise and parliamentary government, initially in western Europe. In France Napoleon III, however, belatedly, relaxed his authoritarian regime and introduced liberal reform, while Italy was united largely due to the efforts of Cavour, whose constitutional Piedmont became the yardstick for aspirant liberals elsewhere, and whose institutions were superimposed on the newly united Kingdom of Italy in 1860. Britain saw a major franchise extension in 1867, while in Prussia the liberals were well represented in parliament, although their aims were frustrated by both Manteuffel and Bismarck. Free trade grew apace as others saw the success of Britain, which under Gladstone abandoned most remaining trade restrictions, and Germany, where the Zollverein had facilitated a rapid process of industrialisation and enrichment. The Cobden-Chevallier Treaty was a step towards happier trading relations between Britain and France as the gospel of free trade spread. The French Third Republic, where the liberal Thiers had fought off the Communards and the resurgent Royalists, also placed France on a liberal par with Britain, with the separation of Church and state in the early years of the twentieth century placing France a step ahead of its former rival. Austria also moved towards a more liberal regime, and even Russia saw important reforms in the 1860s, and an elected Duma after the 1905 revolution. The National Liberals formed an alliance with their former enemy Bismarck, and the Habsburg Empire also moved towards a more liberal regime. By 1914 personal freedoms and a widely elected parliamentary system of government had made considerable gains across Europe.

On the debit side these gains were not always consistently maintained. By 1900 Austria had returned to a much more authoritarian regime, while Bismarck broke with the National Liberals, who had shown a distinct lack of liberalism in their support for the anti-Catholic *Kulturkampf*. The Italian Parliamentary system became notorious for corruption, while the recently enfranchised Hungarians were not prepared to show similar generosity toward subject races in their half of the Dual Monarchy. The Tsar, through a



series of dissolutions and fresh elections, gradually emasculated the Duma, while after 1875 the Great Depression frightened most of Europe into a return to protectionism. The growth of big government, as seen in the embryonic Welfare States of Germany and Britain, ran counter to classical liberalism, while the enfranchisement of the unpropertied left traditional liberals uneasy about their retention of middle class power.

The best marks will go to those candidates who recognise this uneven pattern of the rise of liberalism. Any other material which is accurate and relevant will, of course, be appropriately rewarded.

Answers may deploy some of the following contemporary and later interpretations:

**Level 1 ([0]–[5])**

An awareness of contemporary or later interpretations but the answer may focus only on one interpretation.

**Level 2 ([6]–[10])**

An awareness of contemporary or later interpretations about the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development.

**Level 3 ([11]–[15])**

There is a satisfactory evaluation of either contemporary or later interpretations of the subject or a partial evaluation of both.

**Level 4 ([16]–[20])**

A well-informed and insightful evaluation of contemporary and later interpretations of the subject.

[50]

50

- 2 The question invites candidates to display their knowledge of cultural nationalism and its effects, but realistically one might expect that the major part of the answer will deal with political developments. The usual interpretation of the “cultural dimension” is that a sense of national identity, usually notable by its absence in the eighteenth century, was later stimulated by a combination of writers, linguists, painters and musicians, who played an important part in the creation of nationalist sentiment and pride in history, culture, nation and territory. During the Napoleonic period, when much of nineteenth century nationalist feeling was born, Fichte’s influential “Addresses to the German People” not only called for a specifically German revival at a time when Germany did not exist, but also sought to limit its leadership to the middle classes and the intelligentsia, while Goya’s paintings of the horrors of the Peninsular War inspired nationalist pride among the people of Spain. (But political and military events of the same era also inspired nationalism, especially Napoleon’s rationalisation of the multiplicity of Italian and German states, and the eventual reaction across the continent against French domination.)

Answers may deploy some of the following knowledge:

**Level 1 ([0]–[7])**

Limited in detail to one perspective or period of time, mainly narrative.

**Level 2 ([8]–[15])**

Knowledge which draws from examples from across the period; exhibits some lapses in clarity, with some narrative.

**Level 3 ([16]–[22])**

Information is drawn from all parts of the period with clarity and focus.

**Level 4 ([23]–[30])**

Accurate knowledge from across the period, with clarity and precision.

After 1815 there was great emphasis on the use of “national” languages, e.g. the publication of the “Pesti Hirlap”, the first newspaper in Magyar, and Pushkin’s campaign to persuade the Russian upper classes to speak Russian instead of French. Historians such as Palacky, who wrote extensively on the history of the Czech people, by concentrating on past glories and present oppression, helped encourage nationalist feelings among their readers, who were overwhelmingly upper or middle class. Verdi’s operas were often coded pleas for an end to Austrian hegemony over the peninsula, while many composers plundered folk tunes to produce stirring symphonic works. Chopin (Poles), Smetana and Dvorak (Czechs), and Sibelius for the Finns, were among those who in this way reached beyond the reading classes to touch the unlettered. Cultural nationalism also includes religion, and there are many examples of links between religion and nationalist fervour, such as the Roman Catholic Poles living under Russian Orthodox rule, the Protestant Czechs’ resentment of the Catholic Austrians, and Ottoman (Moslem) control over the largely Christian Balkans. Some candidates may well wish to question whether, for all the growth of nationalist consciousness during the period, those successes nationalism had were due to this or to other, usually political and military factors. During the latter part of the period propagandistic cultural nationalism was adopted by governments to inculcate patriotism and loyalty to the state. Arguably the most potent illustration of this trend was the widespread rush to join the colours in 1914, while the policy of Russification may not have extended its roots very deeply, but still contributed to the preservation of the Russian Empire right up to 1914. In the German Empire, although patriotism seemed high, the state failed in its efforts to wean the workers away from support for socialism.

Candidates must consider the “political characteristics” of nationalism’s success as well. The factors to be discussed might include political leadership, revolution, war and the international climate. The importance of Cavour and Garibaldi in the Risorgimento will be mentioned. The work of the two men complemented each others’ efforts. Cavour recognised the earlier failures of the Carbonari, Mazzini and Charles Albert, and concluded that rather than growing organically, Italian nationalism would be best

served through the leadership of Piedmont, if necessary forcing itself on Italy. Thus he built up Piedmont into a state other Italians could admire, conjured up a quarrel with the Austrians, secured the help of France, and ensured the National Society would campaign for Piedmontese leadership. Garibaldi ensured, through his daring and military skill, that Cavour, however reluctantly, would have to include southern Italy in the new Kingdom, even though his vision for “Italia” was a more radical one than that of the more conservative Piedmontese Prime Minister. Napoleon III, always keen to dismantle as much as he could of the 1815 settlement, also deserves credit for his intervention, which was at least in part a result of his declared support for nationalist causes.

In the case of Germany the *Realpolitik* of Bismarck will be referred to. A Prussian expansionist rather than a true German nationalist, he nonetheless played on nationalist feelings and secured unity after three wars in less than a decade. A consummate diplomatist, Bismarck cajoled, threatened and finally outmanoeuvred his opponents both within and outside Prussia, establishing a powerful new country which dominated central Europe. Always ready to use force as the ultimate weapon of diplomacy, Bismarck had invaluable help from the Minister of War, von Roon, and from Field Marshal von Moltke.

Revolution as a component of nationalist success could be considered, although answers may point out that the revolutions of 1815–1848 and of the “Year of Revolutions” itself were singularly ineffective in comparison with the activities of governments and armies. A possible exception might be Greece, where a popular rising eventually attracted outside interest and help, and Greece was able to break free from Ottoman rule in 1829.

A more profitable seam to mine might be that of warfare. Recent thinking has argued that the nineteenth century was not as successful in terms of nationalist success as earlier interpretations suggested, and that this was due to the comparative peacefulness of the period between 1815 and 1914. In the light of the question it may be argued that most nationalist success of the era depended upon the stimulus of war. Examples could include the 1859 war, which began the rapid process of Italian Unification, the Seven Weeks War of 1866, which paved the way for the creation of the North German Confederation, and its natural successor, the Franco-Prussian War of 1879–71, which resulted in the declaration of the German Empire. The 1866 war also paved the way to the *Ausgleich*, a notable success for nationalism. Turkey would not have had to abandon Greece if Britain, France and Russia had not turned the issue into a full scale war, and both Bulgaria and Albania owed their existence to further wars against the Ottoman Empire.

The international situation was at certain times particularly favourable to nationalist causes. Great Power sympathy was almost indispensable, as cited already in the case of Greece, while at the same period France and Britain, with differing motives, agreed to the independence of Belgium. Albania may not have been ready for self-government, but the Austrian

desire to block Serbia's access to the sea ensured its creation. France, Britain and later Prussia assisted in the achievement of Italian unity, while Russian designs on the Ottoman Empire helped Bulgaria to attain freedom. Bismarck was given a fortunate advantage by the ailing Napoleon III's flawed judgement, while the continuing decline of both the Habsburg and Ottoman Empire eased the way for nationalism in Italy, Germany, Hungary, Rumania and Bulgaria.

There are many arguments which could be used to explain the success of nationalism, and any other valid material may be cited.

Answers may deploy some of the following contemporary and later interpretations:

**Level 1 ([0]–[5])**

An awareness of contemporary or later interpretations but the answer may focus only on one interpretation.

**Level 2 ([6]–[10])**

An awareness of contemporary or later interpretations about the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development.

**Level 3 ([11]–[15])**

There is a satisfactory evaluation of either contemporary or later interpretations of the subject or a partial evaluation of both.

**Level 4 ([16]–[20])**

A well-informed and insightful evaluation of contemporary and later interpretations of the subject.

[50]

**Option 3**

50

**50**

## Option 4: UNIONISM AND NATIONALISM IN IRELAND 1800–1900

AVAILABLE  
MARKS

(Answer **one** question)

- 1 This question requires an assessment of the role played by British governments in the success of constitutional and revolutionary nationalists in this period. The best responses will reflect on the role of governments in relation to other factors, and come to a reasoned conclusion as to where the balance lies. The structure of the answer is immaterial: whether thematic or chronological, adherence to the issues in the question and the quality of evidence is the requirement for creditable marks.

Answers may deploy some of the following knowledge:

### Level 1 ([0]–[7])

Limited in detail to one perspective or period of time, mainly narrative.

### Level 2 ([8]–[15])

Knowledge which draws from examples from across the period; exhibits some lapses in clarity, with some narrative.

### Level 3 ([16]–[22])

Information is drawn from all parts of the period with clarity and focus.

### Level 4 ([23]–[30])

Accurate knowledge from across the period, with clarity and precision.

- (a) **In the first half of this period, the political fortunes of Daniel O’Connell were affected by the response of governments.**

For all the merits of the O’Connell campaign, Catholic emancipation was partly achieved due to the acquiescence of a weak British government in the period 1827–1829. The departure of Lord Liverpool after 1827 brought to a head long-held divisions in the Tory government, and created a political climate conducive to the pressure which O’Connell applied.

Moreover, in the 1830s, the Parliamentary weaknesses of the Whigs made an understanding with O’Connell attractive in order to deny Peel the opportunity to govern. There thus arose the Lichfield House Compact, which produced limited success over such matters as poverty, tithe, local government reform and the commencement of a new era of impartial administration under Drummond.

The response of Peel was decisive in denying O’Connell’s attempt to secure repeal in the 1840s. Peel, the foremost statesman of his generation, was well acquainted with the Irish problem, and his determination to stand firm and maintain the Union by a mixture of resolution and conciliatory reform captured the mood of political opinion at Westminster.

**(b) The extent to which O'Connell achieved his objectives also depended on a range of other factors.**

O'Connell himself deserves credit for the achievement of Catholic emancipation. His skilful campaign united all strands of constitutionalism, moulding peasants, middle class, parish priests and the Catholic hierarchy into a potent pressure group.

The Lichfield House Compact came about partly because O'Connell had to face the harsh reality that the commencement of a repeal campaign in the 1830s would have been futile in the face of a hostile Westminster Parliament. While the Compact brought some benefits, the Whigs were the real winners from the deal. They were kept in office while the Irish had to accept compromises, as none of the reforms dealt with the fundamental problems in the Irish economy and society. O'Connell's failure to achieve repeal was partly attributable to his own shortcomings, which conveniently played into Peel's hands, such as the duplication of the emancipation tactics for a different issue and the predictability of the repeal campaign.

**(c) Parnell was the dominant figure in constitutional nationalism after 1850, and like O'Connell, the response of British governments impacted on the extent to which he achieved his political objectives.**

Constitutional nationalism benefited from the determination of Gladstone's Liberal governments to address Irish grievances through land reform and the introduction of two Home Rule Bills. However, Liberal divisions over the Bill of 1886 caused its defeat in the Commons. The Parliamentary position of the Liberals and the Conservatives after the 1885 general election facilitated Parnell's brief flirtation with Salisbury. It was the stance of non-conformist opinion in the Liberal Party which accelerated Parnell's demise in 1891 following the divorce scandal.

**(d) The fortunes of constitutional nationalism were not solely influenced by the response of governments.**

The Irish Party struggled in its early years due to the shortcomings in Butt's leadership. The New Departure, inspired by Parnell, helped to concentrate the minds of those in government to confront the Irish land question. Moreover, Parnell's organisation of a tightly knit, unified and pledge-bound party, made him into a formidable force which government could not ignore. The public scandal of his divorce destroyed Parnell's career, alienated a majority of his Party and aroused the hostility of the Catholic Church.

**(e) The response of governments partly explains the failure of revolutionary nationalists to achieve their objectives.**

Governments easily suppressed the notable revolutionary actions of Emmett, Young Ireland and the Fenians. *Good answers may reflect that the Fenians made an impact on the public opinion that Gladstone made use of in his goal of pacifying Ireland.*

**Yet other factors were evident:**

Inadequate planning, poor leadership undermined all physical force nationalists, lack of any popular support and, more notably in the case of the Fenians, the outright hostility of the Catholic Church.

Answers may deploy some of the following contemporary and later interpretations:

**Level 1 ([0]–[5])**

An awareness of contemporary or later interpretations but the answer may focus only on one interpretation.

**Level 2 ([6]–[10])**

An awareness of contemporary or later interpretations about the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development.

**Level 3 ([11]–[15])**

There is a satisfactory evaluation of either contemporary or later interpretations of the subject or a partial evaluation of both.

**Level 4 ([16]–[20])**

A well-informed and insightful evaluation of contemporary and later interpretations of the subject.

Examples of contemporary interpretations could include, e.g.:

- Peel's fears if emancipation was not conceded in 1829
- Peel's determination to uphold the Union and thwart the repeal campaign
- Parnell's or Gladstone's views on issues such as land reform or Home Rule; response to the activities of revolutionary nationalists.

Examples of later interpretations could include, e.g.:

- historians' opinions on the weakness of the British government during the emancipation campaign
- assessment of O'Connell's role in the achievement of emancipation and his errors when pursuing repeal
- views on the role of Parnell both in the successes and failures experienced by constitutional nationalists.

[50]

50

- 2 This question invites an assessment of the motives and methods of the supporters of the Union in the north and south of Ireland. Sustained comparison and contrasts are required, though the structure of the answer is optional. Top level responses will embrace a wide analysis, indicating where comparisons and contrasts are most evident.

Answers may deploy some of the following knowledge:

**Level 1 ([0]–[7])**

Limited in detail to one perspective or period of time, mainly narrative.

**Level 2 ([8]–[15])**

Knowledge which draws from examples from across the period, exhibits some lapses in clarity, with some narrative.

**Level 3 ([16]–[22])**

Information is drawn from all parts of the period with clarity and focus.

**Level 4 ([23]–[30])**

Accurate knowledge from across the period, with clarity and precision.

- (a) Economic fears if the Union was broken were a consistent theme in the motives of supporters of the Union in the north and south of Ireland.**

Ulster Unionists believed that their industrial strength, measured in the performance of the linen, shipbuilding and rope making industries, would be undermined by home rule. In the south, economic motives focused on their agricultural prosperity, which they believed was being eroded by legislation such as the Land Acts of 1870 and 1881, as well as electoral reform in 1884 and 1898.

- (b) Religious motives were apparent, but they were more acute among the supporters of the Union in the north than in the south of Ireland.**

Belfast witnessed growing religious tension as the result of the gradual influx of Catholics, and there were several high profile outbreaks of violence, such as in 1886 on the occasion of the first Home Rule Bill. In contrast, religious apprehensions occupied less attention in the south, where Unionists tended to not only stress that the question of the “Union or Separation” was not a religious issue, but argued the benefits of the Union for both Catholics and Protestants.



- (c) **The association between the Union and the empire was more prominent in the south than in the north.**

Southern Unionists argued that Ireland prospered by being a member of a mighty empire, which the introduction of home rule would ultimately jeopardise. In contrast, Ulster Unionists, while no doubt endorsing these sentiments, devoted less in their literature and speeches to the grand “imperial ideal” so often lauded in the south.

- (d) **There was a lack of consistency in the methods used by the supporters of the Union, with aggression and stridency in the north contrasting with a more constitutional approach in the south.**

Ulster Unionists exploited their geographical advantages in their determination to uphold the Union. For example, Young Ulster required its members to possess firearms. The Protestant Colonisation Society defended the rights of Protestants against perceived Catholic encroachment in Ulster. Meanwhile, the Cork Defence Union proclaimed its non-sectarian credentials, while the Property Defence Association made no distinction over the religious composition of those whose interests it served.

*Answers will be credited for offering explanations for these comparisons and contrasts. For example, geographical consideration impacted on the methods and levels of religious toleration displayed in the north and south. Economic concerns were mainly attributable to the social structure of unionism. Adherence to the empire occupied the minds of Southern Unionists who were often educated outside Ireland, travelled more widely and, due to their social contacts and social standing, served the empire in the capacity of viceroys.*

Answers may deploy some of the following contemporary and later interpretations:

**Level 1 ([0]–[5])**

An awareness of contemporary or later interpretations but the answer may focus only on one interpretation.

**Level 2 ([6]–[10])**

An awareness of contemporary or later interpretations about the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development.

**Level 3 ([11]–[15])**

There is a satisfactory evaluation of either contemporary or later interpretations of the subject or a partial evaluation of both.

**Level 4 ([16]–[20])**

A well-informed and insightful evaluation of contemporary and later interpretations of the subject.

Examples of contemporary interpretations could include, e.g.:

- Ulster and Southern Unionist fears for their economic well-being if the Union was broken
- comparisons between Ulster and Southern Unionists' attitudes to religion and the Union
- opinions on the significance of the Union for the empire.

Examples of later interpretations could include, e.g.:

- historians' views on the role of religion, the empire and economic motives for the supporters of the Union
- opinions on where comparisons and contrasts are most apparent.

[50]

**Option 4**

## Option 5: CLASH OF IDEOLOGIES IN EUROPE 1900–2000

AVAILABLE  
MARKS

(Answer **one** question)

- 1 Candidates should select appropriate evidence from Soviet foreign policy in Europe after 1917 to illustrate their responses. Different factors should be considered that impacted upon Soviet foreign policy and whether or not its primary goal was to promote world revolution or to defend its own revolution.**

Answers may deploy some of the following knowledge:

### **Level 1 ([0]–[7])**

Limited in detail to one perspective or period of time, mainly narrative.

### **Level 2 ([8]–[15])**

Knowledge which draws from across the period, exhibits some lapses in clarity, with some narrative.

### **Level 3 ([16]–[22])**

Information is drawn from all parts of the period with clarity and focus.

### **Level 4 ([23]–[30])**

Accurate knowledge from across the period, with clarity and precision.

Most candidates will probably argue that while the Soviet Union was in part determined to protect the ideas of the revolution, other factors were also important at other times. They may also seek to suggest that there were different approaches adopted at different stages and this may have been dependent on the leader of the time or the circumstances they found themselves in, or a combination of the both. In such a broad topic, candidates have to be selective with their historical evidence. The following evidence from each phase is therefore only a suggestion as to what could be included.

1917–1924. The Bolshevik belief that it would be tremendously difficult for the Soviet Union to survive led Lenin to take a number of initial moves to protect the revolution. Lenin set up the Comintern in 1919 with the goal of trying to spread communism internationally and in this regard safeguard the revolution. Equally, it could be pointed out that Kennan was subsequently to claim that communism was an inherently aggressive and expansionist ideology and there is some evidence for that claim.

However, temporary capitalist intervention from western countries in the Civil War also demonstrated to the Bolsheviks that an isolated USSR was vulnerable and for a Communist regime to survive it would have to ensure its security in the future. Survival rather than any desire to expand communism as a means of protecting the ideas of the revolution was the main priority in this phase and in 1922 with the Treaty of Rapallo with Weimar Germany, the USSR showed that it could be pragmatic and work with capitalist states if necessary for survival and thus go against its ideological foundations.

1924–1941. Stalin continued the more inward looking policies of Lenin and concentrated upon the economic reconstruction of the USSR. The policy of “Socialism in One Country” focused partly on industrialisation to develop its ability to increase its levels of rearmament to protect itself from potential attacks by capitalist states. By 1933 with the rise to power of Hitler the USSR recognised the potential threat of Nazism. In 1934 the USSR joined the League of Nations to try to co-operate with capitalist states such as the UK and France to achieve collective security. Self-preservation was the clear motive. The involvement with the Spanish Civil War was limited in character and may indeed be viewed as a piece of opportunism by Stalin rather than evidence of a desire to advance communism. It might also be noted that there had been the internal debate amongst the architects of the revolution as to what was the best way to protect the ideas of the revolution. After the Munich Conference in 1938 the USSR gradually realised that the West could not be relied upon and in 1939 it agreed the Nazi-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact with its ideological enemy Nazism.

Such pragmatism revealed that the USSR needed to gain time to rearm more but also partly in the interests of security it would be beneficial to acquire the Baltic states and Eastern Poland as a potential buffer zone against possible attack from the West. The USSR was also able to recover territory lost by the 1918 Treaty of Brest-Litovsk.

1941–1945. In this regard it could be argued that Soviet foreign policy was seeking to advance communism, but more as a defensive measure than any expansionist tendency. Alternatively it could be argued ala Tucker that this was a piece of pure opportunism on the part of Stalin and that he had initially hoped a war between capitalist powers would have developed. When it didn't he switched sides. The Nazi invasion of the USSR in June 1941 forced it into a temporary alliance with capitalist states to defeat the forces of Fascism but at some point during the Second World War Stalin decided that after victory had been achieved the USSR would never again have to depend on others for its own strategic security.

1945–1964. The traditional interpretation of the origins of the Cold War suggests that the USSR occupied the states of Eastern Europe it liberated from Nazi Germany for ideological motives to spread communism. Here is the prime case that the Soviet Union wanted to advance communism wherever possible, that it was in effect empire building, not a revolutionary state but rather a traditional imperialistic one. Revisionist interpretations suggest that Stalin broke the 1945 Yalta Agreement more for reasons of security and survival. The USSR only narrowly escaped defeat during the Second World War and by 1945 it was near economic ruin. Its security needs led it to seek governments in nearby states which were not anti-Soviet and to ensure that no military threat ever emanated from German soil again. Stalin not only wanted to maintain a sphere of influence in Eastern Europe amongst the People's Democracies through the Cominform in 1947 and Comecon in 1949, but he also wanted to prevent a united capitalist Germany rising up again to threaten the USSR. In this regard it is possible to argue that he was acting to protect the ideas of the revolution.

After the creation of the Warsaw Pact in 1955 the USSR was determined to maintain the Iron Curtain. The 1956 Hungarian revolution was crushed to prevent states in Eastern Europe from leaving the alliance.

1964–1982. After the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968, the Brezhnev Doctrine revived the potential influence of ideology in Soviet foreign policy by stressing that the USSR would protect and maintain any states which had become communist. However, other motives also explain Soviet foreign policy in the Brezhnev era. Co-existence with the West through Détente, such as the SALT agreement of 1972, was partly pursued due to the stagnation of the Soviet economy which could not sustain high levels of rearmament, while the 1975 Helsinki Accords were signed by the Soviets to get recognition from the West of the Soviet Bloc for security reasons.

The 1979 Soviet invasion of Afghanistan led to the end of Détente and was justified by the Soviets on the ideological grounds of the 1968 Brezhnev Doctrine. Equally, it could be argued that here was an example of a desire to spread communism or alternatively that it was a defensive move motivated more by insecurity and the threat of Islamic separatism within the Soviet Union.

1982–1991. Soviet foreign policy was transformed after Gorbachev became the new leader in 1985. He was not prepared to shore up a USSR dominated structure in Eastern Europe which was failing economically and threatened to bankrupt the USSR itself if it continued to try to match the USA as a military force. In a speech to the United Nations in 1988, Gorbachev had committed himself to ending the Cold War, had renounced the emphasis in the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution on trying to export communist doctrine abroad and the 1968 Brezhnev Doctrine, and had committed the USSR to disarmament. From 1986 to 1989 he withdrew troops from Afghanistan; in 1987 he reached agreement with President Reagan to destroy all stocks of intermediate nuclear weapons, and in 1989 did not intervene to prop up unpopular communist regimes in the former Warsaw Pact. Gorbachev was not interested in spreading communism or maintaining the balance of power in Europe. He wanted to reform communism within the USSR, thus maintaining the revolution, but his policies resulted in the disintegration of the USSR in 1991.

Good candidates could explore the central ideas of the October Revolution such as the creation of a communist state in a hostile international environment and whether this was a primary aim of Soviet foreign policy throughout the period.

Answers may deploy some of the following contemporary and later interpretations:

**Level 1 ([0]–[5])**

An awareness of contemporary or later interpretations but the answer may focus only on one interpretation.

**Level 2 ([6]–[10])**

An awareness of contemporary or later interpretations about the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development.

**Level 3 ([11]–[15])**

There is a satisfactory evaluation of either contemporary or later interpretations of the subject or a partial evaluation of both.

**Level 4 ([16]–[20])**

A well-informed and insightful evaluation of contemporary and later interpretations of the subject.

Examples of contemporary interpretations could include, e.g.:

- different attitudes of individual leaders or leading figures within the Soviet Union concerning the foreign policy needs at the time
- contemporary comments from opponents of Soviet foreign policy at various points from across the period, be it British or German in the pre-war period or more likely American in the post war period
- comment may also be attributed to either Soviet or non-Soviet papers, journals or other forms of contemporary material.

Examples of later interpretations could include, e.g.:

- historians' comments on the early motivation of Soviet foreign policy, a particular focus on one motivation at the expense of other factors
- equally attention could be given to the sources of historical debate – such as Soviet engagement with Nazi Germany and the commencement of the Cold War.

[50]

50

- 2 Answers that reach the higher level should discuss the opponents of communism over the whole period from 1917 to 1991. Balanced answers must distinguish between the various types of opponents of communism and whether or not they wanted to primarily destroy communism.**

Answers may deploy some of the following knowledge:

**Level 1 ([0]–[7])**

Limited in detail to one perspective or period of time, mainly narrative.

**Level 2 ([8]–[15])**

Knowledge which draws from across the period, exhibits some lapses in clarity, with some narrative.

**Level 3 ([16]–[22])**

Information is drawn from all parts of the period with clarity and focus.

**Level 4 ([23]–[30])**

Accurate knowledge from across the period, with clarity and precision.

1917–1945. Democratic hostility towards the USSR manifested itself both militarily and diplomatically firstly, by intervention by western powers during the Civil War and secondly, through the isolation of the USSR at Versailles and the League of Nations. However, democratic regimes reluctantly accepted the existence of the USSR as the 1922 Treaty of Rapallo with Weimar Germany showed, rather than actively attempt to bring down the regime in Moscow.

From 1933 the main opposition to the USSR shifted from democratic regimes to Nazi Germany. Hitler made no secret of his loathing of Bolshevism and considered it to be an ideology that had to be destroyed. The invasion of the USSR would bring the territorial expansion to gain the living space needed for the German people and regions of Eastern Europe would provide many of the raw materials needed for Germany to gain self-sufficiency. Fascist opposition developed diplomatically with the Anti-Comintern pacts in 1936 between Germany and Japan and in 1937 when Italy under Mussolini joined. The 1939 Nazi-Soviet pact failed to prevent the Nazi invasion of the USSR in 1941 which was an attempt to try to destroy the communist state by force. This led to Stalin joining forces with the democratic regimes in a marriage of convenience to defeat the Axis powers, which ultimately failed to destroy the USSR.

Thus, on balance, it could be argued that the forces of opposition to the Soviet Union had at different times both attempted to destroy the Soviet regime while at others had sought accommodation with it.

The creation of a Soviet satellite empire behind an iron curtain led the capitalist democratic western powers to adopt a diplomatic and to western eyes a defensive militaristic policy of containment of communism as the Cold War escalated. The Domino Theory now appeared – if one state falls under Soviet influence its neighbour will not be far behind. The 1947 Truman Doctrine illustrated America's determination to contain the spread of communism in Western Europe, and the Marshall Plan of 1947, gave vital economic aid to democratic states in Western Europe to produce stable economies and thus reduce the chances of internal communist revolutions. The 1948 Berlin Airlift prevented Stalin taking the whole of Berlin and the formation of NATO in 1949 showed that the West was determined to contain communism to Eastern Europe. It could therefore be argued that this was not as such an attempt to destroy the Soviet Union as much as a policy that sought to contain its influence and power. However, it might be noted that revisionist historians have seen the West and notably the USA as aggressors in this era – with their primary focus of one of

spreading the power of the US. This argument contrasts deeply with the Orthodox approach which argued that the West was defensive in its actions against an inherently ideologically aggressive USSR.

The West was not prepared to use military intervention in the Soviet sphere of influence behind the iron curtain in Hungary in 1956 or Czechoslovakia in 1968 when the Soviets invaded. The acceptance of Eastern Europe as a Soviet sphere of influence was acknowledged in the 1975 Helsinki Accords. The era of Détente came to an end when Reagan and Thatcher denounced the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan of 1979. The collapse of the Soviet empire in 1989 and the collapse of the USSR in 1991 were primarily due to the policies of Gorbachev who was not prepared to engage in an expensive arms race with NATO led by Reagan. Despite the fears of many, NATO and the Warsaw Pact were essentially defensive alliances and neither was planning a surprise attack on the other, which would almost certainly have escalated into mutual nuclear destruction.

The West won the Cold War because the USSR withered away. In the long-term the policy of containment was relatively successful. Had it not been for the arms race, the USSR might have survived. Gorbachev believed that they could not continue to devote so much of their economy to the military. Most candidates will probably make a periodic distinction between the aims of the opponents of communism but each answer should be judged on its own merits and by the quality of the argument presented.

Answers may deploy some of the following contemporary and later interpretations:

**Level 1 ([0]–[5])**

An awareness of contemporary or later interpretations but the answer may focus only on one interpretation.

**Level 2 ([6]–[10])**

An awareness of contemporary or later interpretations about the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development.

**Level 3 ([11]–[15])**

There is a satisfactory evaluation of either contemporary or later interpretations of the subject or a partial evaluation of both.

**Level 4 ([16]–[20])**

A well-informed and insightful evaluation of contemporary and later interpretations of the subject.



Examples of contemporary interpretations could include, e.g.:

- leading political figures within Britain or later Germany and their attitudes to the Soviet Union and how this shaped their policies towards them
- most likely contemporary comment after World War Two would focus on the United States and leading political and public figures and particular attitudes to what they regarded as the expansionist tendencies of the Soviet Union
- comment may also be attributed to national newspapers, editorials, journals or other forms of contemporary material.

Examples of later interpretations could include, e.g.:

- historians' comments on the motivation of Western states whether it be individually or collectively
- equally, attention could be given to key areas of historical debate – such as what shaped the policies of the opponents of communism in the pre-war years and equally in the immediate years after World War Two.

[50]

50

**Option 5**

**50**

**Total**

**50**





*Rewarding Learning*

**ADVANCED  
General Certificate of Education  
2010**

---

## **History**

**Assessment Unit A2 2**

*assessing*

**[AH221]**

**THURSDAY 10 JUNE, AFTERNOON**

---

**MARK  
SCHEME**

## OPTION 1: ENGLAND 1570–1603

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

- 1 (a) This question targets AO2(a):** as part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.

**Level 1 ([0]–[3])**

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

**Level 2 ([4]–[7])**

Answers will comment that each source provides information from different viewpoints and at different times. The Papal Bull is from Pius V who is condemning Elizabeth's seizure of the Church and declaring her a pretended Queen. Robert Southwell is a Jesuit priest who has come from abroad as part of the counter-reformation. He implies that were it not for the actions of Elizabeth I the Jesuits would have remained loyal to her. Susan Doran provides an impartial objective assessment of Catholicism in the reign of Elizabeth I.

**Level 3 ([8]–[11])**

Answers will go into more detail demonstrating the utility of the sources for a study of the attitude of Catholics to Elizabeth I. Answers at this level will discuss utility, not just the information it provides, but also for the quality of the evidence – author, date and audience. The Papal Bull was written by the Pope at the time, Pius V, who is angry about the spread of the Protestant Reformation and Elizabeth's Church Settlement. This is reflected in the language he uses and the tone of the Bull. By 1570 the Elizabethan Church has been clearly established and she has begun to punish Catholics.

Mary Queen of Scots is also a prisoner in England. The Bull demands that all Catholics, including those abroad, deny Elizabeth's right to the English throne and disobey her orders. This implies that the Catholics, at home and abroad, could prove a great threat to Elizabeth. However, Pius' tone is one of exaggeration, he merely uses emotive language to try and stir up feeling of resentment towards Elizabeth. Robert Southwell is a Jesuit priest sent from abroad as part of the counter-reformation. He has complete loyalty to the Pope. He is already a prisoner for his actions in England. In 1594 Elizabeth had already faced many Catholic plots and due to these had to execute Mary Queen of Scots. She was also at war with one of the greatest Catholic countries of this period, Spain. Therefore, she was in a vulnerable position. Southwell proclaims that it is the actions of Elizabeth that have forced resistance from the Jesuits. However, we are not told what his crime was for his imprisonment, and contextual knowledge implies that the Jesuits proved little threat to Elizabeth I. Susan Doran is a renowned historian who gives an impartial and objective perspective with hindsight. She mentions a variety of issues which

attempted to keep Catholicism alive such as the work of the Marian Bishops and the seminary priests.

**Level 4 ([12]–[15])**

Answers at this level will use a wide range of criteria to assess utility, commenting on the significance of information provided, authorship, motive, viewpoint, audience and date. [15]

- (b) This question targets AO2(a) and AO1(b):** as part of an historical enquiry, 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 and analysis and arrive 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 and analysis. **AO1(b)**  
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 recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation and analysis. **AO1(b)** Answers may make some of the following points: the Pope is granting permission for all Catholics, in England and abroad, to disobey Elizabeth I. He uses harsh language to condemn her as a heretic and proclaims that she is merely a pretended Queen. Southwell is in prison, therefore he has in some way proved a threat to Elizabeth. He does state that the Jesuit priests have found it difficult to obey Elizabeth due to her actions. Doran points out that the Catholic population in England gradually faded into conformity rather than conflict. **AO2(a)**

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

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis are developed. **AO1(b)** The Papal Bull was an official document from the Catholic Church which all loyal Catholics would have found difficult to disobey. The language and tone are harsh. Not only does he condemn and attack Elizabeth's spiritual role but also her political role as a Monarch. At this time Elizabeth was facing Catholic plots within her kingdom and she also held Mary Stuart, a potential Catholic heir, as prisoner. Rumours were circulating that Mary was to obtain help from Catholic countries abroad. However, contextual knowledge proves that the majority of her Catholic population remained loyal to her. Southwell, as a Jesuit priest, was part of the counter-reformation, who held complete loyalty to the Pope. It was his duty to bring the people of England back to Catholicism. At this time Elizabeth was at

war with one of the greatest Catholic countries and was also facing hostility from some of her Catholic population at home. Elizabeth had increased her persecution of the Catholics within England which could have led to Southwell's imprisonment. Doran implies that Catholicism was not a threat to the reign of Elizabeth I. Although attempts were made by the Marian Bishops and the seminary priests to sustain Catholicism, due to the longevity of Elizabeth's reign and a Protestant succession, the Catholics conformed to the Elizabethan Church.

**AO2(a)**

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

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis are very well developed and substantiated. **AO1(b)** Answers will interpret and evaluate the sources fully in relation to their historical context. **AO2(a)** [20]

35

- 2 (a) **This question targets AO1(b) and AO2(b):** the candidate's ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation and analysis and arrive 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), ([0]–[3]) AO2(b)**

**AO1(b) Knowledge**

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. Answers will mainly offer a descriptive account of Elizabethan Parliaments with limited reference to the question. Answers at this level may be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. 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.

**AO2(b) Interpretations**

Answers at this level will have little or no awareness of contemporary or later interpretations of this subject.

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

**AO1(b) Knowledge**

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. The answer will contain supporting evidence. Answers may provide a more detailed account of Elizabethan Parliaments, though answers will be characterised by narrative rather than analysis. They may look at methods she used to control her Parliaments such as patronage and the role of favourites. There will be some lapses in meaning due to flaws in grammar, with defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

**AO2(b) Interpretations**

Answers at this level will have some awareness of either contemporary or later interpretations of this subject. For example, they may mention the view that co-operation was the foundation of Elizabethan Parliaments.

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

**AO1(b) Knowledge**

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed. Answers may concentrate on a narrow range of issues, providing a more detailed yet incomplete account. Answers may address Elizabeth's personal relationship with Parliament and how she used patronage and favourites to manage

Parliament. Answers may also address Elizabeth's use of Ministers and her reliance not on Parliament but on her Privy Council. Answers may assess certain areas of tension between Elizabeth and her Parliaments. They may address the tension surrounding the question of marriage, the Church Settlement and her dealings with the Catholics. Answers may conclude that, although there were areas of tension for the majority of the time, Elizabeth remained in control of her Parliament. 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 language.

### **AO2(b) Interpretations**

Answers at this level will provide 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, the Puritans within Parliament. Historians' interpretations could include, for example, the work of Neale and compare this to revisionists' attitude towards Elizabeth and her Parliaments.

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

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are very well developed and substantiated. Answers will address the various methods Elizabeth used to control her Parliaments. They will look at her personal relationship and attitude towards Parliament. They may mention her belief that Parliament did not have any rights, merely privileges which originated from her. They will look at how she used patronage as a controlling method. They may also look at how she used Ministers to control Parliament, such as Cecil, first in the Commons and then in the Lords, and Walsingham in the Lords. They may also mention the function of a 16th century Parliament and how it did not have the expectations of a modern Parliament. Most of the work was done by the Privy Councillors. Most MPs were not concerned with national politics but their own vested interests. Whilst reference to every factor is not essential to reach this level, answers which deal with a wide range of issues will be appropriately awarded. Answers will attempt in a more definite and sustained way, an assessment of the areas which created tension for Elizabeth. They may assess Parliament's growing confidence and the question of Parliamentary rights and privileges. They will assess the question of marriage and how Parliament attempted to exert some authority regarding this. They may also assess Elizabeth's Church Settlement and how much of an influence Parliament had over it. They may also assess the question of Catholics and the role Parliament played in Elizabeth's treatment of her Catholic subjects. 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 with appropriate use of specialist language.

### **AO2(b) Interpretations**

Answers at this level will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary and later interpretations of this subject. Contemporary interpretations could include, for example, the role of the Puritans within the Commons and the work of Peter Wentworth. Historians' interpretations could include, for example, Haig's negative attitude to Elizabeth's handling of Parliament as well as Pollard's assessment that Elizabeth was always in control. [35]

- (b) This question targets AO1(b) and AO2(b):** the candidate's ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation and analysis and arrive 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), ([0]–[3]) AO2(b)**

#### **AO1(b) Knowledge**

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation or analysis. Answers will mainly offer a descriptive account of Elizabethan foreign policy with limited reference to the question. Answers at this level may be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. 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.

#### **AO2(b) Interpretations**

Answers at this level will have little or no awareness of contemporary or later interpretations of this subject.

### **Level 2 ([6]–[10]) AO1(b), ([4]–[7]) AO2(b)**

#### **AO1(b) Knowledge**

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. Answers may provide a more detailed account of Elizabethan foreign policy, though answers will be characterised by narrative rather than analysis. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. The answer will contain supporting evidence. Answers may focus on each country and give a narrative account of Elizabeth's dealings with it or they may focus on how trade affected her dealings with the Netherlands and Spain. There will be some lapses in meaning due to flaws in grammar, with defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

**AO2(b) Interpretations**

Answers at this level will have some awareness of either contemporary or later interpretations of this subject. For example, they may mention Haig's assessment that Elizabeth's dealings with the Netherlands were not based on trade, but she merely reacted to events as they occurred.

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

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed. Answers may concentrate on a narrow range of issues, providing a more detailed yet incomplete account. Answers may address how trade contributed to Elizabeth's dealings with the Netherlands and Spain. They may mention England's limited resources and over-reliance on one market. This, it could be argued, led it to become involved in the Netherlands against Elizabeth's policy of non-intervention. They may also mention Elizabeth's desire for new markets which led to exploration of the New World and trade routes. Answers may assess other factors which contributed to Elizabethan foreign policy. They may mention the role of religion and Elizabeth's desire for internal security. Answers may conclude that trade had a role to play in Elizabethan foreign policy, but it was not the only contributing factor. 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 language.

**AO2(b) Interpretations**

Answers at this level will provide 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, the frustration of Elizabethan Ministers at Elizabeth's refusal to become involved in foreign events. Historians' interpretations could include, for example, Wernham's opinion that her dealings with the Netherlands were consistent with her need to secure English trade.

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

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are very well developed and substantiated. Answers should deal with trade and how it affected relations with foreign countries. They may concentrate on her dealings with the Netherlands and Elizabeth's desire to secure trade relations. Due to this, Elizabeth intervened against her own personal judgement. They may also assess how trade affected her relations with Spain. They may assess Elizabeth's attitude to the sea beggars and how this affected relations with Spain. Whilst reference to every factor is not essential to reach

this level, answers which deal with a wide range of issues will be appropriately awarded. Answers should look at other factors which played a role in Elizabethan foreign policy. They may mention the role of religion and Elizabeth's reluctance to be seen as Europe's Protestant champion. They may also mention the restrictions of limited resources. They may also mention Elizabeth's desire for internal peace and how this drove foreign policy. 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 with appropriate use of specialist language.

**AO2(b) Interpretations**

Answers at this level will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary and later interpretations of this subject. Contemporary interpretations could include, for example, Parliament's desire for a more active foreign policy. Historians' interpretations could include, for example, Rowse's assessment that Elizabeth had a Protestant foreign policy or MacCaffrey's assessment that she was a realist and therefore many factors played a role in foreign relations. [35]

35

## OPTION 2: IRELAND 1607–1691

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

- 1 (a) **This question targets AO2(a):** as part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.

**Level 1 ([0]–[3])**

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

**Level 2 ([4]–[7])**

Answers will comment that each source provides information from different viewpoints: a member of the House of Lords, William of Orange, and a modern historian. Each source is valuable in its own way. Information is provided in each source about grievances that emerged with the rule of James II. Source 1 asserts that the King is assembling a standing army without justification. Source 2 gives evidence of the unconstitutional actions of James II. Source 3 comments that such were the actions of the King that civil unrest had become an issue in England.

**Level 3 ([8]–[11])**

Answers will go into more detail, demonstrating the utility of the sources for a study of the causes of the Glorious Revolution. 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. All the authors are well placed to comment. However, the motive and purpose of each source is different. Viscount Mordaunt is sounding a warning early in James' reign about the creation of an army containing Catholic officers. William of Orange cites evidence in support of his claim that his father-in-law's actions amount to the establishment of a tyranny. Harris demonstrates that a year and a half into his reign, James had alienated a significant section of the political nation and the people; he writes with hindsight, based on a study of a wide range of primary and secondary sources.

**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. Source 1 is from early in the reign and therefore lacks scope in terms of time span. However, it indicates that the political nation was wary of the new king from an early stage. It could also be argued that James' actions were necessary in the light of Monmouth's rebellion which has just been crushed. Source 2 should be considered in the light of William wanting to make the best possible public case for his replacing James on the throne. However, good candidates will be able to substantiate the abuses listed in the source. Source 3 notes that James had gone some way to alienating public and political opinion by 1686. However, the source does not

cover the events of 1687–88. Judgement would be expected from top-level candidates, who may nominate Source 2 although this does not preclude a contrary assessment. [15]

- (b) This question targets AO2(a) and AO1(b):** as part of an historical enquiry, 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 and analysis and arrive 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 and analysis. **AO1(b)** 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 recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation and analysis. **AO1(b)** All the sources support the proposition to some extent: Source 1 refers to “officers who cannot be allowed to serve without overthrowing the laws”; Source 2 has a number of references to Papists. Source 3 notes James’ overturning of the Test Act. **AO2(a)**

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

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis are developed. **AO1(b)** Candidates will address the shortcomings of the sources both in terms of the information they provide and their provenance. Note should be made of the other – though not necessarily unrelated – issues raised in the sources, e.g. the fear of a standing army or the interference with the Parliamentary election machinery. **AO2(a)**

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

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis are very well developed and substantiated. **AO1(b)** Answers will interpret and evaluate the sources fully in relation to their historical context. Candidates will use contextual knowledge to assess the sources’ strengths and limitations in relation to the question. In addition to covering and developing the points already referred to, candidates should note critical events such as the trial of the seven bishops, the birth of an heir. Events in Ireland should also be noted, especially the work of Tyrconnell, developing the point made in Source 3. Generally it could be argued that there was a religious element to most of James’ actions and that this was indeed critical to his undoing. **AO2(a)** [20]

- 2 (a) **This question targets AO1(b) and AO2(b):** the candidate's ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation and analysis and arrive 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), ([0]–[3]) AO2(b)**

**AO1(b): Knowledge**

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. 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.

**AO2(b): Interpretations**

Answers at this level will have little or no awareness of contemporary or later interpretations of this subject.

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

**AO1(b): Knowledge**

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer will have supporting evidence. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. The answer will have supporting evidence. There will be some lapses in meaning due to inaccurate spelling or punctuation or grammar; at times the style of writing will be inappropriate; there may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

**AO2(b): Interpretations**

Answers at this level will have some awareness of either contemporary or later interpretations of this subject. For example, reference may be made to the active promotion of Scottish involvement by James I.

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

**AO1(b): Knowledge**

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed. Candidates may note the uptake by Scots of places allocated to but unfilled by English undertakers, e.g. in counties Tyrone and Londonderry and in east Donegal; also the impact of the unofficial plantation by Hamilton and Montgomery in 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. References may be made to the geographic proximity and familiarity of Ulster as a factor in attracting Scots to the plantations.

**AO2(b): Interpretations**

Answers at this level will display a satisfactory evaluation of contemporary or later interpretations of this subject or a partial evaluation of both.

**Contemporary interpretations** could include, for example, the views of key figures at the time.

**Historians' interpretations** could include, for example, the views of Canny and Robinson.

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

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are very well developed and substantiated. To challenge the proposition, reference could be made to the importance of the London companies in developing the north-west, the role of the native Irish in providing manpower, and also to the role of Lord Deputy Chichester. However, these and similar arguments do not necessarily undermine an argument in support of the proposition.

**AO2(b): Interpretations**

Answers at this level will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary and later interpretations of this subject. In relation to historiography, reference may be made to the work of Perceval-Maxwell and A. T. Q. Stewart, while contemporary interpretations might include the survey carried out by Pynnar or public pronouncements by government officials such as Chichester. [35]

- (b) This question targets AO1(b) and AO2(b):** the candidate's ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation and analysis and arrive 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), ([0]–[3]) AO2(b)****AO1(b): Knowledge**

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. 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.

**AO2(b): Interpretations**

Answers at this level will have little or no awareness of contemporary or later interpretations of this subject.

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

Answers at this level 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. Note may be made of James's flight from Ireland after the Boyne but also that William had no desire to capture/humiliate his father-in-law. Also, after the Boyne, the Jacobites still held much of Munster and Connaught. There will be some lapses in meaning due to flaws in grammar, with defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

**AO2(b): Interpretations**

Answers at this level will have some awareness of either contemporary or later interpretations of this subject. For example, reference may be made to the attitude of the Catholic Irish in the Williamite Wars.

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

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed. The proposition invites the candidate to make a comparison between the Boyne and Aughrim, one the largest battles ever fought on Irish soil, the second the bloodiest and arguably the decisive clash in ending Jacobite resistance in Ireland. It would be valid for candidates to include the Treaty of Limerick and its consequences in evaluating the Battle of Aughrim.

**AO2(b): Interpretations**

Answers at this level will display a satisfactory evaluation of either contemporary or later interpretations of this subject or a partial evaluation of both. For example, reference may be made to the work of historians such as Childs and Lenihan.

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

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are very well developed and substantiated. Candidates might argue that after the Boyne there was no realistic prospect of military recovery by the Jacobites. It would also be reasonable to take a wider perspective and consider the impact of other engagements, such as that at Londonderry, on the overall outcome of the struggle between James and William.

**AO2(b): Interpretations**

Answers at this level will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary and later interpretations of this subject. In relation to historiography, reference may be made to the work of Robert Shepherd and J. G. Simms, while contemporary interpretations might include eyewitness accounts of the battles, such as that of Captain John Stevens who served in the Jacobite army, or views representative of the native and planter and international communities.

[35]

35



## OPTION 3: IRELAND 1775–1800

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

- 1 (a) **This question targets AO2(a):** as part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.

**Level 1 ([0]–[3])**

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

**Level 2 ([4]–[7])**

Answers will comment that each source provides information from different viewpoints: a member of the Irish House of Commons, the British Prime Minister, and a modern historian. Each source is valuable in its own way. Information is provided in each source about the passing of the Act of Union. Source 1 presents the view of William Plunket, one of the most eloquent opponents of the Union; Source 2 presents the argument of Prime Minister William Pitt, the architect of the Union plan; Source 3 presents an assessment of the subject by the historian Wendy Hinde.

**Level 3 ([8]–[11])**

Answers will go into more detail, demonstrating the utility of the sources for a study of the passing of the Act of Union. 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. All the authors are well placed to comment. However, the motive and purpose of each source is different. Source 1 is from an outspoken opponent of the Union and while it shows how passionate at least some of the opposition was, it does not provide an insight into the generally positive reception in the British House of Commons. Source 2 from William Pitt will obviously present a positive view of the Union, and candidates may develop contextual analysis in relation to the defeat of Pitt's earlier commercial propositions and the impact of the 1798 Rebellion. The source does not, however, acknowledge the type of opposition that exists in the Irish Parliament, as reflected in Source 1. Source 3 gives a different perspective on the subject – the widespread use of bribery to overcome opposition in the Irish Parliament – but ignores the principled and passionate argument that was applied by both sides on the Union question.

**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. Judgement would be expected from top-level candidates, who may argue that used together, the sources are a useful guide to someone investigating how the Act of Union came to be passed by the Irish and British Parliaments. [15]

**(b) This question targets AO2(a) and AO1(b):** as part of an historical enquiry, 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 and analysis and arrive 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 and analysis. **AO1(b)** 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 recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation and analysis. **AO1(b)** Only Source 3 clearly supports the proposition, but does so in some detail. **AO2(a)**

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

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis are developed. **AO1(b)** Candidates will address the shortcomings of the sources both in terms of the information they provide and their provenance. Sources 1 and 2 clearly demonstrate that there was more to the passing of the Act of Union than simple bribery – Parliamentary argument and debate also had a part to play – but candidates need to weigh up the relative importance of these elements in determining how the Union Bill was passed. **AO2(a)**

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

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis are very well developed and substantiated. **AO1(b)** Answers will interpret and evaluate the sources fully in relation to their historical context. Candidates will use contextual knowledge to assess the sources' strengths and limitations in relation to the question. In addition to covering and developing the points already referred to, candidates should note that Source 3 refers only to activities in relation to the Irish Parliament, and that such measures were not required in support of the Union Bill at Westminster. Reference should also be made to extra-Parliamentary opinion, especially in Ireland and especially that of Irish Catholics, many of whom anticipated emancipation to be part of the overall political settlement. Better informed candidates may note that for all his fiery eloquence against the Union (Source 1), William Plunket went on to take a seat in the UK House of Commons and pursued a very successful and distinguished career in British politics. **AO2(a)** [20]

35

- 2 (a) **This question targets AO1(b) and AO2(b):** the candidate's ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation and analysis and arrive 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), ([0]–[3]) AO2(b)**

**AO1(b): Knowledge**

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. 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.

**AO2(b): Interpretations**

Answers at this level will have little or no awareness of contemporary or later interpretations of this subject.

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

**AO1(b): Knowledge**

Answers at this level 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. Reference may be made to end of the invasion threat which deprived the Volunteers of their ostensible *raison d'être*. With the end of hostilities in America, the Volunteers became an overtly political pressure group, which was of concern both to Dublin Castle and increasingly the Ascendancy class. There will be some lapses in meaning due to flaws in grammar, with defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

**AO2(b): Interpretations**

Answers at this level will have some awareness of either contemporary or later interpretations of this subject. For example, reference may be made to the public pronouncements of the Volunteer Convention in Dungannon.

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

**AO1(b): Knowledge**

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed. Disappointment with legislative independence may be presented as a factor in Volunteer decline. Candidates will note that the Constitution of 1782 did not bring the expected results in terms of establishing Irish control of Irish affairs, hence the dispute over the Renunciation question in 1783. Equally the anticipated economic benefits of Free Trade (1779) only began to filter through after the end of the War of American Independence (1783).

**AO2(b): Interpretations**

Answers at this level will display a satisfactory evaluation of either contemporary or later interpretations of this subject or a partial evaluation of both. For example, reference may be made to the work of historians such as McBride and Smyth.

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

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are very well developed and substantiated. Increasing radicalism of Volunteer politics can be cited as a cause of disunity. While the Volunteers' objectives were those which the Ascendancy approved of – i.e. legislative freedom and an end to commercial restrictions – the movement flourished with aristocratic patronage. However, when these goals were achieved, the Volunteers began to lose their cohesion as more controversial measures were debated, specifically Parliamentary reform and Catholic emancipation. Candidates may note that the Volunteer drive for reform resurfaced in the shape of the United Irishmen in the 1790s.

**AO2(b): Interpretations**

Answers at this level will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary and later interpretations of this subject. In relation to historiography, reference may be made to the work of A. T. Q. Stewart and Ian McBride, while contemporary interpretations might include the views of government officials, such as the Duke of Portland, one of the Viceroy's of the period, or Volunteer notables such as Revd William Drennan. [35]

- (b) **This question targets AO1(b) and AO2(b):** the candidate's ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation and analysis and arrive 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), ([0]–[3]) AO2(b)****AO1(b): Knowledge**

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. 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.

**AO2(b): Interpretations**

Answers at this level will have little or no awareness of contemporary or later interpretations of this subject.

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

Answers at this level 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 support of the proposition, reference could be made to Tone's involvement with the Catholic Committee. There will be some lapses in meaning due to flaws in grammar, with defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

**AO2(b): Interpretations**

Answers at this level will have some awareness of either contemporary or later interpretations of this subject.

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

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed. In opposition to the proposition, the key figure is the Presbyterian minister Dr William Drennan. Candidates will also note the disproportionate presence of Ulster Presbyterians among the United Irishmen's founders, including the likes of Henry Joy McCracken and Samuel Nielson.

**AO2(b): Interpretations**

Answers at this level will display a satisfactory evaluation of either contemporary or later interpretations of this subject or a partial evaluation of both. For example, reference may be made to Tone's authorship of the influential pamphlet *An Argument on behalf of the Catholics of Ireland* (1791). Reference may be made to the work of historians such as McBride and Elliott.

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

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are very well developed and substantiated. Reference may be made to the impact on Belfast radical thinking of both the American and French revolutions, while those advocating the traditional 'Tone-centred' interpretation of the creation of the United Irishmen may argue that it was only with his involvement that the organisation began to acquire a political profile.

**AO2(b): Interpretations**

Answers at this level will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary and later interpretations of this subject. In relation to historiography, reference may be made to the work of Marianne Elliott and Nancy Curtin, while contemporary interpretations might include the views of Tone himself, as recorded in his diary, or other activists such as William Drennan, or the view of the United Irishmen's own newspaper, the *Northern Star*.

[35]

35

## OPTION 4: PARTITION OF IRELAND 1900–1925

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

- 1 (a) **This question targets AO2(a):** as part of an historical enquiry, 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 provides an insight into the reaction of Irish Nationalists toward the government's response to the Rising. Source 2 is valuable because it is written by an Irish Party supporter unafraid to present a criticism of his own Party. Source 3 indicates the range of problems facing the Irish Party, such as the impact of government policy on the newly enfranchised young voters.

**Level 3 ([8]–[11])**

Answers will present a more sustained assessment of the value of each source in relation to its value, and reach a credible conclusion. Source 1 owes its value to its authorship, depth of its content and offers a portent of the problems that were to confront the Irish Party in the next two years. Dillon's view is that the government's response is turning those who opposed the Rising into sympathisers with the rebels and against the Irish Party. Source 2, approximately one year later, gives a valuable insight into the developments of the trends alluded to by Dillon. Additionally, Moore apportions blame for the defections to Sinn Fein to shortcomings in the Irish Party itself. Thus, these two sources combine to greatly assist the study of the reasons behind the decline in the Irish Party in the post-Rising period. Source 3 presents a wider perspective on the problems of the Irish Party: government policy in relation to the Rising and the controversy over conscription. Moreover, there are indications of how Sinn Fein exploited the difficulties of the Party.

**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 appreciate the circumstances of Dillon's emotional speech, as he was the most senior member of his party present in Dublin during the Rising. His comments, amidst the executions in Dublin, mark the beginning of his "manufacturing Sinn Feiners" theme, whereby he indicted government actions for pushing committed home rulers into the arms of a physical force, nationalism. Moore's references to the Church indicate how the

hierarchy, hitherto steadfast behind Redmond, are now wavering. Home rule appears remote, due the prolongation of the War and the formation of a hostile coalition government, while Redmond's acceptance of partition at the Lloyd George Talks contributed to this loss of faith. Top level responses will note that Dillon, having succeeded Redmond in March 1918, walked out of the Commons, thereby unintentionally vindicating the abstentionist line. Good answers can utilise Source 3 and explain how Sinn Fein profited from the anti-conscription campaign, and attempt to assess the role played by Sinn Fein in striving to gain maximum advantage from the Irish Party's discomfiture. For example, its vagueness over policy at its Ard Fheis of October 1917. All three authors are well informed, basing their analysis on either contemporary or later investigation. Key predictions in Sources 1 and 2 materialise in Source 3. Indeed, all the sources interrelate in their assessment of the Irish Party defeat in the general election of 1918, while individually they contribute in a distinctive way to the study of Irish Party decline between 1916 and 1918. [15]

- (b) This question targets AO2(a) and AO1(b):** as part of an historical enquiry, 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 and analysis and arrive 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 and analysis. **AO1(b)**

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 and analysis. **AO1(b)** For example, Sources 1 and 3 indicate how the government was responsible for the loss of support for the Irish Party. **AO2(a)**

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

Historical knowledge is recalled, selected and deployed relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis are developed. **AO1(b)** For example, answers could concur with the question, pointing to the post-Rising reaction of the government, such as the arrest of many innocent people, and the publicised deaths of Sheehy-Skeffington and Thomas Ashe. The threat to impose conscription fulfilled Dillon's prophecy – "All Ireland will rise against you" – while the German Plot episode and "pinpricking coercion" under emergency legislation served to irritate Nationalist opinion. The content of Source 1 may be used to

illustrate how unequivocal Dillon was in his focus of responsibility for the misfortunes of the Irish Party. Source 3 comments on how the government's intention to introduce conscription antagonised young voters who turned against the Irish Party. **AO2(a)**

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

Answers will consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis are very well developed and substantiated. **AO1(b)** Answers will interpret and evaluate the sources fully in relation to their historical context. For example, answers will link their contextual knowledge to weigh up the arguments that the question invites. Regarding the comments about government policy in Source 1, they might comment on the role of General Maxwell, whose action aroused the much publicised condemnation of Bishop O'Dwyer of Limerick. There were nearly twice as many people arrested as participated in the actual Rising. The "German Plot" contributed to Sinn Fein's success in the East Cavan by-election. Context may be used with Source 2 to identify other elements in the Irish Party's misfortunes. The party of home rule had seen its aspirations diminished by the prolongation of an unpopular war which Redmond supported at Woodenbridge. Source 2 implies that the Party has undermined itself. Their leadership was out of touch with the emerging generation of young voters in 1918; distrusted by the Catholic clergy (a legacy of the Lloyd George Talks); unable to influence the government (Redmond declined a Cabinet post); while enthusiasm for the Sinn Fein tactic of abstention testifies that *they themselves* were actively making policy decisions in order to replace the Irish Party. Source 3 encourages a reflection on the demise of the Irish Party in several ways. There was the role of government, its impact on the new electorate, Sinn Fein's actions and policies (implied in Source 2) and shortcomings of the Irish Party itself. **AO2(a)** [20]

35



- 2 (a) **This question targets AO1(b) and AO 2(b):** the candidate's ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation and analysis and arrive 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(a) Knowledge, ([0]–[3]) AO2(b) Interpretations**

**Knowledge:**

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. 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.

**Interpretations:**

There will be little or no awareness of either contemporary or later interpretations of this subject.

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

**Knowledge:**

Answers 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 will be a limited focus on the outcome of the aspirations of the opponents and supporters of home rule, perhaps confined to the Ulster Unionists and the Irish Party. There will be some lapses in meaning due to flaws in grammar, with defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

**Interpretations:**

There will some awareness of either contemporary or later interpretations of the subject. For example, a contemporary view from the parties identified in the answer.

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

**Knowledge:**

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed. Answers may focus on some of the opponents and supporters of home rule, and make some assessment as to which of them would have been more satisfied with the outcome

of the crisis by September 1914. Such answers may address the Liberals, the Conservatives and perhaps one other: Southern Unionists, Irish Party, or Ulster Unionists.

**Interpretations:**

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, the views of the main party leaders during and at the end of the crisis.

**Historians' interpretations** could include, for example, assessments as to the degree of satisfaction which the main party leaders had. Was Carson satisfied with the compromise of Ulster exclusion? How did the Southern Unionists respond?

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

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 satisfied the main parties were by September 1914. One approach would be to identify the aspirations of each party and evaluate them against the course of events by 1914.

**Ulster Unionists:** Carson led the Ulster campaign in order to destroy home rule completely, and only entertained exclusion in the belief that a home rule bill so compromised would be unacceptable to Nationalists. By September 1914, excluding Ulster and abandoning his fellow Southern Unionists had become a reality, so Carson would have had mixed feelings. However, James Craig's priority was the welfare of the Protestant majority in Ulster, and he was satisfied by September 1914 that, although home rule was on the statute book, there would be special provision for Ulster, an assurance that was to be reinforced by the formation of a Unionist-dominated coalition several months later.

**Southern Unionists:** By September 1914 they were to be effectively abandoned under a 26 county home rule Parliament. While exclusion became a second best alternative to many in Ulster, Southern Unionists thought that their own and Ireland's best interests would be served by a united Ireland containing a substantial Ulster minority. They had supported the Ulster case against the home rule bill for tactical reasons, believing that home rule without Ulster would be unworkable and unacceptable to Nationalists.

**Conservatives:** Led by Bonar Law, the Party of Empire and the Union had successfully supported the campaign to resist home rule. Moreover, Law had used home rule to reinvigorate the party after its divisions over tariff reform and its electoral setbacks in 1906 and 1910. While the "New Style" had weakened the Liberals, Law's

acceptance of Ulster exclusion brought only a partial victory. Answers may reflect that the Conservatives damaged themselves by aligning themselves to tactics which brought Britain to the brink of civil war.

**Irish Party:** While the passing of the Home Rule Act on 18 September 1914 was regarded as a triumph, Redmond faced the complexities of dealing with special provision for Ulster once the Act was implemented after the War. Political pressures had pushed Redmond to accept Asquith's temporary exclusion offer of March 1914. While holding the Parliamentary balance, the reality was that Redmond was tied to the Liberals, and the consequences of their response to opposition pressure to acquiesce.

**Liberals:** For the Liberals, committed to home rule since the Gladstone era, albeit with reservations and divisions, the passing of the home rule bill by September 1914 was a mixed success. The Liberals were hesitant and weak under Asquith's leadership during the crisis. Cabinet divisions emerged among Birrell, Lloyd George and Churchill. Episodes such as the Curragh, Larne and Buckingham Palace Conference were handled without conviction. Ulster exclusion was thus an unsatisfactory compromise, wrested from a government overwhelmed by the "New Style". 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.

**Interpretations:**

Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary and later interpretations of this subject.

**Contemporary interpretations** could include, for example, comments, either from letters or speeches, from any of the main opponents of home rule: Carson, Craig, Bonar Law, Midleton; observations from organisations representing the opposition to home rule: UUC or IUA or from newspapers; observations from the supporters of home rule: Redmond, Dillon, Asquith, Churchill, Lloyd George.

**Historical interpretations** could include, for example, historians' opinions on the extent to which the opponents of home rule such as Carson and Craig had achieved their objectives by September 1914; assessments of the Liberals and Irish Party position by September 1914; comments as to which side had gained/lost or compromised the most by September 1914. [35]

35

- 2 (b) **This question targets AO1(b) and AO2(b):** the candidate's ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation and analysis and arrive 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**

**Knowledge:**

Answers will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic and largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. 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.

**Interpretations:**

There will be little or no awareness of either contemporary or later interpretations.

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

**Knowledge:**

Answers 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. The answer will have supporting evidence. For example, a partial identification of some of the problems facing Craig's government, such as security problems, which took the form of sectarian violence within Northern Ireland, along with IRA attacks on the new state. There will be some lapses in meaning due to inaccurate spelling or punctuation or grammar; at times the style of writing will be inappropriate; there may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

**Interpretations:**

There will be some awareness of either contemporary or later interpretations of this subject. For example, the opinion of a historian on Craig's response to security problems.

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

**Knowledge:**

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements developed. Answers may concentrate on a narrow range

of issues, providing a more detailed yet incomplete account. Such answers may address some of the problems and/or give a limited assessment of the response of Craig's government. Craig faced serious **security problems** which undermined the very existence of Northern Ireland. **Political problems** were apparent and complex. The Catholic minority was antagonistic towards the new state. The proposed **Boundary Commission** increased Catholic expectations of the State's impermanence while simultaneously destabilising the aspirations of Unionists. **Socio-economic** problems were evident, such as the post-war slump in industry, and difficulties over the amount of money available from the Treasury for the needs of running Northern Ireland. 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 appropriate use of specialist vocabulary.

**Interpretations:**

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, observations from Craig himself, members of his government/or security advisers.

**Historians' interpretations** could include, for example, assessments of success/and or failure that Craig had in confronting some of the aforementioned problems.

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

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 Craig's government responded to the problems already identified. *While reference to every problem is not essential to reach this level, answers which deal with a wide range of issues will be appropriately rewarded.* In 1922 over 230 people were killed in political disturbances in Belfast alone. Internal violence was accompanied by threats from outside in the form of IRA attacks across the border. To deal with internal **security**, Craig made an attempt to promote peace with a secret meeting with De Valera on 5 May 1921. He strengthened the USC with fresh recruits, and agreed two Pacts with Collins between January and March 1922 to end violence. The Special Powers Act was passed in April 1922. Craig's government lobbied Westminster for more money to deal with the financial and **economic** problems it inherited. The imperial contribution of £8m was onerous in the face of unemployment levels of 100,000. The Colwyn Award in 1925 brought some degree of financial stability. There was controversy over

proposals for non-denominational **education** in Northern Ireland. **Nationalists** were angry at the abolition of PR under the Local Government Act of 1922. Craig's government retreated under pressure from both Protestant and Catholic Churches which resisted Lord Londonderry's plans for non-denominational education. The government intended that Catholics would comprise  $\frac{1}{3}$  of the RUC. Denis Henry, the Catholic Unionist MP for South Derry, was chosen as the first Lord Chief Justice of Northern Ireland. The **machinery** of government was gradually assembled, with the transfer of civil servants from Dublin, the selection of a Cabinet and the appointment of all necessary officers for the new judiciary. 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 appropriate use of specialist vocabulary.

**Interpretations:**

Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary and later interpretations of this subject.

**Contemporary interpretations** could include, for example, the views of leading Nationalists such as Joseph Devlin, or the Catholic Church; comments from Craig about any of the issues he dealt with, or even some views from Westminster, e.g. Churchill, who helped broker the two Pacts.

**Historians' interpretations** could include, for example, opinions of the Craig-Collins' Pacts; views on the Special Powers Act and Craig's security measures; assessments of the relationship between Craig's government and the Catholic minority; comments about the abolition of PR; overall assessment of Craig's response to the problems that he faced. [35]

35



