



Rewarding Learning

**ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education
2014**

History

Assessment Unit A2 2

[AH221]

THURSDAY 22 MAY, AFTERNOON

**MARK
SCHEME**

Level of response mark grid

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

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

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

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

Option 1: England 1570–1603

AVAILABLE
MARKS

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

- 1 (a) **Consult all the sources and your knowledge of this period.** Which of the sources would an historian value most as evidence in a study of Puritan opposition to the Elizabethan Church in the period 1570–1603?

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

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

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

Level 2 ([4]–[7])

Answers will comment on the value of the sources, using the content more fully. Source 1 is valuable because it is from John Field, a London clergyman who is unhappy with the new Church. He is protesting about the Book of Common Prayer and its reference to Popish ceremonies. Source 2 is valuable as it is from Edmund Grindal, Archbishop of Canterbury. He is unhappy about Elizabeth’s demands to end prophesying which he believes is strengthening the Church. He agrees that some ministers have used this inappropriately but this should not invoke punishment for the whole Church. Source 3 is valuable as it is a later interpretation and has the value of hindsight. Fellows implies that by the end of Elizabeth’s reign Puritanism was waning in influence.

Level 3 ([8]–[11])

Answers will present a more sustained assessment of the value of each source and reach a credible conclusion. Answers at this level will discuss value, not just in terms of the information it provides, but also for the quality of evidence such as author, date and audience. Source 1 is a public document protesting against the Elizabethan Church. Field represents the clergy and not the government of the Church. The source is written in 1572, many years after the Church Settlement of 1559, therefore highlighting that opposition to the Church Settlement has grown and matured. Field clearly expresses concern over the Book of Common Prayer and the influence of Catholicism which he describes as a “popish dunghill”. He is unhappy about this book and claims that the Bible is the only book which should be followed. Source 2 is valuable as it is a private letter from Edmund Grindal to Elizabeth I. He is Archbishop of Canterbury, the highest position within the Church, apart from Elizabeth I, the Supreme Governor, and is therefore very influential. He is criticising Elizabeth’s demands to end the spreading of the word through prophesying. He believes that this has strengthened the new Church. He also expresses his belief that the Church rather than the Queen should deal with ecclesiastical matters. Source 3 is the opinion of an historian, Nicholas Fellows, who implies that, by the end of Elizabeth’s reign, most Puritans had accepted the new Church, yet there were some who were still unhappy with it and they would influence later reigns.

Level 4 ([12]–[15])

Answers will use a wide range of criteria to assess value, commenting on

the significance of the information provided, authorship, motive, viewpoint, audience and date. Contextual knowledge will be introduced to enhance the answer. Source 1 is of value because it was written in 1572, several years after the Elizabethan Church Settlement. This article accompanied *The Admonition to Parliament*, another Puritan document which was addressed to parliament. It, too, expressed opposition to the new Church. Field is a London clergyman and London was the centre of Puritan opposition where ideas would be easily spread. He could also be classed as a Presbyterian as he had previously been critical of the style of Church government. Field had already been reprimanded for refusing to wear the vestments. He is critical of the Book of Common Prayer, a view shared by many Puritans who believed that all knowledge came from the Bible. He also criticises the “popish” ceremony of communion and the mark of the cross. Source 2 is of value as it is from the Archbishop of Canterbury. Grindal had previously compromised with Elizabeth I regarding the wearing of vestments and advised the clergy not to be too concerned with trivial matters. As time progressed, he became disillusioned with the new Church and Elizabeth’s attitude towards Puritanism. Here he is critical of Elizabeth’s demands to end prophesying which he regards as a great strength of the Church. He wishes to spread the word to all, while Elizabeth demands control of preaching. This implies that Elizabeth is concerned with Puritan opposition as she viewed it not only as a religious but also a political threat. Grindal claims this as he suggests that all ecclesiastical matters should be dealt with through the Church. He warns her of her position and reminds her that she is a mere “mortal”. After this outburst Grindal was suspended from his position. After his death he was replaced by Archbishop Whitgift, who viewed Puritanism with much distrust and attempted to eradicate it from the Elizabethan Church. Source 3 is also of value as it is a later interpretation. It infers that Elizabeth was able to deal with Puritan opposition in the short term but in the long term Puritanism would remain in England. It is also useful as it reminds us that Puritanism was not just present in the Church but also amongst influential members of the Court. They, too, expressed opposition to the new Church. At this level candidates are expected to nominate a particular source as the most valuable. [15]

- (b) **Use all the sources and other evidence you have studied.** How far do the sources support the view that the Puritans posed a threat to Elizabeth I in the period 1570–1603?

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

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

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

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

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement **AO1(b)**. For example, Sources 1 and 2 suggest that Puritans were a threat to Elizabeth and to the Church, as these are protests against the new Church Settlement and the monarch herself. Field is unhappy about the Common Book of Prayer and Source 2 is concerned about Elizabeth's demands to end prophesying. Source 3 suggests that Elizabeth's handling of the Puritans meant that they were a threat.

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

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgement are developed and substantiated. **AO1(b)**. For example, the sources illustrate that to some extent the Puritans were a threat to Elizabeth I's Church of England and her power, not just as Supreme Governor of the Church but also as monarch. Source 1 is written by a member of the London Clergy. He expresses concern about the Book Common of Prayer. His language is harsh. Yet at no point does he threaten Elizabeth I, he merely criticises her policy. Source 2, to some extent, is threatening in tone and manner. As Archbishop of Canterbury, Grindal holds the highest ecclesiastical office in England and it is clear from his letter that he is unhappy with the new Church and Elizabeth herself. He speaks out against her policy but also reprimands her, reminding her that she is not above God. Source 3 confirms that Puritans were a threat but suggests that this was due to Elizabeth's handling of them and not their actions. However, it does mention that, although they were not that significant a threat to the Elizabethan Church, they were a force that would remain **AO2(a)**.

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

Answers at this level will consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are very well developed and substantiated **AO1(b)**. For example, the sources illustrate that the Puritan movement was a threat to the new Elizabethan Church. Sources 1 and 2 are written some time after the Church Settlement. The clergy have compromised and worked within the new Church, yet many are still unhappy. Field is from London, the centre of new religious thought; his actions might encourage other members of the Church to oppose the new settlement. Source 2 is written in 1576; by this date Grindal and his clergy have compromised on a number of issues, including the wearing of vestments. Grindal, in the beginning, did not threaten Elizabeth and supported the new Church, yet, because of her actions, he has now spoken out in protest. Many will follow him. Elizabeth responds by suspending him, highlighting that she believed that he was a threat to the new Church. This is confirmed in Source 3 which states that Elizabeth's actions made the Puritans a threat. She was not prepared to compromise with them and treated them all severely. Some have suggested that she viewed them as a greater threat than the Catholics because they seemed to threaten the power of the monarchy. The source also highlights that they were not just a threat in her Church but also at Court where they influenced a great many important courtiers. Many would follow these influential men. Although in the short term the Puritans proved little threat, most of them worked within the new Church and in the long term did threaten it **AO2 (a)**.

[20]

35

- 2 (a) How effectively did Elizabeth I control her Parliaments between 1570 and 1603? Use relevant evidence you have studied including contemporary and later interpretations to support your answer.

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

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

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. Responses at this level may be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. For example, answers will mainly offer a descriptive account of Elizabethan Parliaments with limited reference to how effectively Elizabeth I controlled them. There will be little or no awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject. Meaning may not always be clear because of inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

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

Answers at this level will select and deploy historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. It will have supporting evidence. For example, responses may provide a more detailed account of Elizabethan Parliaments, though answers will be characterised by narrative rather than analysis. They may mention some methods Elizabeth used to manage Parliament, such as her selection of capable men. They may mention their support of her. She appointed William Cecil to the House of Lords, while Walsingham was able to communicate to her what was happening in the House of Commons. As long as she had both men planted in Parliament, she was able to curtail opposition. Through their use of patronage they were able to ensure that she had a co-operative Parliament. Responses may mention the revisionist school of thought which supported this. There will be some awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to illegibility, inaccurate spelling and punctuation or, at times, the style of writing will be inappropriate. There may be occasional flaws, with defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

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

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. Answers may focus on the methods Elizabeth used to control and manage her Parliaments. She used the system of patronage to ensure that Parliament was loyal to her and supported her policies. The overwhelming majority of MPs were eager to support the Queen in the hope of advancement. Those she did promote were able men, such as Cecil and Mildmay, and through their use of patronage they were able to manage Parliament on her behalf. Answers may make reference to speeches they made in support of her. Elizabeth's personality also helped

her to manage her Parliaments. She and her people firmly believed in the Divine Right of Kings, thereby ensuring loyalty. Elizabeth, through the use of propaganda, built on this image. She was also conservative in nature and therefore avoided conflict as much as possible. Yet conflict did arise, particularly with members of the Puritan movement who were unhappy with her religious settlement. Some members of the Commons spoke out in protest against her. There will be a satisfactory evaluation of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject **or** a partial evaluation of **both**. Contemporary interpretations could include, for example, the opinion of individual members of parliament such as Peter Wentworth and Anthony Cope. Despite her efforts to manage parliaments, some did oppose her and cause conflict in her reign. This is the opinion of the traditional school of thought. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

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

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis are very well developed and substantiated. Answers provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of this subject.

Answers will attempt in a more definite and sustained way an assessment of how effectively Elizabeth I managed her parliaments. She used a variety of methods to control parliament: patronage, her personality and her conservative policies. Answers may mention her belief that Parliament did not have any rights, merely privileges which originated from her. They may make reference to Elizabeth's own opinion of her parliaments. Many in Parliament believed that they had rights which did not derive from her. The speeches of Wentworth may be addressed here. However, although there were certain members who opposed Elizabeth, they were in the minority and she was able to manage them through punishment. Historians' interpretations could include, for example, the traditional negative attitude to Elizabeth's management of Parliament, as well as revisionists' assessment that Elizabeth was always in control. The Puritans were silenced by this and had little influence within parliament. It is worth noting that Peter Wentworth was removed from Parliament not by the Queen but by the Commons itself. Answers may also mention the functions of a sixteenth century Parliament, showing how it did not have the expectations of a modern parliament. Elizabeth was always able to manage her parliaments and remained firmly in control. Parliament was only powerful when it was sitting and this only occurred when Elizabeth called it. She did this only when she required money and only then was she prepared to work with it. Elizabeth may have changed policy but only ever in her own time and after discussions with her Privy Council and not parliament. Parliament was rarely called and when it was it was usually characterised by loyalty. Whilst reference to every factor is not essential to reach this level, answers which deal with a wide range of issues will be appropriately rewarded. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate; there is very good organisation and use of specialist vocabulary.

[35]

- (b) “Economic developments in England between 1570 and 1603 were characterised by continuity rather than change.” To what extent would you accept this verdict? Use relevant evidence you have studied including contemporary and later interpretations to support your answer.

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

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

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. Answers at this level may be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. For example, they may offer a mainly descriptive account of the Elizabethan economy with limited reference to whether this was characterised by continuity or change. There will be little or no awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject. Meaning may not always be clear because of inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

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

Answers at this level will select and deploy historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. There will be some awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development. The answer will have supporting evidence. For example, it may provide a more detailed account of the Elizabethan economy. Like previous Tudor monarchs, Elizabeth I relied heavily on the cloth trade from the Netherlands. England also faced, at this time, an increase in population which placed a strain on the economy and prices rose, as did unemployment. As well as the declining economy, there was a series of bad harvests which added to the new vagrancy class. Answers may suggest that this highlights the continuity of the Elizabethan economy in the period 1570–1603. The response may make reference to some contemporaries who suffered due to the Elizabethan economy. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to illegibility, inaccurate spelling and punctuation or, at times, the style of writing will be inappropriate. There may be occasional flaws, with defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

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

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. There will be satisfactory evaluation of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject **or** a partial evaluation of **both**. The answer will look at economic developments and refer to continuity and change in this period. Answers may focus on the new developments Elizabeth I introduced into the economy. Unlike previous Tudor monarchs, she did discover new markets to trade with, such as Russia and Canada. She also exploited the New World and developed trading companies such

as The East India Company and Muscovy. Later interpretations may make reference to this, particularly revisionist historians. This period also saw government intervention which attempted to improve the economy. This was a clear change in policy. The Statute of Artificers, introduced in 1563 in an attempt to regulate wages and set fair prices, remained in force. The Poor Law of 1601 attempted to deal with the new problem of the vagrant class. Contemporary interpretations could include, for example, the opinion of JPs and officials who administered these changes. Therefore, Elizabeth did change aspects of her economic policy. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

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

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis are very well developed and substantiated. Answers provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of this subject. Answers will attempt in a more definite and sustained way an assessment of whether economic developments in England between 1570 and 1603 were characterised by change or continuity. Elizabeth did attempt to exploit new markets in other parts of the world, particularly the New World. New adventurers, such as Raleigh and Hawkins, brought further developments to the economy. Answers may make reference to individuals at the time who documented their adventures. However, Elizabeth I did continue to rely on trade with the Netherlands and this helped lead to war with Spain. Like previous monarchs, she faced a rise in population and inflation. The government did use legislation to bring change to the economy but this was a slow process. The Poor Law of 1601 helped to deal with the new vagrant class but they still remained a problem. In some respects Elizabeth’s economy was characterised by continuity as the problems remained the same during this period. The traditional school of thought views her reign as the “golden age”, while post-revisionists, such as Haigh, believe that her economic policies were not that significant. Answers may also mention revisionists who believed that she did introduce improvements but change was slow. Whilst reference to every factor is not essential to reach this level, answers which deal with a wide range of issues will be appropriately rewarded. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate; there is very good organisation and use of specialist vocabulary. [35]

Option 1

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

35

70

Option 2: Ireland 1607–1691

AVAILABLE
MARKS

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

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

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

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

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

Level 2 ([4]–[7])

Answers will comment on the value of the sources, using the content more fully. Source 1 is valuable because it is an eyewitness account by one of the Jacobite officers present at the Battle of the Boyne. Likewise, Source 2 is another eyewitness account, by one of the French generals also present at the battle. Source 3 is also of value because it is written from a neutral perspective and also presents a wider focus on the battle.

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. Answers at this level will note that all three sources provide relevant information about factors that influenced the outcome of the Battle of the Boyne. John Stevens in Source 1 points to a lack of unity in the Jacobite ranks as a reason for the outcome, and, perhaps more significantly, a lack of courage. This view is supported to an extent by Desgrigny in Source 2, commenting on how one regiment fled in disarray from the battlefield. Vallance, in Source 3, presents a wider range of factors than the other two sources in assessing the result of the battle, though his reference to French opinion on the lack of discipline among the Irish ranks does corroborate the observations in Source 2.

Level 4 ([12]–[15])

Answers will use a wide range of criteria to assess value, commenting on the significance of the information provided, including authorship, motive, viewpoint, audience and date. Contextual knowledge will be introduced to enhance the answer. Responses may note that the focus of Sources 1 and 2 is much narrower than that of Source 3. An evaluation of the sources might also consider that Stevens' account (Source 1) is quite generalised overall, and initially equivocal, and that Desgrigny (Source 2) may be exhibiting well-known French prejudice against and contempt for the native Irish, thereby limiting the value of these sources. By contrast, Vallance (Source 3) presents a more balanced assessment of the battle, and his interpretation can be evaluated by the application of contextual knowledge relating to the significance of the role of William, the respective strategy of the two sides and their equipment and armament. At this level, candidates would be expected to nominate a particular source as the most valuable and, while Source 3 has significant strengths, candidates may legitimately argue that

either Source 1 or Source 2 merits nomination on the grounds that the key factor in the Jacobite defeat was disunity or lack of morale in the ranks. [15]

- (b) **Use all the sources and other evidence you have studied.** How far do the sources support the view that the Jacobites' low morale was responsible for the Williamite victory at the Battle of the Boyne?

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

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

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

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

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement **AO1(b)**. For example, Sources 1 and 2 clearly suggest a lack of morale among the Jacobite forces, as they abandoned the battlefield. Source 3 supports this assessment to an extent, in its reference to the opinion of French officers at the Boyne **AO2(a)**.

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

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgement are developed and substantiated. **AO1(b)**. For example, the whole question of the state of Jacobite morale can reasonably be focused on the role of James II in the battle, as alluded to in Source 3. However, in addressing Source 2, it may be noted that apparently morale was not a problem when the battle began, the Jacobite army raising 'cries of joy at the sight of the enemy', suggesting that it was subsequent events that led to a breakdown in discipline. Source 1 certainly confirms that there was such a breakdown. Source 3, however, points to a range of factors beyond a lack of morale that contributed to the Jacobite defeat, notably the role of William III **AO2(a)**.

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

Answers at this level will consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are very well developed and substantiated **AO1(b)**. For example, arguably the key to the Jacobite defeat at the Boyne was James II's misinterpretation of the Williamite feint as the main attack, allowing a successful crossing by Williamite forces at Oldbridge. This threw the Jacobite defence into disarray. There are, however, other factors to consider, including William's numerical advantage and the superior equipment at the disposal of his army. Morale, nonetheless, is a significant factor, and here a contrast can be drawn between the dynamic and inspiring leadership of

William, fighting in the front line, and the hesitant and uncertain leadership of James, no match for William as a soldier, and conspicuous by his absence in the fighting. An argument might therefore be offered that lack of morale among the Jacobites was a crucial factor in their defeat, but that it spread from the top down – from the King – rather than from the bottom up – from the rank and file soldiers. Answers will interpret and evaluate the sources fully in relation to their historical context. For example, Sources 1 and 2 make explicit reference to a lack of military discipline and indeed a lack of courage on the Jacobite side, Source 2 openly condemning the performance of the native Irish in the battle. This demonstrates French contempt for their Irish allies, a point that is reinforced in Source 3. This was hardly conducive to good morale, but more able candidates might point out that this division was exacerbated by James II's own low opinion of the native Irish as untrustworthy and undisciplined. Although Captain Stevens in Source 1 does not refer to the Irish by name, that is undoubtedly who he is speaking of, considering that the Irish made up roughly 75 per cent of the Jacobite army at the Boyne. Good candidates might add that James's negative view of his Irish army was fully reciprocated on the part of the Irish soldiery **AO2(a)**. [20]

35

- 2 (a) “The most important reason for the success of the Ulster Plantation up to 1636 was the part played by the London Companies.” To what extent would you agree with this statement? Use relevant evidence you have studied including contemporary and later interpretations to support your answer.

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

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

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

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

Answers at this level will select and deploy historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The response contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. The answer will have supporting evidence. For example, it may be noted that it was the London companies which were responsible for the establishment of the two fortified towns of Londonderry and Coleraine, critical defence features of the Plantation. There will be some awareness of either contemporary or later interpretations of the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development. For example, reference may be made to one of the contemporary government surveys of the Plantation, while in terms of

later interpretations, reference might be made to Cyril Falls' study of the Plantation. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to illegibility, inaccurate spelling, punctuation or grammar; at times, the style of writing will be inappropriate. There may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

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

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. There will be a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject **or** a partial evaluation of **both**. Answers may focus on the financial resources that the London companies – in the form of the Honourable the Irish Society – were able to deploy in the plantation of the newly named county of Londonderry (formerly County Coleraine) which was on a much more impressive scale than that available to the average Plantation undertaker, and therefore arguably critical to the success of the whole enterprise. Candidates should employ contemporary material, such as correspondence between the Crown and the London companies, to illustrate the importance of this connection. This financial clout allowed not only the creation of the two fortified towns of Londonderry and Coleraine, but other significant settlements by individual companies, such as Draperstown by the company of Drapers. Candidates may, however, note that the Plantation extended well beyond County Londonderry, and that in the other planted counties the emphasis was on individual enterprise and initiative rather than on corporate effort. Here, the views of the likes of Robinson might be deployed to reinforce this comparison. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

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

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis are very well developed and substantiated. Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of this subject. Responses will attempt in a more definite and sustained way an assessment of the importance of the role of the London companies in the overall success of the Ulster Plantation. The emphasis on security – specifically the fortification of Londonderry and Coleraine – is not only a key feature of the Plantation in the north-west of Ulster, but is indicative of the fact that this was where the British authorities felt an invasion to restore Gaelic control of Ulster (possibly backed by the Spanish) was most likely. Londonderry and Donegal were the only official Plantation counties with a coastline, but the rugged nature of much of the Donegal coast made County Londonderry the most likely target for an attack. Arguably, therefore – and certainly in the opinion of James's government – the fate of the whole plantation hinged on the fate of the plantation in County Londonderry, marking it out as critical to the success of the whole project. The new county was indeed enlarged at the expense of the neighbouring counties of Tyrone, Donegal and Antrim, and the London companies made their mark not only by the building of the walls of Londonderry but by the establishment within those walls of the first purpose-built Protestant cathedral in Europe. However, apart from the fact that the London companies were responsible for the plantation of only one

of the six Plantation counties (the others being Armagh, Cavan, Donegal, Fermanagh and Tyrone), it could also be argued that the companies signally failed to attract sufficient numbers of settlers from the British mainland to fulfil the obligations they had undertaken. Proof of this is seen in the heavy fines (£70 000) imposed on the companies by Lord Deputy Wentworth in 1635 – though it would also be reasonable to argue that this type of failure was typical of the Plantation as a whole. Nonetheless, in looking at the overall Plantation, the role of individual undertakers, the role of the government (in terms of its overall management of the project, with regular surveys held to assess progress), and the role of the Scots in taking up many of the places unfilled by English undertakers are arguably just as important in securing the Plantation as was the part played by the London Companies. Contemporary comment from some of the Scots involved in the Plantation (such as the King himself) could be given, while candidates could refer to the observations of historians such as Bardon or Hill about the Scottish contribution compared to that of the London companies. Candidates may well argue that the Scots' contribution was more important in terms of both the quality and quantity of colonists provided, while others might note that, although contrary to the Plantation objectives, the native Irish provided an essential support network for the Plantation to survive. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate; there is very good organisation and use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. [35]

- (b) How far were the political and religious policies of James II in Ireland and England in the period 1685–1688 a reaction to the rebellions of Argyll and Monmouth in 1685? Use relevant evidence you have studied including contemporary and later interpretations to support your answer.

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

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

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The response is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. Answers at this level may be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. For example, there may be a general reference to the crushing of the rebellions in 1685. There will be little or no awareness of either contemporary or later interpretations of this subject. Meaning may not always be clear because of inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

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

Answers at this level will select and deploy historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. It will have some supporting evidence. For example, a direct consequence of the Monmouth rebellion was the Bloody Assizes conducted by Judge Jeffreys which, in the

eyes of many contemporaries, amounted to a judicial reign of terror, as some 300 people, not all of them directly involved in the rising, were put to death and close to three times that number transported to the West Indies. This could be seen as both a political action – to intimidate James’s opponents – and a religious action against Protestants in the south-west of England. There will be some awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development. For example, there may be contemporary comment from the likes of Jeffreys or James II, while in terms of later interpretations, reference might be made to the views of Ashley. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to illegibility, inaccurate spelling and punctuation or, at times, the style of writing will be inappropriate. There may be occasional flaws, with defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

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

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. Answers may focus on how James’s political and military policy was directly linked to the rebellions of 1685, and indeed, from the King’s point of view, was a justified response to those risings. The main policy decision arising from the events of 1685 was the establishment of a ‘standing’ or permanent army. The county militias had not performed well in the rebellions – indeed, some of the militia had defected to Monmouth – and James felt they could not be trusted, hence the rationale for the maintenance of a professional military force loyal to the Crown. This army was to grow in size until it stood at 20 000 by 1688. While Parliament had been initially supportive of the King, in voting the funds necessary to respond to and suppress the rebellions, many MPs began to express concern about the existence of an army in peacetime (and there was no manifest threat to the Crown after the Bloody Assizes), one of the reasons that James decided to dissolve Parliament. There will be a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject **or** a partial evaluation of **both**. Contemporary interpretation could include excerpts from parliamentary debate on this subject. Candidates might also argue that the King’s use of the dispensing power to appoint and promote Catholic officers in the army (both in England and Ireland) – an example of one of James’s religious policies – was a response to the rebellions, as at their core these rebellions were about championing the Protestant cause and removing a Catholic from the throne. But candidates may also begin to consider that much of James’s policy, certainly after the shock and aftermath of the rebellions had died down, and especially by 1687–88, was dictated by an agenda other than that of reaction to the rebellions of 1685. Candidates could support their argument by reference to the views of historians such as Kishlansky. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

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

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis are very well developed and substantiated. Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of this subject. Answers will attempt in a more definite and sustained way an assessment

of how far James's political and religious policies in England and Ireland were a reaction to the rebellions of Monmouth and Argyll. Candidates can argue that with the establishment of an army in both England and Ireland (the latter force turned into an overwhelmingly Catholic one by James's new Lord Deputy, Tyrconnell), he was more than prepared for any possible recurrence of unrest. It is also reasonable to argue that James's subsequent policies went well beyond a mere desire to protect his throne. In fact, he began a sustained drive – certainly in the view of much of the political nation – to reshape the constitution, undermine the Church of England and subvert the law. This was manifested in his use of the dispensing and suspending powers, the issuing of the two Declarations of Indulgence, the interference with Anglican control of the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and the preparations to 'pack' Parliament and thereby fashion a legislative body ready to implement his will. Candidates could employ contemporary material such as the reaction of representatives of the Church of England to the King's blatantly pro-Catholic policies. Candidates might argue that his policy in Ireland, directed by Tyrconnell, had very little to do with Monmouth and Argyll but was instead driven by a desire to create Catholic supremacy. There are two schools of thought on this topic. One sees James as becoming ultra-cautious in a desire to defend his position after the violent risings of 1685; and the other sees James as exploiting these rebellions to pursue a policy of ruthless Catholicisation in Church and State, which had been his objective from the outset. Either interpretation is equally valid, as indeed is any other variation provided that it is supported by credible evidence. Candidates could include the views of historians such as Miller to support their argument. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate; there is very good organisation and use of specialist vocabulary. [35]

Option 2

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

35

70

Option 3: Ireland 1775–1800

AVAILABLE
MARKS

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

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

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

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

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

Level 2 ([4]–[7])

Answers will comment on the value of the sources, using the content more fully. Source 1 is valuable because it is a first-hand report of events in Dublin in the winter of 1783, when both the Volunteer Convention and the Irish Parliament were in session, and a proposed Bill for reform of Parliament was drawn up by the Convention. Source 2 is referring to the same events, but its particular value in this instance is that it gives the views of a radical reformer, Dr William Drennan. Source 3 is of value because not only does it give an overview of the events referred to in Sources 1 and 2, but sets these events in a wider context with reference to the decline of the Volunteers.

Level 3 ([8]–[11])

Answers will present a more sustained assessment of the value of each source and reach a credible conclusion. Answers at this level will note that all three sources are valuable because they all refer to events that are relevant to the decline of the Volunteers. Both Source 1 and Source 2 refer to the critical rejection by the Irish House of Commons of the Volunteer Convention's proposal for reform of Parliament. The margin by which this proposal was rejected, referred to in Source 1, was a clear indication of the division that now existed between the Volunteers and their erstwhile Patriot allies in the Irish Parliament. Source 3 adds further detail to these events, but also notes that there were divisions emerging within the ranks of the Volunteers themselves, referring to the deep embarrassment experienced by Lord Charlemont – Commander-in-Chief of the Volunteers – at having to preside over the debate about reform of Parliament.

Level 4 ([12]–[15])

Answers will use a wide range of criteria to assess value, commenting on the significance of the information provided, including authorship, motive, viewpoint, audience and date. Contextual knowledge will be introduced to enhance the answer. Responses may note that the focus of Sources 1 and 2 is much narrower than that of Source 3. If this might be perceived as a limitation to these sources, it could be argued that it is mitigated at least to an extent by the value of the respective authors. Source 1 provides the Ascendancy view on developments, those who potentially have much to lose in terms of political power from any reform of Parliament, and whose withdrawal of support from the Volunteers was an important factor in the movement's decline. Source 2, by contrast, is written by someone from the

radical wing of the reform movement who, in contrast to the expression of relief exhibited at the end of Source 1, is clearly frustrated by the turn of events and highly critical of the tactics employed by Flood. The first two sources, therefore, are of value in highlighting a critical turning-point in the fortunes of the Volunteers – perhaps *the* critical point – when the split between the Patriots in Parliament and the Volunteers outside Parliament was exposed for all to see. That said, it would be reasonable for a candidate to argue for the primacy of Source 3 in terms of value, by virtue of the fact that it has a wider focus than Sources 1 and 2 and also because it makes specific reference to the end of the American War of Independence (the war had effectively ended in 1781), which deprived the Volunteers of their nominal *raison d'être*. Furthermore, Bardon also highlights another matter that deeply divided and therefore hastened the decline of the Volunteers, namely the controversial issue of 'whether Catholics should be given the vote', one of the many issues not resolved by the Constitution of 1782. At this level, candidates would be expected to reach a judgement related to the question, and while Source 3 has a strong claim in this respect, this does not preclude an alternative verdict. [15]

- (b) Use all the sources and other evidence you have studied.** How far do the sources support the view that the main reason for the decline of the Volunteers was the dispute over reform of the Irish Parliament?

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

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

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

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

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement **AO1(b)**. For example, Sources 1 and 2 emphasise the significance of the question of reform of Parliament as a factor in the decline of the Volunteers, while Source 3 identifies a number of other factors relevant to the decline, such as the controversial question of Catholic emancipation and the end of the American War of Independence **AO2(a)**.

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

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgement are developed and substantiated **AO1(b)**. For example, it could be argued that reform of Parliament was an issue taken up by the Volunteers simply to justify their continued existence, and was to some extent a natural follow-up

to the successful political campaigns waged earlier (alluded to in the opening sentence of Source 3). However, this was a high-risk strategy because of its potential to divide the movement. It is this division that is highlighted by the first two sources, between conservative Ascendancy opinion, as represented by Lord Harberton (Source 1), who did not want his political power compromised by parliamentary reform, and radical reform opinion, as represented by Dr William Drennan (Source 2), who felt that the Volunteers had in fact not argued their cause forcefully enough in the Irish House of Commons. Parliamentary reform was clearly critical in the demise of the Volunteers, but candidates may also note, perhaps prompted by Source 3, that the end of hostilities in America was also a fundamental body blow to their continued existence **AO2(a)**.

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

Answers at this level will consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are very well developed and substantiated **AO1(b)**. For example, candidates will recognise that the Volunteers never really recovered from the defeat of their reform proposals in November 1783, which effectively ended the Volunteer–Patriot alliance that had been fundamental to their rise and their success in helping win Free Trade (1779) and legislative independence (1782). Without the backing of the Patriots in Parliament, the Volunteers became politically isolated and went into steady and terminal decline. However, it would also be valid to argue that the process of decline had begun much earlier, in the wake of the Constitution of 1782, when Henry Flood, backed by the Volunteers, had campaigned successfully for a Renunciation Act (passed in early 1783). Not all Patriots were convinced of the necessity for this piece of legislation, and many were determined that this would be the last indulgence granted to their extra-parliamentary allies. Parliamentary reform was therefore the last straw for the Patriots, who were on the whole satisfied with what the Constitution of 1782 had delivered, and who were wary, to say the least, of further constitutional experimentation. Answers will interpret and evaluate the sources fully in relation to their historical context. For example, Source 1 gives the perspective of the Protestant Ascendancy, who are reassured by the defeat of the parliamentary reform proposal, and relieved by the imminent closure of the Volunteer Convention. Dr Drennan, in Source 2, expresses the frustration of Presbyterian radicals like himself, who were well represented in the Volunteers, especially in Ulster, where the movement had originated, and who sought the extension of the franchise to Nonconformists, and possibly Catholics. This latter issue, mentioned in Source 3, not only widened the gulf between the Volunteers and the Patriots, but split the Volunteers themselves. For example, Henry Flood (referred to in all three sources) was a champion of reform of Parliament, but would not countenance granting the vote to Catholics, while his great Patriot and Volunteer rival, Henry Grattan, supported emancipation. Candidates may well argue that, with the end of hostilities in America (noted in Source 3) and hence the end of any threat of invasion, the decline of the Volunteers was inevitable, irrespective of constitutional controversy in this period **AO2(a)**.

[20]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

35

- 2 (a) “The Irish Parliament established as a result of the Constitution of 1782 failed to meet the expectations of its supporters.” How far would you accept this verdict? Use relevant evidence you have studied including contemporary and later interpretations to support your answer.

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

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

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. Answers at this level may be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. For example, there may be a general reference to the fact that the Constitution of 1782 changed very little. There will be little or no awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

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

Answers at this level will select and deploy historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. The answer will have supporting evidence. For example, it may be noted that, while the British government had amended Poyning’s Law and repealed the Declaratory Act, the King, on the advice of his ministers, still retained the power of veto, assuring the British government of ultimate control of Irish legislation. There will be some awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development. For example, in terms of contemporary interpretation, reference may be made to parliamentary opinion of the time, while later interpretations may consider the views of Beckett. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to illegibility, inaccurate spelling, punctuation or grammar; at times, the style of writing will be inappropriate. There may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

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

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. Answers may focus on the fact that the Irish Parliament had secured important concessions from the British government in 1782, relating not only to the passing of legislation but also to security of tenure for the judiciary and control of the army in Ireland. However, candidates may balance these gains against the fact that the Lord Lieutenant, who controlled the Irish executive, was still a British appointee and answerable to the British government, and that, with the use of patronage, the Irish Parliament continued to be ‘managed’ according to the desire of Westminster. In terms of the Constitution failing to fulfil expectations, candidates may consider the question of Catholic emancipation and the fact that the Irish Parliament continued to leave the

great majority of the Irish people without a political voice. The same point could be argued in relation to the position of Presbyterians. Indeed, it would be reasonable to argue that the formation of the United Irishmen in 1791, pledged to achieve full political representation for Irishmen of all religious denominations, was a damning indictment of the Constitution of 1782. There will be a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject **or** a partial evaluation of **both**. Contemporary opinion might include the views of the Lord Lieutenant or a member of the Irish executive. A later interpretation of events could include an evaluation of the situation by the likes of Foster. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

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

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis are very well developed and substantiated. Answers provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of this subject. Answers will attempt in a more definite and sustained way an assessment of how far the Irish Parliament, established by the Constitution of 1782, failed to meet the expectations of its supporters. There is evidence that the Parliament could exercise a degree of independence, such as the passing of Foster's Corn Law and the rejection of Pitt's Commercial Proposals in 1784, as well as the Regency Crisis of 1788–89, which showed that the Irish Parliament was prepared to make provision for the Prince of Wales to succeed the incapacitated George III as Regent (although this matter was not fully put to the test). However, candidates might plausibly argue that the British government was content to allow the Irish Parliament freedom only in matters that did not conflict with its own interests. This meant that the Irish Parliament was able to establish a not unimpressive record in economic and commercial matters. However, when it was considered necessary, the British government was ready to take the lead in terms of both progressive and repressive legislation passed in the 1790s. Through effective management of the Irish House of Commons, and the employment of key Irish administrators, to hide the hand of British control – most notably, Foster, Beresford and Clare –, the British government secured the legislation it wanted, such as the Catholic Relief Act of 1793 (modelled on the British equivalent of 1791) and the Insurrection Act of 1796. Later interpretations of the period could include reference to the views of historians such as Bartlett. Better candidates might plausibly argue that the Irish Parliament – or at least a significant proportion of it – never really wanted to make the 'legislative independence' that the Constitution of 1782 supposedly bestowed on Ireland a reality, and that the lack of serious and sustained conflict between Westminster and Dublin in this period is evidence of this. Therefore, while the Constitution was a real disappointment to Catholics in general and to radical Presbyterians, it was perfectly satisfactory to most of the Protestant Ascendancy and by extension, most members of the Irish Parliament. The views of Tone, Drennan and others could be deployed here as contemporary analysis of the shortcomings of the Constitution of 1782. There is scope for candidates to construct opposing arguments on the topic, or arrive at a conclusion that embraces both sides but not fully. These approaches are all equally valid. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling,

punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate; there is very good organisation and use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. [35]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

- (b) “The failure of the United Irishmen to achieve their objectives up to April 1798 was due to the shortcomings of Wolfe Tone as their leader.” To what extent would you agree with this statement? Use relevant evidence you have studied including contemporary and later interpretations to support your answer.

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

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

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. Answers at this level may be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. For example, there may be a general reference to Wolfe Tone’s leadership of the movement in the 1790s. There will be little or no awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject. Meaning may not always be clear because of inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

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

Answers at this level will select and deploy historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The response contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. The answer will have supporting evidence. For example, the basic argument that might be mounted in support of this proposition is that Tone was simply not a realist and did not appear to be well enough informed on the deep sectarian divisions within Irish society to make a sound judgement in terms of practical objectives (initially parliamentary reform, later an independent republic). A basic counter argument is that much of what happened between 1791 and 1798 was out of Tone’s control – specifically and most importantly the actions of the British government. There will be some awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development. For example, in terms of contemporary opinion, reference may be made to some of Tone’s writings, such as ‘An Argument on Behalf of the Catholics of Ireland’. Later interpretations could include reference to the views of Beckett. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to illegibility, inaccurate spelling and punctuation or, at times, the style of writing will be inappropriate. There may be occasional flaws, with defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

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

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. Answers may focus on the fact that, while Tone may have given the United Irishmen its name, the inspiration for the

organisation came from a group of radical Ulster Presbyterians, notably Dr William Drennan. Indeed, contemporary Presbyterian opinion could be utilised for the purposes of interpretation of this period. It is reasonable to argue that, if the leadership had remained in Ulster Presbyterian hands, the United Irishmen may not have pursued the ultimately futile policy that they did in the 1790s. Furthermore, candidates might well argue that Tone's commitment to, and indeed dependence on, a French alliance was a high-risk strategy. The French were never wholly committed to the backing of the United Irishmen – Tone only had the support of a handful of members of the French Directory, such as De La Croix and Carnot – and when Napoleon took charge later, Ireland was given a much lower priority. There will be a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject **or** a partial evaluation of **both**. A later interpretation of the French alliance with the United Irishmen could include the views of Marianne Elliott. Connected with the French alliance was Tone's absence from Ireland after May 1795. Though initially exiled to America, Tone's subsequent absence was self-imposed as he devoted himself to securing French support for a United Irish rising (arriving in Paris in January 1796). Inevitably, this meant that he lost touch with the situation in Ireland and failed to appreciate how circumstances were becoming less and less favourable to a successful revolution led by the United Irishmen. Candidates will also begin to consider balancing factors in relation to the proposition, notably the government's mixture of conciliation (such as the grant to help establish the Royal College of St Patrick at Maynooth in 1795) and coercion (such as the creation of the Yeomanry and the suspension of habeas corpus in 1796) which undermined support, or potential support, for the United Irishmen and their objectives. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

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

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis are very well developed and substantiated. Answers provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of this subject. Answers will attempt in a more definite and sustained way an assessment of Tone's responsibility for the failure of the United Irishmen to advance their objectives (initially parliamentary reform, later an independent republic). Candidates could argue that it was Tone's absence from Ireland from the mid-1790s on – and especially during the period of heightened sectarian tension, particularly in County Armagh – that was crucial to his misguided leadership as it compounded his already overly optimistic assessment of uniting the Irish people in opposition to British rule. However, a substantive case can be constructed against the proposition, focusing on events occurring in Ireland which were beyond Tone's influence. These include the alliance between the United Irishmen and the nakedly sectarian Defenders, which disaffected many Presbyterian members, especially in Ulster, and caused them to leave the movement. While Tone did nothing to oppose the Defender–United Irishmen merger, it was others who took the lead in promoting it. Here the views of historians such as Kevin Whelan could be used by candidates to support their analysis. Another factor beyond Tone's influence was government counter-measures such as the Militia Act and the infiltration of the United Irishmen by a network of government informers.

Perhaps most important was General Lake's 'Dragooning of Ulster' in 1797, which dampened the revolutionary spirit in what had up until then been seen as the heartland of the movement. Candidates might make reference to the contemporary opinion of those like Lake and others charged with applying British policy in evaluating the thinking of those in positions of power and responsibility. It is also reasonable to argue that the fact that Tone was able to persuade the French to back the United Irishmen (first, in the aborted Bantry Bay expedition of December 1796) is testament to his powers of persuasion, a not unimportant aspect of leadership. He was particularly effective on paper, and his writings undoubtedly inspired many to support the United Irish cause in the 1790s, and in this respect he had no rival in the revolutionary movement. Candidates, therefore, have scope to argue for or against the proposition – or chart a course somewhere in between. Any of these approaches are equally valid. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate; there is very good organisation and use of specialist vocabulary. [35]

Option 3

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

35

70

Option 4: Partition of Ireland 1900–1925

AVAILABLE
MARKS

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

- 1 (i) **Consult all the sources and your own knowledge of the period.** Which of the sources would an historian value most as evidence in a study of the Easter Rising of 1916?

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

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers will paraphrase the content of each source and make assertions that are not fully supported. For example, there may be some reference to Pearse's views on revolution and the aspirations outlined in the Proclamation, but any argument will lack substance and development.

Level 2 ([4]–[7])

Answers will comment on the value of the sources, using the content more fully. Source 1 is valuable because it reveals the attitude of one of the leaders of the Easter Rising towards the use of force. The value of Source 2 is attributed to the fact that it contains a declaration of the aims of those who planned the Rising. Source 3 discusses some of the causes of the Rising of Easter 1916.

Level 3 ([8]–[11])

Answers will present a more sustained assessment of the value of each source, and reach a credible conclusion. Answers at this level will examine the authorship and content more closely. The authorship of Source 1 enhances its value, since Pearse was a key figure in the planning of the Rising. The fact that he writes about revolution over two years before the actual outbreak of the Rising indicates how determined the Irish Republican Brotherhood (IRB) was to make a revolutionary statement. The content is of merit, as Pearse's dismissal of the Gaelic League suggests that Irish nationalism is going to enter a new phase. Source 2 also benefits from its authorship, since it is a public testimony of the views of the IRB's leaders. The content of the source explains their justification for the Rising, how they wanted the population to respond and their perception of its outcome. Source 3 provides a wider perspective on the Rising from an historian. Rees explains how Carson's activities during the Home Rule crisis encouraged radical nationalism, a point reinforced by Pearse's reference to the activities of the Orangemen in the North of Ireland. Rees examines the impact of the Gaelic League, the effects of the First World War, and the role of the IRB in bringing about the Easter Rising of 1916. In summation, the sources reveal the revolutionary thinking of one of the leaders of the Rising in the period prior to Easter 1916, the aims, justification and agenda of those who planned the Rising, as well as an analysis of other circumstances which brought it about.

Level 4 ([12]–[15])

Answers will use a wide range of criteria to assess value, commenting on the significance of the information provided, authorship, motive, viewpoint, audience and date. Contextual knowledge will be introduced to enhance the

answer. Source 1 indicates how Pearse and other exponents of revolutionary nationalism were acknowledging a new phase in Irish politics, where the traditional deference to constitutionalism was to be openly challenged. Pearse wrote in the context of the formation of the Irish Volunteers on 25 November 1913, and he was one of the founders. Moreover, he was sworn into the IRB in December. His praise of the stance of Orangemen in the North echoed Eoin MacNeill's article of 1 November, *The North Began*, which created the momentum for nationalists to establish the Irish Volunteers as an insurance against any attempt to deny Home Rule. The frequent reference to arms and bloodshed in the latter part of the source foretells with great potency, if unintentionally, what the future held in the period 1914–1916, both in Ireland and in Europe. Source 2 represented the ideals of the signatories of the Proclamation: the planners of the Rising for whom death was the inevitable outcome upon surrender. Good answers may remark on several themes in the Proclamation, referring, for example, to the association with the Irish Volunteers, who were successfully infiltrated by the IRB, and the German “gallant allies” who had been the object of lobbying by Casement. The rebels vindicate their actions by associating themselves with the republican tradition of revolt, stretching over three centuries, embracing the Fenians and the United Irishmen. They proclaim “full confidence of victory”, while references to “equal opportunities to all” suggests a social agenda once the republic has been achieved. Source 3 analyses the various factors which caused the Easter Rising of 1916. Carson's endorsement of armed resistance against the Third Home Rule Bill, during which the Ulster Volunteer Force (UVF) was formed, and armed with guns purchased in Germany, encouraged those nationalists who felt uneasy about the prospects of Home Rule being achieved through conventional constitutional means. This led to the formation of the Irish Volunteers, and a gun-running episode at Howth in July 1914. Rees' comments about the Gaelic League corroborate Pearse's declaration in Source 1. His views about the war creating the opportunity for the IRB endorse the words “right moment” in Source 2, where the republican assertion of “England's difficulty is Ireland's opportunity” is made clear. At this level candidates are expected to nominate a particular source as the most valuable. [15]

- (b) Use all the sources and other evidence you have studied.** How far do the sources support the view that the Easter Rising of 1916 was caused by the impact of the First World War on Ireland after 1914?

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

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

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement **AO1(b)**. For example, Sources 1 and 2 deal with the attitudes of the leaders of the Easter Rising towards revolt and their aspirations for their uprising in 1916. Source 3 mentions the impact of the First World War on Ireland. 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 clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement **AO1(b)**. Source 2 suggests that the planners of the Rising “waited for the right moment”, so the War suited their purposes. Source 3 reflects on how the War made a Home Rule settlement on terms amenable to constitutional nationalists less likely. **AO2(a)**.

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

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgement are developed and substantiated **AO1(b)**. Answers will address the sources in relation to the question, and perhaps confine their analysis to either concurring with or disputing the proposition. Source 1 disagrees with the proposition, since Pearse’s declaration is written several months before the outbreak of the First World War in August 1914. Source 2 suggests that the war influenced the planning of the Rising in two ways. First, by creating the opportunity for a revolt, and secondly, by providing the rebels with “gallant allies in Europe” in the form of German help. Source 3 debates both sides of the proposition. Rees refers to the impact of the war, as well as the role of Carson and the Gaelic League. **AO2(a)**.

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

Answers at this level will consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are very well developed and substantiated **AO1(b)**. Answers will interpret and evaluate the sources fully in relation to their historical context **AO2(a)**. Both aspects of the proposition should be addressed, with answers indicating how far the Rising was due to the impact of the war, as well as other factors. Source 1 disputes the proposition. Pearse praises the Gaelic League for having begun “the Irish Revolution”, but is “glad that the Orangemen in the North” have armed and set the example for militant republicanism. Indeed, the words “armed” or “arms” are mentioned five times. Source 2 endorses the proposition in several ways. The rebels have “waited for the right moment”, a reference to the fact that Britain was in its second year of a war, the outcome of which is uncertain. Moreover, help from Germany – “gallant allies” – would take on a new meaning for both the rebels and the government. However, the authors of the Proclamation establish a link between the 1916 Rising and previous revolts over the “past three hundred years” as they portray the rebellion as the logical development of a long-established republican tradition. In this sense, the war provided the opportunity for the revolt rather than its cause. Source 3 both supports and disputes the proposition. The creation of the wartime coalition in 1915 further undermined constitutional nationalism, while the continuation of a war which had no perceived end in sight suited the revolutionary intentions of the IRB. Yet Rees reflects on other factors, such as the impact of Ulster Unionist resistance to Home Rule and the role of the Gaelic League. The historical context in which the sources are addressed may take various forms. For example, Pearse’s declaration of revolutionary intent in Source 1 came against the background of great tension in Ireland, where the threat of force was apparent. The UVF, which was formed in January 1913, and Pearse applauded the actions of his fellow Irishmen taking a stand to defend their birthright. The formation of the Irish Volunteers was directly influenced

by these events, sparked off by Eoin MacNeill's influential article, *The North Began*. Pearse endorses the actions of the "Orangemen in the North". His exhortation to "become accustomed" to the use of arms foretells the gunrunning at Larne and Howth in 1914. Source 2 reflected the ideology of signatories such as Pearse, MacDonagh, Plunkett and Connolly. References to the Irish Republican Brotherhood place that organisation at the forefront of the Rising, since it was its Military Council which planned for a rising as early as 1915. Ironically, contemporaries described the revolt as the "Sinn Féin Rising". The fact that the Irish Volunteers were successfully infiltrated by the IRB, with the Irish Citizen Army joining the conspiracy in January 1916, indicates serious intentions which pre-date the War. Carson's formation of the UVF and the subsequent gun-running at Larne in 1914 (Source 3) weakened Redmond, polarised Irish politics and gave a boost to those from the republican tradition who believed that Irish independence could only be achieved by force of arms. The Gaelic League, while a cultural organisation, often attracted young men who felt politically excluded from the established forces of constitutional nationalism. The war curtailed emigration which meant that there was an indeterminate number of young Irishmen whose resentment about recruitment and conscription would draw them closer to more radical nationalists. A vital ingredient was the role of the IRB, whose formation of a secret Military Council in May 1915 was the most important factor in the planning of the Easter Rising. 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. [20]

35

- 2 (a) "The Liberal Government under Asquith was primarily responsible for the crisis over the Third Home Rule Bill in the period up to September 1914." How far would you agree with this statement? Use relevant evidence you have studied including contemporary and later interpretations to support your answer.

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

Level 1 ([0]–[5]) AO1 (b) Knowledge, ([0]–[3]) AO2 (b) Interpretations
Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. Answers at this level may be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. For example, there may be some comments on the events of the Home Rule crisis which mention the response of the Liberal Government. There will be little or no awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([6]–[10]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([4]–[7]) AO2(b) Interpretations
Answers at this level will select and deploy historical knowledge with greater

relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. The response will have supporting evidence. For example, there may be a limited focus on the role of the Liberal Government during the Home Rule crisis or some comment about the conduct of Asquith. There will be some awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject but this will be limited and in need of further development. For example, there may be some contemporary opinion from one of the leading figures in the Liberal Government, such as Lloyd George. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to illegibility, inaccurate spelling, punctuation or grammar; at times, the style of writing will be inappropriate. There may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

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

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. Answers may argue that Asquith and the Liberals were primarily responsible for the crisis, focusing on the mistakes and misjudgements made by the Prime Minister and his cabinet colleagues during the Home Rule crisis, as well as making a limited assessment of some mitigating factors. Asquith and the Liberal cabinet failed to take into account the nature and extent of the opposition to the Third Home Rule Bill even though there were sufficient warning signs. The political atmosphere in the years preceding the Home Rule crisis was noteworthy for its hatred and emotions, as evidenced by the controversies over the 1909 budget. The political climate in the summer of 1910 was particularly tense and unpleasant as the row over the Parliament Bill reached its climax. Yet the Liberals showed no sense of urgency for the expected onslaught from the Conservatives and Ulster Unionists upon the introduction of the Third Home Rule Bill in April 1912. Birrell, who was Chief Secretary for Ireland, was described as a political lightweight who lacked any real insight into the Irish problem, yet Asquith refused to move him, even though Birrell himself had admitted to feeling the pressure of the post. The Home Rule Bill was prepared in a “leisurely manner”, with no provision to accommodate by means of compromise the crisis that was to follow. The historical experiences of the previous two Home Rule Bills were ignored. Asquith showed no inclination to take the initiative, and allowed himself to be unduly influenced by the assurances of John Redmond that the resistance to Home Rule was a bluff. He failed to act upon an early compromise proposal from Lloyd George and Churchill in February 1912 regarding the exclusion of Ulster. There may be a limited analysis of the proposition that Asquith and his colleagues were not “primarily responsible”. For example, the government was distracted by other serious domestic issues, such as strikes by miners and dockers. There will be a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject **or** a partial evaluation of **both**. Contemporary interpretations could include comments from Asquith about the Home Rule Bill, or from members of his cabinet. Later interpretations could include assessments from historians such as Jalland, who has criticised the Liberals’ approach to the Home Rule crisis, or from Jenkins, who presents a more balanced analysis of Asquith’s conduct. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

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

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis are very well developed and substantiated. Answers will provide a more sustained assessment of whether Asquith and the Liberals were “primarily responsible”. Since the Liberals were in power, it is appropriate that their conduct during the crisis is the object of closer scrutiny. Even before the drafting of the Third Home Rule Bill itself, the opportunity to take the initiative was missed. The cabinet made no special provision for any violent act of resistance from the Ulster Unionists and the Conservatives. Political resistance to the Bill did not result in any special action or preparation on the part of the government. The Liberals failed to devise any coherent strategy to deal with the exclusion of Ulster, and instead the Irish Parliamentary Party was offered its ultimate goal of Home Rule at the outset, only for it to be eroded by compromises in the period 1912–1914. Warnings from cabinet colleagues and the War Office about the possible resignation of British Army officers in the event of being ordered to move against the Ulster Unionists went unheeded by Asquith, and contributed to the Curragh Mutiny. The Buckingham Palace Conference partly failed because Asquith was reacting to events rather than taking the initiative. Level 4 responses will examine other considerations when assessing the performance of Asquith and the Liberals. The Conservatives and the Ulster Unionists bear some responsibility for the nature of the crisis and the difficulties which confronted the government. F. E. Smith and Carson vied with each other in the calculated extremity of their language, which was part of what became the “New style” of politics in this period. Bonar Law pushed the boundaries of constitutional politics to the limit in order to prevent Home Rule. By the summer of 1914 the words and actions of the opponents of Home Rule had brought Britain to the edge of civil war. In addition, other factors may be referred to in order to place any assessment of the Liberals in perspective. Home Rule had been a contentious issue as far back as the first and second Home Rule Bills of 1886 and 1893. Possible compromises were complex. Other issues occupied the attention of the Liberals. Against the background of violent industrial action, Asquith and his colleagues had to contend with the activities of the suffragettes, and the impending international crisis with Germany. Answers will provide a good analysis of contemporary **and** later interpretations of this subject. Contemporary interpretations could include, for example, comment from any of the main participants in the crisis, such as Bonar Law, Carson, Smith or Lloyd George. Historians’ interpretations could include opinions from Mansergh about the performance of Asquith, the views of Aiken about the role of the opponents of Home Rule, or the assessments of Kee and Lyons about the response of the government to the main events in the period. [35]

- (b) “Divisions in Sinn Féin were the most important reason for the outbreak of the Irish Civil War in 1922.” How far do you agree with this verdict? Use relevant evidence you have studied including contemporary and later interpretations to support your answer.

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

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

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answers are in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. Answers at this level may be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. For example, there may be a comment that the Irish Civil War was caused by disagreements over the Anglo-Irish Treaty of 1921. There will be little or no awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

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

Answers at this level will select and deploy historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. The answer will have supporting evidence. For example, there may be a limited focus on how divisions in Sinn Féin after 1917 contributed to the outbreak of the Irish Civil War. When the Sinn Féin programme was devised in October 1917 at the Ard Fheis (Convention), priority was placed on glossing over differences, leaving aside details and instead concentrating on mounting a challenge to the Irish Parliamentary Party at the next general election. There will be some awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development. For example, there may be reference to a contemporary opinion from one of the leading members of Sinn Féin at the October 1917 Convention. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to illegibility, inaccurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; at times, the style of writing will be inappropriate. There may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

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

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgement are developed and substantiated. Answers may focus on the role played by the divisions in Sinn Féin after 1917, as well as making a limited assessment of some of the other causes of the outbreak of the Civil War. Sinn Féin had been a rallying point for all forms of radicalism in Irish politics, ranging from physical force separatists to dissatisfied constitutionalists. While a diversity of people brought into the Sinn Féin party a breadth of support, it rendered agreement over policy and tactics more difficult. The original policy of Sinn Féin, created by its founder, Arthur Griffith, committed the party to the establishment of an independent Ireland with a dual monarchy for Britain and Ireland. This aim was to be achieved by a policy of Irish representatives abstaining from Westminster. Sinn Féin became the unwitting beneficiary of widespread popular support in the months after the Easter Rising of 1916, which had been mistakenly labelled the “Sinn Féin Rising”. It faced the problem of reconciling fundamental differences among its members in 1917 in order to replace the Irish Parliamentary Party. At the October Convention there was a confrontation between republicans who stood by the Proclamation of 1916 and non-republicans like Griffith. De Valera produced a compromise formula which achieved agreement, whereby Sinn Féin would aim at “securing the international recognition of Ireland as an independent Irish Republic. Having achieved that status the Irish people

may by referendum freely choose their own form of government". This was a form of words that had something in it for everyone. Much was left purposely vague and the compromise formula had the air of a delaying mechanism rather than a solution. Yet in the difficult circumstances of 1917 a working agreement linking the various wings and traditions of an emerging nationalist movement allowed Sinn Féin to move forward and ultimately replace the Irish Party at the general election of 1918. The end of the Anglo-Irish War in July 1921 confronted the various strands that comprised Sinn Féin with the reality of having to respond to a negotiated settlement with the British Government. The outbreak of the Civil War was also attributable to differences over the Anglo-Irish Treaty of 1921. While the Dáil ratified the Treaty in January 1922, the vote of 64 to 57 merely confirmed the extent of dissent within the ranks of Sinn Féin. The contentious aspects of the Treaty were the extent to which the Republican ideal had been compromised, the Oath of Allegiance to the Crown, Ireland's future relations with the British Empire and Irish sovereignty over its own security and foreign affairs. There will be a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject **or** a partial evaluation of **both**. For example, there may be reference to contemporary Sinn Féin opinions during the Dáil debates over the Treaty, or references to historians such as Lyons regarding the compromises made by Sinn Féin during the 1917 Convention. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

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

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis are very well developed and substantiated. Answers will attempt in a more definite way an assessment of the role of the divisions in Sinn Féin in relation to a wider range of other causes of the Civil War. A feature of the Sinn Féin Convention in 1917 was the desire to avoid dissent over the details as to what form of government an independent Ireland would have, and instead create a united front to remove the Irish Party, rid Ireland of British rule and then sort out differences afterwards. Possible unease over the justification or appropriateness of the use of physical force was accommodated by the resolution to "make use of every available means to make impotent the power of England to hold Ireland in subjugation by military force or otherwise". The impressive display of superficial unanimity in 1917 was swept away by a series of interrelated events in the period 1921–1922. The Dáil debates over the Treaty highlighted the crucial discrepancies of 1917. Supporters of the Treaty argued that it was an honourable document, while opponents regarded the Treaty as a betrayal of the Republic, and this sense of grievance was accentuated by the wording of the oath of allegiance. The failure to reach a peaceful compromise over the Treaty and the subsequent split in the IRA made military conflict more likely. Collins and de Valera made a "Pact" upon which the general election of June 1922 could be contested, which was an unconventional and unrealistic attempt to avoid civil war. In April 1922, anti-Treaty IRA forces occupied the Four Courts in Dublin, a defiance which could not be ignored by the new pro-Treaty government. This act was compounded by blatant acts of lawlessness involving the robbing of post offices and attacks on trains. The assassination of Field Marshal Sir Henry Wilson in London resulted in pressure on Collins to take immediate steps against the Four Courts garrison, with the implication that

failure to do so would result in British military re-involvement in the south of Ireland. This was virtually an ultimatum requesting one set of Irishmen to fire upon another. It was in these circumstances that the Irish Civil War began. Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary and later interpretations of this subject. Contemporary interpretations could include, for example, comments from supporters of the Treaty such as Griffith and Collins, as well as its opponents, such as Brugha and de Valera. Historians' interpretations could include opinions from Kee and Smith about the Sinn Féin Convention of 1917, or from Lyons and Rees about the other short-term causes of the Civil War in the period 1921–1922. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate; there is very good organisation and use of specialist vocabulary. [35]

Option 4

Total

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

35

70

70

