cea

Rewarding Learning

ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education
January 2014

History

Assessment Unit A2 1

[AH211]

WEDNESDAY 15 JANUARY, 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.

Synoptic Assessment

Examiners should assess the candidate's ability to draw together knowledge and skills in order to demonstrate overall historical understanding. Candidates' answers should demonstrate breadth of historical knowledge and understanding by ranging comprehensively across the period of study as a whole. They should make links and comparisons which are properly developed and analysed and thus indicate understanding of the process of historical change. The knowledge and understanding of the subject should come from more than one perspective – political or cultural or economic – and there should be understanding demonstrated of the connections or inter-relationship between these perspectives.

Generic Levels of Response for Synoptic Assessment

The generic levels of response should be used in conjunction with the information on the indicative content outlined for each answer.

Level 1 ([0]–[5]) AO2(b), ([0]–[7]) AO1(b)
Answers at this level may recall some accurate knowledge and display understanding of mainly one part of the period and one perspective. The answer will be characterised throughout by limited accuracy and a lack of clarity. Answers may provide a descriptive narrative of events. There will be few links and comparisons made between different parts of the period. Answers will be mainly a series of unsubstantiated assertions with little analysis **AO1(b)**. There may be perhaps an awareness of contemporary **or** later interpretations but the answer may focus only on one interpretation **AO2(b)**. Answers at this level will be characterised throughout by unclear meaning due to illegibility, inaccurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; there will be an inappropriate style of writing; and defects in organisation and lack of a specialist vocabulary.

Level 2 ([6]–[10]) AO2(b), ([8]–[15]) AO1(b)
Answers at this level may recall and deploy knowledge which draws from examples across the period. The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy and at times lack clarity. The answer will provide some explanation though at times will lapse into narrative. Links and comparisons will be made but these will not be fully developed or analysed. Answers will contain some unsubstantiated assertions but also arguments which are appropriately developed and substantiated **AO1(b)**. There will be an awareness of contemporary **or** later interpretations about the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development **AO2(b)**. Answers at this level will have frequent lapses in meaning, inaccurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; at times the style of writing will be inappropriate; there will be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([11]–[15]) AO2(b), ([16]–[22]) AO1(b)
Answers at this level will recall and deploy knowledge accurately, drawing from all parts of the period with clarity and focus. Answers provide focused explanations and make links and comparisons which are developed and analysed, indicating an understanding of the process of historical change. Arguments are developed, substantiated, illustrated and reach a judgement **AO1(b)**. There is a satisfactory evaluation of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject **or** a partial evaluation of both **AO2(b)**. 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 and with some specialist vocabulary.

Level 4 ([16]–[20]) AO2(b), ([23]–[30]) AO1(b)
Answers at this level will demonstrate accurate recall of knowledge from across the period studied with clarity and precision. Answers will provide detailed and focused insightful explanations drawing on actions, events, issues or perspectives across the period, and there is an excellent understanding of the connections or interrelationships between these. A judgement is reached using arguments that are fully developed, illustrated and substantiated **AO1(b)**. There is a well informed and insightful evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations **AO2(b)**. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate; there is very good organisation and appropriate use of specialist vocabulary.

Option 1: Anglo-Spanish Relations 1509–1609

Answer **one** question.

1   "English and Spanish advisers had a greater influence on Anglo-Spanish relations in the period 1509–1609 than their monarchs". To what extent would you agree with this statement?

This question requires an assessment and comparison of the impact advisers and monarchs had on Anglo-Spanish relations in the period 1509–1609. Answers should consider a range of political and economic advisers. Responses will consider the varied character of English and Spanish monarchs and discuss how much influence they exerted on Anglo-Spanish relations. Top level answers will reflect on the nature of sixteenth century government and the influence advisers had.

The structure of the answer is immaterial: whether thematic or chronological, adherence to the issues in the question and the quality of evidence is the requirement for creditable marks.

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

(a) Henry VIII, 1509–1547
Answers should focus on the nature of Henry's reign and how his policy demands were generally met. In 1512 Henry saw himself as a "warrior prince" and was determined to follow the example of Henry V by conquering France. Much of Henry's Privy Council had served his father, Henry VII, and sought to avoid war. Henry ignored the advice of men like John de Vere who said that he could find 'no benefit for England in war with France', and appointed new advisers who could deliver his wishes. Thomas Wolsey rose to prominence and remained there because he delivered what his master wanted. Candidates might use contemporary comments from any of these advisers to show the influence they had on Anglo-Spanish relations. Responses should consider how far Wolsey began to direct policy towards his own aims. Candidates could show how some historians, such as Elton, conclude that Wolsey used Anglo-Spanish relations as a means to gain higher office, the Papacy. By contrast, they may use comments by Guy to show that Wolsey was a faithful servant to Henry VIII. Wolsey became Europe's leading diplomat and Henry gave him a free hand in many of his actions and answers could use this to show how advisers influenced Anglo-Spanish relations. Wolsey's fall from power shows that Henry only allowed freedom as long as his own needs were met. Wolsey's failure to deliver a divorce led to his removal from power and indicated that Anglo-Spanish relations were controlled primarily by monarchs and not advisers.

Answers might consider the impact of the divorce on Anglo-Spanish relations and conclude that this was driven by Henry's will and no other. Responses might suggest that Henry was only driven to his break with Rome because of the opposition of his wife, Catherine of Aragon, to the divorce and, as a result, created the opposition of the Pope. Henry was unable to control events which led to declining Anglo-Spanish relations and major religious change in England. Answers might suggest that Cromwell delivered what his master sought but also used the opportunity to advance the reformed faith

which created a religious division which was to undermine Anglo-Spanish relations. Cromwell's execution in 1540 suggests that Henry remained the dominant influence on Anglo-Spanish relations and the renewal of an alliance against France in 1542 highlights this.

(b) Ferdinand and Charles V(I), 1509–1556

Answers might suggest that the experience of Ferdinand allowed him to dominate his own nation and even Henry VIII. Candidates might use the contemporary comments of Machiavelli to demonstrate how Ferdinand manipulated people. The young and inexperienced Charles found great difficulty in dealing with the Spanish nobility. Charles found himself manipulated by men like Gattinara who pursued their own agendas. Charles' early failings as a monarch created a deep distrust of his advisers and led both he and his son to dominate Spanish policy. Charles was a shrewd political operator and his rule in the Netherlands recognised local needs and this maintained Anglo-Spanish relations. Candidates might use the comments of historians like Elliott to show the nature of Charles' rule. Charles' imprisonment of the Pope showed that he controlled events, even though his advisers may have had a greater impact in the first part of his reign.

(c) Edward VI and Mary I, 1547–1558

Answers might identify this period as a mid-Tudor crisis where a minor and a woman attempted to run England. During Edward's reign, the government was controlled by two Protectors, John Dudley and Edward Seymour. Responses could suggest that their actions show that Edward had little to do with Anglo-Spanish relations. Seymour's use of Edward as a hostage in 1549 and Dudley's attempts to change the succession in 1553 demonstrate this. Answers might consider the second Act of Uniformity of 1552 as showing the growing influence of Edward VI, and Protestant reform had a major impact on Anglo-Spanish relations.

Mary I is often regarded as having a weak government, dominated by her Spanish husband and his Catholic advisers. Candidates might use comments by historians like Pollard and McCullough to show the debate on the effectiveness of Mary's government. Answers might suggest that Cardinal Pole directed religious policy and Philip drew England into a war against France which only benefited Spain. Mary's refusal to consider the advice of Stephen Gardiner about a foreign marriage shows that she had her own ideas, although this caused Wyatt's rebellion which damaged Anglo-Spanish relations. Candidates could use the contemporary statements made by Wyatt to demonstrate the strength of xenophobia in England and its impact on Mary's government.

(d) Philip II, 1556–1598

Answers might note Charles V's advice to his son to 'trust no one but yourself' to demonstrate contemporary opinion on the influence of advisers. Philip adhered to this throughout his reign and dominated all aspects of government. His religious faith and growing dislike of Elizabeth I led to a steady decline in Anglo-Spanish relations. Responses might suggest that the changing circumstances of Mary Stuart allowed Philip to be more anti-English and that her execution brought Anglo-Spanish relations to an all-time low which resulted in the dispatch of the Armada. Answers might suggest that the Duke of Alva forced Philip into a more warlike policy or that he was

AVAILABLE MARKS

manipulated by Antonio Perez. Candidates could use the historical debate on the 'Black Legend' between historians like Geyl and Kamen to show the nature of Philip II's control.

(e) Elizabeth I, 1558–1603

Answers might suggest that Elizabeth was directed by the anti-Spanish feelings of William Cecil, Francis Walsingham and Robert Dudley. Anti-Spanish feelings were high in this period, as was demonstrated by Drake and Hawkins, yet Elizabeth avoided war with Spain for the first twenty-seven years of her reign. Candidates could use contemporary comments from Cecil and Dudley about their attempts to influence Dutch policy to show how Elizabeth controlled her own policy. Answers might suggest that Dudley used Elizabeth's love for him to control her, yet her suggestion of a marriage between him and Mary Stuart suggests that Elizabeth remained in control. Elizabeth's refusal to execute Mary Stuart for such a long period of time, despite the advice of her council, suggests that it was Elizabeth who was in control of Anglo-Spanish relations. Candidates might use the interpretations of Neale or Wernham to highlight the motivation behind Elizabeth's actions and the influence others had on her policy.

(f) James I (1603–1609) and Philip III (1598–1609)

James depended on Robert Cecil to control Anglo-Spanish relations, as is demonstrated by events at the Treaty of London. As a new monarch, he was aware of his Scottish background and was prepared to listen to advice in the early years of his reign. Philip III learnt from his father's mistakes and allowed greater freedom for his first minister, the Duke of Lerma, to direct events. Candidates could use the historian Roper's comments to show the success of Philip III's administration.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately. [50]

50

2 How far would you agree that Anglo-Spanish relations in the period 1509–1609 were characterised by mutual hatred?

This question requires an assessment of what type of relations existed between England and Spain in the period 1509–1609 and whether these relations were characterised by mutual hatred throughout the entire period. Answers must consider if the attitudes of each nation were the same and if their view of the other changed over time. Responses might consider the international standing of each nation and assess to what extent this influenced Anglo-Spanish relations during this period.

Top level responses will reflect on the changing nature of Anglo-Spanish relations and the balance of power between various monarchs. Changes in relationship should also be considered during, as well as between, reigns.

The structure of the answer is immaterial: whether thematic or chronological, adherence to the issues in the question and the quality of evidence is the requirement for creditable marks.

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

(a) Ferdinand and Henry VIII, 1509–1516

Answers might compare the status of both nations. Both were strengthening their position after the unification of Aragon and Castile and, in England's case, after almost a century of dynastic turmoil. The growth of Spain's New World colonies, with an increasing flow of bullion from these and the acquisition of the Kingdom of Naples, showed that Spain's international standing was rising. Comments by historians like Woodward could be used by candidates to support this position. Henry VIII had inherited a relatively stable realm with a sound financial position but little international standing. Responses might suggest that the positions of both gave little reason for either nation to hate the other. The marriage of Henry VIII to Ferdinand's daughter, Catherine of Aragon, showed that good relations did exist between England and Spain. Candidates could use contemporary comments by Catherine as a means to influence Anglo-Spanish relations in a positive manner. Both nations saw France as a natural enemy and this united them in war against France in 1512. Ferdinand's manipulation of the less experienced Henry VIII may have caused some difficulties but mutual hatred would be too strong a description.

(b) Charles I (V) and Henry VIII, 1516–1547

When Charles became King of Spain in 1516, the balance of power seemed to have shifted towards England. He had been born in the Netherlands and was a foreigner to Spain and its ways. Initially, Charles' rule was marred by mistakes as he trusted the advice of nobles who had their own aims. However, by 1519 Charles had been crowned as Holy Roman Emperor and was now the most powerful man in Europe. Answers might suggest that this inequality was to place England in an inferior position and it allowed Spain to dictate the nature of Anglo-Spanish relations. By 1520 there were two major forces in Europe, the Spanish/ Holy Roman Empire and France. Clearly England was in a weaker position and responses might suggest that England might have envied Spain rather than hating it. Answers might discuss whether England's foreign policy, under Thomas Wolsey's direction, maintained England in a higher position than its power warranted. Candidates could support this position with the opinions of historians like Starkey or Scarisbrick. With events such as the Field of the Cloth of Gold and the Treaty of London, Wolsey maintained England's position at the centre of European diplomacy and continued strong Anglo-Spanish relations. Responses might consider how this relationship worsened with Charles V's success at the Battle of Pavia in 1525. With a growing domination of the French, Charles disregarded Henry VIII's suggestion of a possible invasion of France. The divorce issue of the late 1520s and 1530s could be used to argue that Charles adopted a certain arrogance in his attitude towards Henry and this did affect Anglo-Spanish relations. Candidates might use the contemporary comments of the Imperial ambassador, Chapuys, to demonstrate this. Answers might suggest a growing hatred between the nations due to the divorce issue and England's split from Rome. The alliance of 1542 shows how Charles once more needed England because of his conflict with the French and this suggests that, if hatred did exist, it was disregarded for the political needs of each nation.

(c) Charles I (V) and Edward VI and Mary I, 1547–1556

As a minor, Edward VI was dependent on others to rule on his behalf and this placed England at a disadvantage when compared to the power of Spain. Despite this fact, Charles V was still in need of an alliance against France. This is clear when considering Charles' limited criticism of Northumberland's First Book of Common Prayer in 1549. Answers might use this to show that, despite Charles V's hatred of Protestantism, he was still prepared to work with the English.

The accession of Mary I to the English throne in 1553 was to create a close tie between the nations as Mary was a cousin of Charles and had been receiving advice from his ambassador, Simon Renard. The marriage of Mary to the future Philip II of Spain cemented good Anglo-Spanish relations and seems to suggest that hatred did not exist. Candidates might use the harsh terms imposed by the English Parliament as contemporary evidence of a distrust or hatred of Spain. Alternatively, this may show a worry about the dominance of any foreign husband over an English Queen. Wyatt's rebellion of 1554 had a religious motivation but this was not used to gather support. Wyatt relied on anti-Spanish feelings and xenophobia to gather support which suggests a hatred of the Spanish among its participants. Mary's persecution of Protestants in England was largely on the advice of Philip's spiritual advisers and this was to increase hatred towards the Spanish in the decades that followed. Philip's treatment by parliament and some of the English nobility created a dislike which was to fester during the next thirty years. Candidates might use the historian Davies to demonstrate Philip II's religious hatred of England.

(d) Philip II and Elizabeth I, 1556–1598

The early years of Elizabeth's reign saw England depending on Spanish assistance. With the question of Elizabeth's legitimacy and the French-backed claim to place Mary Stuart on the English throne, England was in a weak position. Elizabeth's Church settlement saw the creation of a Protestant state and this created Papal opposition. Answers might suggest that the religious differences between the states would lead to mutual hatred, yet it was Philip II who persuaded the Pope not to excommunicate Elizabeth. Candidates might quote Philip II's 'better a heretic on the English throne than a French woman' to show his support for England. Spanish support for Elizabeth continued throughout the early 1560s, suggesting that hatred was not present on the part of either country. Responses may refer to a decline in Anglo-Spanish relations and a growth in political conflict towards the end of the 1560s. They may identify Spanish aggression towards England with its support for the Rebellion of the Northern Earls, the Ridolfi plot, Munster rebellion, Throckmorton plot and Babington plot, all of which suggested Spanish hatred of England. Candidates could use the historical debate between Davies, Pierson and Kamen to show differing motivations for Philip's actions towards England. The declaration of war by Spain in 1585 and the sending of the Armada in 1588 further support this case. Elizabeth's seizure of Spanish silver in 1568, her support for the Dutch rebels, including the Treaty of Nonsuch of 1585, and for Drake's attacks on Spain's New World possessions all suggest a decline in Anglo-Spanish relations and hatred on England's part. Individuals like the Duke of Medina Sidonia and Francis Drake had a mutual hatred for England and Spain respectively. These views can be seen to be representative of public opinion in England and Spain during this period.

AVAILABLE MARKS

(e) Elizabeth I/James I and Philip III, 1598–1609
The death of Philip II in 1598 did not bring the conflict with England to an end because it was the hatred of Elizabeth which maintained poor Anglo-Spanish relations. The succession of James Stuart to the English throne in 1603 brought almost immediate peace talks. Candidates might use Robert Cecil's attitude to peace to oppose the proposition. Responses will show that the Treaty of London of 1604 brought a normalisation of Anglo-Spanish relations, although the mutual hatred which had developed during the 1570s and 1580s would remain for centuries to come.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.   [50]   50

Option 1   **50**

Option 2: Crown and Parliament in England 1603–1702

Answer **one** question.

1 **"**The role and status of Parliament was transformed in the period 1603–1702". How far would you accept this statement?

This question requires an assessment of the extent to which the role and status of Parliament was changed by the events of the seventeenth century.

Top level responses will reflect on the extent to which the relationship between Crown and Parliament changed and identify the decisive moments when it did. The Constitutional Revolution, the execution of Charles I, the Restoration Settlement, the Glorious Revolution and particularly the reign of William and Mary saw the power and position of Parliament fluctuate.

However, the seventeenth century should not be seen as a simple victory of Parliament over the King. Candidates might argue that, while the role and status of Parliament changed between 1603 and 1702, its actual prerogative power did not change significantly.

The structure of the answer is immaterial: whether thematic or chronological, adherence to the issues in the question and the quality of evidence is the requirement for creditable marks.

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

(a) **The Role and Status of Parliament in 1603**
At the outset of the Stuart period, Parliament provided a contact between the monarch and his subjects. It advised the King, provided supply and passed bills. The Crown retained control of foreign policy, the church and appointing royal advisers. It was also the King's responsibility to summon, prorogue and dissolve Parliament. Contemporary comment from James I could be employed to illustrate his views on the role and status of Parliament.

As Parliament was an occasional event rather than an annual institution, it had limited status and influence. It was weakened by the factional nature of politics with support often based on family connections or patronage rather than shared ideals. Parliament's main strength lay in its role in helping to change the law and particularly its control of the country's, and consequently the monarch's, purse strings.

(b) **The Reign of James I, 1603–1625**
During the reign of James I (1603–1625) there were some clashes, predominantly over the King's financial and foreign policies. However, there was little significant change in the role and status of Parliament. Good candidates may note that the Monopoly Act limited the monarch's independence in this area of finance and Parliament's impeachment of Cranfield challenged the King's power to choose his own ministers. Candidates may include an observation by an historian such as Russell about the nature of the relationship between Crown and Parliament at the end of James I's reign.

12

(c) The 'Constitutional Revolution' of 1640–1642
During the Constitutional Revolution, Parliament succeeded in limiting some aspects of royal power. The Triennial Act and Act Against Own Dissolution restricted the monarch's ability to rule alone and the abolition of prerogative financial devices made the monarch more dependent on calling Parliament for finance. Abolishing the prerogative courts restricted the King's legal independence. Candidates could employ the contemporary opinion of leading MPs such as John Pym to illustrate the aims and ambitions of Parliament during this period.

Despite these successes, Parliament actually failed to achieve many of its aims. The King continued to choose his ministers and control the church. Customs duties remained part of the monarch's prerogative, as did the control of the armed forces. Nevertheless, there had been a significant shift in the role and status of Parliament, even if it was not revolutionary. The Whig interpretation of the Constitutional Revolution could be used to analyse the extent to which the role of Parliament changed.

(d) The Execution of Charles I, 1649
More radical was the removal of monarchy in 1649. Victory in the Civil Wars, as well as the execution of Charles I and the establishment of a republic, transformed the role and status of Parliament. Replacing the monarchy represented the pinnacle of parliamentary power during this period but its inability to find a workable political settlement resulted in the collapse of the Commonwealth and the restoration of monarchy. Contemporary opinion from Cromwell outlining his view on the execution could be given, while candidates could refer to the arguments of historians such as Hill.

(e) The Restoration Settlement and the reign of Charles II, 1660–1688
Since Charles II was invited back by Parliament, it might be expected that it would be on its terms and that the role and status of Parliament would be strengthened. The Restoration Settlement did maintain the reforms of the Constitutional Revolution and fixing the monarch's income should have ensured that Parliament enjoyed the regularity and influence that had been eroded under Charles I. However, Charles II's loyal Cavalier Parliament helped him to secure the monarchy by making it an act of treason to imprison the King, censoring the press and weakening the Triennial Act. Charles benefited from a trade explosion and was able to strengthen the position of the monarchy. Contemporary comment from Hyde and the views of historians such as Coward and McInnes could be used to explain the strengthening of the position of monarchy in this period.

Top level candidates may note that political parties emerged during the Exclusion Crisis, creating a new style of politics that was to change the nature of Parliament.

(f) The Glorious Revolution and the Revolution Settlement, 1688/1689
Although James II and his Tory Parliament were initially on good terms, his pro-Catholic, absolutist policies soon alienated his natural support base. His attempt to secure religious toleration and manipulate Parliament resulted in a total breakdown in the relationship between Crown and Parliament. Contemporary opinion of leading figures such as Bishop Compton may be included to explain the impact of the policies of James II.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

The arrival of William and Mary in the Glorious Revolution and their acceptance by Parliament signalled a new relationship. The Glorious Revolution resulted in a new Coronation Oath, a Bill of Rights, Mutiny Act, Toleration Act and new financial arrangements. Parliament had challenged the divine right of kings and created the foundations for a new relationship with the monarch. Arguably, the Glorious Revolution transformed the role and status of Parliament more than any other event. Candidates may employ an observation from an historian such as Trevelyan about the importance of the Glorious Revolution.

(g) Changes to the role and status of Parliament during the reign of William III

By the end of the century, Parliament had a direct influence over the country's finances, achieving royal dependence and accountability through the Commission of Accounts and Civil List. William had been willing to create a partnership with Parliament to finance his war with France. The Triennial Act further secured the regularity of Parliament, allowing it to become more efficient and effective. The Act of Settlement further weakened the monarchy by securing the independence of the judiciary and determined the religion of future monarchs. The revisionist interpretation of the reigns of William and Mary may be used to explain the changing role and status of Parliament in this period.

The Whigs and Tories had become the basis of parliamentary politics with factions becoming less significant than policies. The Commons also replaced the Lords as the true seat of power. By 1700, it was in the interest of the King to appoint ministers who could command a majority in the House of Commons, even if he was not legally obliged to do so. Parliament even influenced foreign affairs, establishing in the Act of Settlement of 1701 that the Crown could not go to war in defence of its foreign dominions without parliamentary support. In 1701, William thought it best to ask Parliament's approval for his treaty of Grand Alliance. The contemporary opinion of William III may be employed to explain his willingness to concede prerogative power to Parliament.

By the end of the seventeenth century the role and status of Parliament had changed considerably. It met almost annually and was an integral part of government. Parliament had also expanded its range of powers, setting the King's income through the Civil List and controlling all taxation. It is notable, though, that, although the actual income of the King had been raised, he now, more than ever, depended on his Parliament to raise it. Parliament had even been able to determine the succession and religion of the monarch. Despite these changes in the role and status of Parliament, the King remained at the centre of governmental power and the need for a working partnership between Crown and Parliament would have been something James I was familiar with in 1603.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.   [50]   50

2 'The Restoration Settlement marked the most important change in the power and position of the monarchy in the period 1603–1702.' To what extent would you agree with this verdict?

This question requires an assessment of the impact of the Restoration Settlement on the power and position of the monarchy. A comparative analysis should be made with other pivotal events, including the execution of Charles I, the Constitutional Revolution, the Glorious Revolution and the impact of war during the reign of William and Mary.

Top level responses will reflect on the ways in which the Restoration Settlement changed the prerogative power of the monarchy. The answer should discuss the prerogative powers which were restored in 1660 and how the Cavalier Parliament further strengthened the position of the monarchy.

It may be argued that the changes in the power and position of the monarchy during the seventeenth century were more gradual. It may even be suggested that the extent of the change has been exaggerated and that the Crown remained in a powerful position at the end of the century.

Responses may begin by outlining the power and position of the monarchy at the beginning of the seventeenth century.

The structure of the answer is immaterial: whether thematic or chronological, adherence to the issues in the question and the quality of evidence is the requirement for creditable marks.

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

(a) The Restoration Settlement, 1660–1665
Since Charles I had been defeated in two Civil Wars and subsequently executed, and his son and heir had been invited back on terms dictated by Parliament, it might be expected that this settlement would have marked the most significant change to the power of the monarchy. All the reforms achieved by Parliament up to the end of 1641 were confirmed, ensuring that the prerogative taxes and courts of Charles I remained illegal. The Crown's revenue was set at a level designed to ensure the need to call Parliament to vote additional supply, and the King was no longer free to collect taxes without its consent. Despite this, by the early 1680s the permanent ordinary revenue of the Crown had actually risen to the point where Charles II was financially independent and able to enjoy a short period of personal rule. The position of the Crown was strengthened by a series of Acts to protect the position of the King, as well as a revised Triennial Act. Contemporary comment from Charles II outlining his view on the power of the restored Crown could be given, while candidates could refer to the observations of an historian such as Anderson.

(b) The power and position of monarchy in 1603
In 1603 the powers of the monarchy were wide-ranging. Although James I required the consent of Parliament in order to raise money, he was able to generate some income by using his prerogative powers, including wardship, purveyance and the sale of monopolies. James had the power to summon, prorogue or dismiss Parliament when he chose and had sole control over the

appointment of officials. The monarch also retained complete control over the making of foreign policy and the armed forces. Although James clashed with Parliament during his reign, most notably over foreign policy and finance, the monarchy remained in a powerful position when he died in 1625.

(c) The Constitutional Revolution, 1640–1642

It is valid to argue that this period represented a more important change in the power and position of the monarchy. Candidates may include an observation by an historian such as MacAuley about the importance of the Constitutional Revolution. A number of successful attempts were made to limit royal power. The Triennial Act of 1641 and Act Against Own Dissolution restricted the Crown's ability to control the existence of Parliament. Prerogative taxation and feudal courts were abolished entirely. Parliament also demanded control of ministerial appointments and the armed forces, and a share in controlling the Church. However, there were limits to what Parliament achieved. It failed to secure control of royal ministers or the armed forces, and never succeeded in abolishing the episcopacy. There was also nothing to prevent a monarch becoming financially independent if his revenues increased due to trade expansion. Contemporary comment from Charles I may be used to show his views on the importance of the changes made during this period.

(d) The Execution of Charles I, 1649

The execution of Charles I represented the most radical change to the power and position of the monarchy in the century, and resulted in the onset of a period of 'parliamentary' rule. However, the interregnum was short-lived and the failure to find a workable political settlement to replace the monarchy resulted in the restoration in 1660. Despite the monarchy's impressive comeback, the execution did have a long-term impact upon relations between future monarchs and their Parliaments. The spectre of civil war and regicide was not easily forgotten. Candidates could employ contemporary material such as the views of Ireton or a comment from the Marxist school of thought on the importance of the execution.

Of course, the event itself had been instigated by a radicalised minority and did not represent a popular revolt against the monarchy. It could be argued that the execution was against the individual rather than the institution.

(e) The Glorious Revolution and the Revolution Settlement, 1688/1689

James II's controversial policies resulted in his loss of power and the creation of a joint monarchy. Contemporary comments from leading MPs such as Danby could be used to illustrate the extent of the opposition to the King. Top level responses will examine how the power and position of the monarchy was changed by the new Coronation Oath, Bill of Rights, Mutiny Act, Toleration Act and the revised financial arrangements. While the Crown retained significant powers, it was now more financially dependent upon Parliament. The Bill of Rights also insisted that the monarch should be a Protestant. The Glorious Revolution had significantly changed the power and position of the monarchy. The King retained control over foreign policy and the armed forces, appointed ministers and held the right of veto and supremacy over the Church. It may even be argued that the Glorious Revolution did not actually make lasting changes to the Crown's prerogative power and was most significant in setting the foundations for the transformation that was to come in the following decade. Candidates may

include a comment from an historian such as Kenyon about the significance of the changes made during the Glorious Revolution.

(f) Changes to the power and position of the monarchy in the reign of William III

The most important, and long-lasting, changes to the power and position of the monarchy came in the century's final decade. William III's desire to resist the expansionist policies of Louis XIV committed England to a costly war. It resulted in a new relationship between the King and his Parliament as William sought a partnership to ensure a regular supply for his armed forces. Comments from historians such as Williams may be included to explain the nature of the changing power and position of the monarch in relation to his Parliament.

Parliament gained a direct input into how subsidies were spent and the creation of the Commission of Accounts and Civil List ensured a high degree of royal dependency and accountability in its financial activity. The Triennial Act of 1694 limited the royal power of dissolution and made Parliament a regular event. This new style of government gave Parliament a degree of permanency that allowed it to become more efficient and effective. The Crown was committed to allowing its Parliament a greater influence in policy forming. The Act of Settlement saw the establishment of an independent judiciary and the securing of a Protestant succession.

The reigns of William and Mary had seen the establishment of a working relationship between Crown and Parliament. Although this period saw a weakening of the prerogative power of the monarchy, candidates may argue that, despite a loss of independence, the Crown's position had in some ways never been stronger. The Civil List and Bank of England enabled William to lead England into a major war in Europe. Contemporary opinion, such as that of the Earl of Nottingham, may be included to explain the reaction to the introduction of these financial changes.

Furthermore, the Crown retained the right to choose its ministers, determine foreign policy and call, dissolve and prorogue Parliament. Top level responses may note that a working relationship with Parliament was nothing new and that James I had also depended on parliamentary subsidies for his foreign policy, even if the mechanisms of government had undoubtedly changed.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately. [50]   50

Option 2   **50**

Option 3: Liberalism and Nationalism in Europe 1815–1914

Answer **one** question.

1 "Political liberalism was far less successful than economic liberalism in Europe between 1815 and 1914". How far would you agree with this statement?

This question requires a comparison of the progress made by liberal ideas in the fields of politics and economics in Europe in the years in question. It is to be expected that the "economic" input will be more slender than the "political", but there must be some consideration of the economic dimension such as the *Zollverein* and the later decline of free trade. Answers will show how liberal success was, in political terms, limited in the period 1815**–**50, but that after that date there were increases in representative government and citizens' rights. Top level responses will expand on the above, illustrating both the rise and decline in economic liberal influence. They will also discuss not only the increase in liberal political institutions but the periods of regression and the difficulty of maintaining the middle class grasp on political power as franchises widened. A judgement will be made as to which branch of liberalism enjoyed greater success.

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

(a) 1815–1850

Political liberalism had to start from a low point in 1815. The Congress of Vienna restored many reactionary regimes, and the association of liberal ideas with the French Revolution meant a difficult time for those bourgeois groups whose appetite for a share of power had been whetted during the previous generation. Metternich co-ordinated repression, sending Austrian forces to subdue largely liberal uprisings in Italy in 1820 and 1831, while he persuaded the German Confederation to impose anti-liberal legislation after the Wartburg Festival of 1819 and the Hambach Festival of 1832. Within the Habsburg Empire itself a complex system of censorship and surveillance was imposed to clamp down on liberalism, while the reactionary Ferdinand of Spain was restored by a French expeditionary force in 1823. In France Charles X tried to rule despotically, but was overthrown. His successor, Louis Philippe, initially appeared more liberal, but the liberals now in power in France proved unwilling to continue with franchise reform, and were perceived as selfish defenders of their own position in the face of economic troubles, until the "bourgeois monarchy" was itself overthrown. That event gave liberals across Europe renewed optimism, and the spring of 1848 saw an explosion of liberal success, with Metternich toppled and constitutions put in place throughout Germany and Italy. But the liberal spring was not to last, as the old rulers bided their time, retaining the loyalty of their armies and waiting for the inexperienced liberal revolutionaries to fall out among themselves, which they did, most notably over their fear of radicalism in France and Austria. Historians such as Jones might be quoted about their verdict on the failure of liberalism up to 1850.

But to write off the period before 1850 as devoid of all success would be too harsh. Some German states in the South West fulfilled their obligations under the terms of the German Confederation to introduce, and maintain, constitutions. In France, in 1814 and in 1830, constitutions were put in place and, although Charles X tried to ignore them, French rulers were obliged to

pay some heed to elected parliaments. Even after 1848 the Piedmontese *statuto* remained in place, as did, for a few years, the Prussian constitution granted by Frederick William IV, while the end of serfdom in Austria survived the post-1850 reaction.

Economic liberalism had its origins in the writings of Adam Smith and others who believed that it was every man's right to enjoy his property unhampered by state interference, thus appealing particularly to those middle classes who had significant property to enjoy. Interpretations might be utilised here in the form of contemporary views on the efficacy of tariff reductions.

Economic liberalism had made some progress before 1850, with steps towards the freeing of trade in Germany and in Britain. The *Zollverein* was a Prussian-inspired free trade area which, beginning in 1818, rapidly spread until by 1835 it included most of the states in the German Confederation, and even concluded trade agreements with Sweden and Belgium.

(b) **1850–1875**

Clearly political liberalism had suffered a substantial defeat in 1848, but at a deeper level all was not lost, as rulers who had received a fright saw the need to make liberal concessions if they were to preserve their thrones. This was not immediately apparent in the 1850s, however, as the three-tier voting system in Prussia diluted the gains of the Constitution, the Bach era heralded neo-absolutism in Austria, and Napoleon's Second Empire (1852) marked a return to authoritarianism. But political success for liberalism was to come as the following decade saw the French Emperor gradually liberalise his regime, even appointing the republican Ollivier as Prime Minister. Napoleon's justification for liberalising his regime might be used as a contemporary interpretation, perhaps comparing it with Catterall and Vinen's views on his shrewdness. In Piedmont, a raft of liberal reforms modernised the country and won admirers to such an extent that most of Italy accepted the Piedmontese-driven unification of the country. In Prussia, the Liberals constituted the largest party, while in the Habsburg Empire the October Diploma and the February Patent were attempts to set up a parliamentary system.

After 1870 the French Third Republic continued the liberal success of Napoleon III's last years. It maintained liberal values against attempts by the Commune to decentralise France and by royalists to revive the Bourbon monarchy in the 1870s, and fighting off Boulanger's bid for military dictatorship in the following decade. In Germany, a group of Liberals, who had vainly opposed Bismarck's army expansion scheme in the 1860s, adopted a pragmatic approach to become Bismarck's partners in government for nearly a decade in the 1870s. The late 1860s saw much liberalisation in Austria in the wake of the *Ausgleich* of 1867, with greater equality before the law, freedom of speech and association, and a reduction in Church power, culminating in the abandonment of the Concordat in 1870.

Economically, the period 1850–1875 was one when liberal ideas saw their greatest success. Piedmont took the lead in promoting free trade within Italy, and Napoleon III ignored much opposition to sign a flurry of free trade agreements, most famously the Cobden Treaty with Britain, which itself had done away with virtually all import tariffs. Even during the reactionary Bach Era the Austrian government had declared the whole Empire a united customs territory.

(c) 1875–1914

From 1875 until 1914 the successes of political liberalism were mixed, but for the economic variety there was a decided downturn. The culprit was an economic depression, which panicked governments into a retreat from free trade, but there were many, and not only agriculturalists, who were always uneasy with the creed of free trade, while Bismarck wished to change course and ally with more right-wing factions who wished for protection. His return to tariffs was imitated across continental Europe, and the great era of free trade ended. Answers may take the opportunity to quote the views of opponents of free trade. Further blows to the classical liberal economic beliefs followed with the rise of socialism, which stressed collectivism rather than the liberals' favoured individualism. By 1914 the Social Democrats were the largest group in the German *Reichstag*, and syndicalist strikes threatened the existence of the Third Republic. In the late 1880s Bismarck, seeking to weaken socialism, had introduced a series of state-funded welfare reforms which were copied elsewhere, dealing another blow to liberal economic beliefs.

Politically, this was a mixed time for liberals. On the debit side the German National Liberals happily supported anti-Catholic laws, and were only lukewarm in their opposition to similar anti-socialist legislation. Top answers might refer to the challenges by Waller and other historians to the conventional view of the illiberalism of Wilhelmine Germany. The lengthy Dreyfus Affair showed the continuing strength of illiberal forces in France, the Italian parliament became a byword for corruption, and in Germany and Austria, the executive had gained in strength at the expense of the legislature by 1914. Despite this, the right to vote was continually extended, and constitutions survived, guaranteeing basic civil rights and freedoms across Europe, even in Russia after the 1905 revolution. The opinions of historians such as Collins on the overall success of political or economic liberalism could be quoted.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately. [50]

2 "Cultural and political factors were equally important in the development of nationalism in Europe in the period 1815–1914". To what extent would you accept this verdict?

This question requires an assessment of the factors which underlay the development of European nationalism between 1815 and 1914, assessing how nationalist consciousness was stimulated by cultural phenomena such as music, literature and religion. It also requires a survey of the work of nationalist leaders, both statesmen and revolutionaries, in achieving the creation of nation-states during the period. There will be a judgement as to the relative importance of cultural and political factors.

The structure of the answer is immaterial: whether thematic or chronological, adherence to the issues in the question and the quality of evidence is the requirement for creditable marks.

AVAILABLE MARKS

50

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

(a) 1815–1850

Responses will refer to the part played in raising national consciousness by cultural factors as a necessary precursor to independence and/or national unity. Top level answers will also note that the development of such consciousness did not always lead to political success, thus suggesting the necessity of the presence of both factors. There was much cultural and political activity centred around nationalism between 1815 and 1848, but two major developments in terms of practical success were the independence of Greece and of Belgium. In the case of the latter, culture was important in that the bond of a common religion (Catholicism) differentiated the Belgians from their Dutch overlords. Their industrial sophistication also gave them an extensive and well-educated middle class which was able to persuade the Powers of their cause. In Greece religion was again important, the Orthodox Greeks gaining Great Power sympathy in their struggle against Moslem Turkey, and also profiting from Western European perceptions of ancient Greek culture as the bedrock of European civilisation, and thus worthy of support. The historian Richard Clegg's reference to this might be quoted. The period from 1815 to 1914 was a fertile one for cultural nationalism elsewhere in Europe, even if no tangible results were achieved. In Germany, nationalism became popular among the *Burschenschaften*, particularly the ideas of Herder and Fichte, which produced national pride and the sense of belonging to the *Volk*. But "political" nationalism in Germany was remarkably unsuccessful in this period. The demonstrations held at Wartburg (1817) and Hambach (1832) only succeeded in provoking repressive measures from the Diet. In 1848 nationalists succeeded in calling an all-German Assembly to Frankfurt, but the delegates squandered this opportunity by their indecision, eventually snubbed by Frederick William of Prussia when they offered him the throne of a united Germany. One of the issues that consumed the Frankfurt Parliament was whether the new Germany should include Poles. This would have horrified Mazzini, the most famous of the Italian thinkers, who believed that every nation should have its own state, and that this would usher in an era of European peace. There might be an opportunity for candidates to quote from Mazzini in this context. He wanted a unitary Italian republic; Balbo and Gioberti, on the other hand, sought a looser federation under papal leadership. Musically, nationalism was promoted by Verdi's "Chorus of the Hebrew Slaves", which became an unofficial national anthem for a still disunited Italy. But politically Italian nationalism was weak between 1815 and 1848. Metternich sent armies into rebellious states in 1820 and 1831, in the 1830s a series of revolts inspired by Mazzini failed ignominiously, and, although hopes were briefly raised in the north, Charles Albert of Piedmont was no match for his Austrian opponents in 1848. Top answers may note that the cultural phenomenon of *campanilismo* militated against nationalist success.

Other cultural influences were at work during this period, but without producing short-term political gains. The Brothers Grimm were collecting German folklore in addition to their philological work, Palacky was writing on Czech history, as well as compiling the first Czech dictionary, and Louis Kossuth was agitating for Hungarian independence in his newspaper, the *Pesti Hirlap*.

8434.01 F

21

(b)   1850–1871

While political nationalism achieved little in the 1850s, the period between 1859 and 1871 produced a burst of nationalist successes. In Italy political nationalism came to the fore as Cavour's Piedmont led the drive for Italian unification. With the help of France, he pushed Austria out of Lombardy and then benefited from the assistance of an organisation at least partly cultural, the National Society, to unify northern Italy. The link between cultural and political nationalism was continued when Mazzini's disciple Garibaldi led a successful rising which swept through Naples and approached Rome. The conquests of Garibaldi and Cavour were united to form the Kingdom of Italy in 1860. Candidates may debate whether this was ever Cavour's intention, and whether this was a true victory for nationalism as dreamt of by Mazzini, or a cynical Piedmontese takeover. Historians such as Smith might be used to illustrate this point.

In Germany, there was also a spectacular success, with Bismarck's Prussia fighting three wars to unify Germany. He profited from nationalist sentiment when fighting Denmark over its claims to Schleswig and Holstein, duchies perceived as "German". In 1866 he drove Austria out of Germany, shattering the dreams of *Grossdeutsch* nationalists, and, good answers may observe, defeating most of the *Zollverein* states as well, underlining the importance of Prussian expansionism rather than idealistic, culturally based nationalism. Nonetheless, when France was defeated in 1871, German nationalists were triumphant and there was none of the reluctance to acknowledge the new Empire witnessed in parts of Italy. E H Carr might be quoted on the German people's attitude to these events.

The Habsburg Empire was struggling to hold its multi-ethnic territories together, more so now Metternich had gone. This in itself is testimony to the influence of cultural nationalism. But the key breakthrough was military, when the Empire lost the Seven Weeks' War, and Magyar pressure could no longer be resisted. The *Ausgleich* of 1867 set up the Dual Monarchy, making Hungary an equal partner in the Empire. But this was the last success for nationalism in the Austro-Hungarian Empire until after 1914. Cultural nationalism continued to inspire the Southern Slavs, the Croats and the Czechs, where Smetana's and Dvorak's music drew on traditional folk melodies, but there was to be no political progress for nationalism in these areas until after the First World War.

(c)   1871–1914

The period after 1871 saw few important nation-state creations. There were successes, such as Norway which achieved its independence in 1905, its sense of nationality assisted by Grieg's music and Tidemand's paintings. Bulgaria achieved self-government from Turkey in two stages, in 1878 and 1885. In its case its Christianity acted as a focus for nationalism. It received help from Russia, which was motivated not only by expansionist ambitions but also through pan-Slavist ideology which also played on the shared Orthodox traditions of many Eastern European races. Although Albania was predominantly Moslem, its creation was in part a result of the religious link which served to inspire the Balkan League in its war in 1912 against Turkey.

Responses will probably suggest that both cultural and political factors were necessary for success, but "development" allows for wider interpretations. Thus, religion may be seen as important in building national awareness

AVAILABLE
MARKS

in Poland and in Ireland, where the self-conscious creation of an interest in Irish culture via the Gaelic League and the Gaelic Athletic Association helped to foster nationalism. Late in the period nationalism also developed in another way, when it changed character into something more aggressive, even racialist and jingoistic. Candidates might quote Waller in this context. This sometimes happened under state auspices, as governments began to promote nationalism as a diversion away from socialism for the urban working classes. In Germany military values increasingly dominated civilian life, especially under William II. Some historians have seen the outbreak of war in 1914 as in part due to the heightened nationalistic atmosphere which prevailed at this time. Nor was the darker side of nationalism always a product of the state. Anti-semitic feelings were strong in Vienna, where local politicians stirred them up further for political advantage, while the Dreyfus case in France was a further example of xenophobia and the way in which much nationalism had developed. Emile Zola or another participant in the Dreyfus Affair might be quoted here.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately. [50]

50

Option 3 | **50**

Option 4: Unionism and Nationalism in Ireland 1800–1900

Answer **one** question.

1   "The quality of their leadership determined the extent to which Irish nationalists achieved their objectives". How far would you agree with this assessment of constitutional and revolutionary nationalism in Ireland in the period 1800**–**1900?

This question invites an assessment of the impact of leadership in determining the outcome of the objectives of Irish nationalists in the period. Top level responses will examine how leadership contributed to success or acted as an obstacle to the achievement of objectives. Moreover, such answers will also reflect on the fact that the question of leadership was but one of several factors which affected the fortunes of Irish nationalists.

The structure of the answer is immaterial; whether thematic or chronological, adherence to the issues in the question and the quality of evidence is the requirement for creditable marks.

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

(a)   Constitutional nationalists achieved some of their objectives partly because of the quality of leadership, principally from O`Connell and Parnell
O`Connell`s charisma, powerful personality and oratorical skills greatly assisted his campaign for emancipation. He unified the Catholic peasantry, middle class and Church and employed tactics comparable to most modern-day pressure groups. In the 1830s, faced with forlorn prospects of achieving the repeal of the Union, his liaison with the Whigs, known as the Lichfield House Compact, brought some benefits for Ireland regarding tithe, local government and the work of Thomas Drummond. Candidates could include later interpretations from Boyce regarding O`Connell`s leadership skills. Parnell dominated constitutional nationalism after 1870, and his "New Departure", which embraced physical force nationalists, agrarian activists and home rulers, proved profitable. This liaison produced the Land Act of 1881 and the Arrears Act of 1882. Home rule was pushed to the forefront of British politics because Parnell moulded a modern-day political party, whose members were the first in Europe to receive a salary and were disciplined to vote in unison on key issues. Hence, the Irish Parliamentary Party became such a formidable force that it commanded the respect of both the Liberal and Conservative Parties. Candidates could include some contemporary comment from Parnell, or later observations from historians such as Lyons about Parnell`s achievements.

(b)   Other factors impacted on the achievements of constitutional nationalists in this period
O`Connell benefited from the weaknesses of the British government between 1827 and 1829, just when the emancipation campaign reached its climax. Contemporary comment from Peel or Wellington could illustrate the Tory dilemma over emancipation in 1829. The Lichfield House Compact was also made possible by the precarious parliamentary position of the Whigs in the 1830s. Parnell was fortunate in that Gladstone was prepared to jeopardise his political future by addressing the issue of Irish grievances

both through agrarian reform and the Home Rule Bills of 1886 and 1893. Candidates could refer to contemporary comment from Gladstone regarding his attitude towards Ireland.

(c) **A combination of shortcomings in leadership, as well as a range of other reasons, explains the failures of constitutional nationalism**
O`Connell failed to achieve all his aspirations in the Lichfield House Compact because of the realities of politics in Westminster. All Irish reforms were subject to veto by the House of Lords. Candidates could provide a comment from O`Connell regarding the Compact, or later assessments from Boyce or Kee. O`Connell contributed to his failure to achieve repeal by underestimating Peel. His duplication of tactics from the emancipation campaign in the 1820s made him predictable and easier to counter. Moreover, Peel presented a formidable obstacle. The outstanding statesman of the period, Peel enjoyed the full confidence of Westminster in resisting any attempt to repeal the Union. He was able to take firm measures secure in the knowledge that he enjoyed all-party support for his attempt to uphold the Union, and in the process preserve British security and maintain the Empire. Contemporary references to Peel`s determination to resist repeal could be mentioned, or historians' views on the reasons for O`Connell's failure in the 1840s. Parnell failed in his ultimate objective of achieving home rule partly because the issue split the Liberal Party. He also faced the insurmountable obstacle of the Lords` veto. His divorce scandal alienated the Catholic Church in Ireland and nonconformist opinion in England, thereby forcing Gladstone to abandon him. Candidates could utilise interpretations from historians such as Boyce or Lyons regarding the circumstances of Parnell`s downfall.

(d) **Shortcomings in leadership contributed to the common failure of revolutionary nationalists to achieve their goal of breaking the Union with Britain**
Emmet in 1803, the Young Irelanders in 1848 and Fenians such as Stephens in 1867 all failed because of poor preparation by their leaders. Men, money, arms and some semblance of popular support were all lacking in various degrees during these periods of physical force activity. In the case of the Fenians, there were splits over tactics and personalities between James Stephens and John O`Mahony which damaged their leadership, both in the USA and in Ireland. Candidates could refer to historians such as Kee or Moody regarding the failure of the Fenians.

(e) **However, answers may reflect that, regardless of leadership qualities, the obstacles which revolutionaries encountered were so great that they could not be overcome**
The Catholic Church refused to endorse any revolutionary assault on legitimate government. In particular, the hierarchy adopted a publicly aggressive stance against the Fenians, thereby destroying any prospect of accumulating widespread support. Cardinal Cullen adhered to the Vatican line that it was irreconcilable for Catholics to practise their faith and at the same time participate in secret oath-bound revolutionary movements. Contemporary comment from Cullen or other Catholic clergymen could be employed to illustrate clerical opposition to Fenianism. Revolutionary groups failed to obtain significant foreign intervention. Emmet in 1803 received no help from France, while American aid for the Fenians in 1867 was inadequate. The firm government response was significant

8434.01 F

in thwarting revolutionary ambitions. Spies undermined revolutionaries, emergency legislation was utilised appropriately, while civil and military resources were mobilised effectively. Emmet failed to co-ordinate anything other than a feeble insurrection which was confined to Dublin. The Young Irelanders were suppressed by the Irish constabulary in Tipperary in 1848. Moreover, since Ireland was in the throes of the Famine, this revolt was ill-timed. The informer Corydon conveyed Fenian plans to Dublin Castle. The attack on Chester Castle was dealt with by a forewarned military force. The suspension of habeas corpus led to the arrest of scores of Fenians. General Massey, arrested in early March 1867, became the chief witness for the Crown in the prosecution of his former Fenian associates. Candidates could employ interpretations from historians such as Kee, Lyons or Boyce assessing the reasons for the failure of the revolutionary nationalists.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately. [50]

50

2 "The supporters of the Union in the north and south of Ireland had the same aims throughout the period 1800–1900, but the methods by which they attempted to achieve these aims were different". To what extent would you accept this verdict?

This question requires candidates to examine the relationship between the supporters of the Union in the north and south of Ireland. Top level responses should fully address the proposition, assessing the extent to which differences existed over the aims and the methods used to uphold the Union itself. Top level answers may reflect that all supporters of the Union held deep and strikingly similar convictions regarding their economic welfare if the Union was broken. Clearer contrasts emerge in other areas. While religious attitudes were common to both, there was more focus on this in the north of Ireland than in the south. Conversely, references to the empire were more prevalent in the south than in the north. Regarding methods, there was a clear distinction in the willingness of northern unionists to use force to protect the Union.

The structure of the answer is immaterial: whether thematic or chronological, adherence to the issues in the question and the quality of evidence is the requirement for creditable marks.

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

(a) **The supporters of the Union in the north and south of Ireland shared common aims about their economic welfare if home rule was introduced**
In the north, unionists argued that their industrial prosperity depended on the Union. Literature and speeches, especially during the crises of the Home Rule bills of 1886 and 1893, attested to the economic progress made in the areas of shipbuilding, linen and rope making. Thomas Sinclair, a prominent Belfast businessman, spoke about this at the famous unionist convention in Belfast in 1892. In 1893, the Belfast Chamber of Commerce reminded Gladstone of Belfast`s progress under the Union. Candidates could employ contemporary views from Ulster unionists and businessmen such as Sinclair to illustrate these views. In the south, the economic emphasis was on agriculture, as supporters of the Union reflected with apprehension on the

potential impact of a Dublin parliament on their vast landholdings. These fears were heightened by legislation such as the Ballot Act of 1872 and Reform Act of 1884, which loosened landlord control over their tenants' voting intentions. The Local Government Act of 1898 witnessed the end of southern unionist influence at local level. Meanwhile, the activities of the Land League, and land legislation in 1870 and 1881, made southern landlords feel that the only safeguard for their material welfare was under the direct rule of Westminster. Candidates could utilise contemporary material from southern unionist organisations, such as the Irish Unionist Alliance (IUA), or interpretations from historians such as McDowell.

(b) Religious aims and attitudes were quite different between the supporters of the Union in the north and south

Northern unionists placed more emphasis on their religious fears if the Union was broken. Competition for jobs between Catholics and Protestants in Belfast increased sectarian tension in the city. The occasion of the first Home Rule Bill in 1886 witnessed rioting which resulted in 32 dead and 371 injured. There were serious outbursts of civil unrest in Londonderry in 1870 and 1883. Even in 1834, O`Connell`s movement for repeal, which offered a forlorn prospect of success, prompted a gathering of 40,000 unionists at Hillsborough to hear the Reverend Henry Cooke speak about the imminent onslaught of Roman Catholicism. Candidates could refer to the views of contemporaries such as Cooke or later interpretations from Buckland. By contrast, the scattered southern unionist minority played down the theme of religious differences and instead emphasised the fact that the Union was beneficial to men from all religions. The Irish Loyal and Patriotic Union (ILPU) said that the Union benefited everyone, and doubted if Catholics could enjoy any more religious freedom if a Dublin parliament was established. For Lecky, religion formed no basis of argument in considering the merits of the Union. The Cork Defence Union declared at its inauguration in 1885 that its organisation was "non-sectarian and non-political", and its intention was to "unite all friends of law and order of all classes". William Kenny, a notable Catholic lawyer, won the St. Stephen`s Green seat in Dublin in the General Election of 1892. He declared that this achievement illustrated that the defence of the Union was not the sole preserve of his countrymen in the north. Top level answers may reflect on the geographical imbalance of unionism to explain these differing attitudes. Candidates could employ contemporary views from William Kenny, Lecky or statements from organisations such as the IUA. Ulster Protestants comprised a population of 800,000 out of 1.25 million, and could therefore speak more freely about their religious views. By contrast, their southern counterparts formed only 250,000 of the 2.25 million population in the rest of Ireland, and were more sensitive to the feelings of their Catholic neighbours.

(c) The Empire and the imperial ideal were a more prominent theme among southern unionists than in the north, thereby indicating differences in aims

Southern unionists argued that the Empire would be endangered if Ireland`s links with Britain were loosened under a home rule settlement. It was said that home rule for Ireland would ultimately lead to the dismantling of the most prestigious empire in the world. Devotion to empire in the south can be attributed to the social structure of those who led unionism. Lansdowne, for example, was a Viceroy of India, Secretary of State for Canada and eventually Secretary of State for War. Midleton served in India in a diplomatic

role. Dunraven became Secretary of State for the Colonies. Candidates could use appropriate contemporary comment or interpretations from historians such as McDowell or Buckland. However, northern unionists, while not placing the same political priority on the empire, were still receptive to the imperial ideal. The Marquis of Dufferin and Ava was Viceroy of India from 1884 to 1888, having previously been Governor General of Canada. Today in Quebec there is "Dufferin Terrace" in his honour. Brigadier John Nicholson was born in Lisburn and died in the service of the Crown in India in 1857. John Balance, originally from Glenavy, was Prime Minister of New Zealand between 1891 and 1893.

(d) **There were notable differences in the methods employed by the supporters of the Union**

Southern unionists used their social and political connections at Westminster, as well as their wealth, to uphold the Union by means of literature, rallies, pamphlets, newspapers and electioneering. The ILPU financed 48 election contests in Britain and Ireland. In the House of Lords there were, by 1886, of 144 peers with Irish interest, some 116 who owned land in the south and west. The IUA managed meetings, distributed manifestoes and petitions, and organised tours of Ireland for British electors. The Property Defence Association, led by Lord Courtown, sought to protect the agricultural interests of its members. Newspapers such as the *Irish Times* and *Dublin Daily Express* became the voice of southern unionist interests. Candidates could refer to interpretations from historians such as Buckland or McDowell. However, Ulster unionists added a more forceful edge to their methods. Members of Young Ulster were required to possess a firearm and ammunition. The Ulster Defence Union was formed in 1894 to collect funds and organise resistance to home rule. The Protestant Colonisation Society believed that the best way to protect the property of its members was to prohibit marriage with a Catholic. Contemporary comment from these organisations could be employed to indicate their methods. The titles of the respective organisations provide an insight into the self-perception of unionism in Ireland. In the north, the word "Ulster" dominates, for example, the Ulster Loyalist and Anti-Repeal Union. In the south, the word "Irish" prevails, as in the IUA and ILPU. Geographical considerations play a role here, for the unionist majority in the north felt more capable and therefore secure when it came to resisting home rule by all means they deemed necessary.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately. [50]   50

Option 4   **50**

Option 5: Clash of Ideologies in Europe 1900–2000

Answer **one** question.

1 "Between 1917 and 1948 Soviet foreign policy in Europe was aggressive; from 1949 to 1991 it was defensive." How far would you accept this verdict?

This question requires an assessment of how far Soviet foreign policy was motivated by different considerations across different time periods. Answers will discuss whether Soviet foreign policy was aggressive between 1917 and 1948 but defensive in the period 1949–1991.

Top level responses will reflect on the idea that Soviet foreign policy can be neatly divided into two time periods and whether or not those distinct periods are as coherent as the statement suggests.

The structure of the answer is largely immaterial: whether thematic or chronological, adherence to the issues in the question and the quality of evidence is the requirement for creditable marks.

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

(a) 1917–1924
This period deals with Lenin's years in power and allows candidates to assess how accurate the first part of the statement may be. Candidates could argue that there is no simple depiction of Soviet foreign policy during this initial period. As Condren remarked, the "Soviet leadership pursued its aims with whatever means were at its disposal". The importance of events and circumstances were to shape decisions and, while there may have been an ideological aspiration to export the revolution, such hopes were to flounder on the rocks of reality.

In discussing this issue, candidates would be expected to consider the Soviet withdrawal from World War One, the Civil War, the creation of the Comintern, the Russo-Polish War and the diplomatic treaties which were signed with Britain and Germany in the early 1920s. Each of these events is certainly open to interpretation and candidates may seek to argue that Soviet foreign policy was aggressive, as evident through the creation of the Comintern or the Russo-Polish War. Indeed, candidates could draw upon Kennan's argument that the Soviet Union was "inherently aggressive" due to its revolutionary nature. Equally, candidates may use other events to adopt an interpretation that challenges the statement.

(b) 1924–1948
With the death of Lenin and the emergence of Stalin, it is important to consider if the new leadership marked a change in the direction of Soviet foreign policy. Candidates may want to address the ideological divisions that emerged during this period. A contrast could be drawn between Stalin's more inward-looking policies and his commitment to securing the revolution at home and Trotsky's belief in the importance of internationalising Bolshevism. As Stalin was famously to quip, he would rather have "one Soviet tractor" than ten foreign communists. With the rise of fascism in Germany, candidates should consider whether Stalin altered Soviet foreign policy and, if so, in which direction. The 1930s offer ample opportunities to

consider the validity of the statement. Candidates may wish to argue against the proposition, highlighting the lengths to which the Soviet Union went in order to counter the fascist threat. The joining of the League of Nations, which Lenin had previously disparaged as a "robbers' den", the signing of various non-aggression pacts and the willingness to "take up arms" against the swelling fascist sea in Spain could all be used to illustrate the non-aggressive and very defensive nature of Soviet foreign policy during this period.

The signing of the Nazi-Soviet Pact in 1939 could be argued to be a prime example of Soviet expansionist desires. The division of Northern and Eastern Europe into Nazi and Soviet spheres of influence could be offered as an example of the aggressive impulse within Soviet foreign policy. Equally, it could be argued that the pact emerged as a result of the failure of Western democratic powers to stand up to Hitler, and, as such, the Soviet move was defensive in character. This very debate offers candidates the opportunity to delve into the interpretations concerning this period. It is possible to strengthen the historical discussion with reference to the arguments of both the Collective Security school and the German school of historians.

The war itself was clearly defensive but it was to be the results of the war that were to witness the greatest expansion of communism in Europe in the period 1917–1991. The effective "takeover" of large swathes of Eastern and Central Europe presents candidates with a prime opportunity to weigh up the merits of the statement. Whether this was the result of a Soviet desire for a sphere of influence that could act as a buffer zone or the logical consequence of communist ideology is for candidates to argue. Once again, answers could highlight this discussion by drawing on the interpretations of the Orthodox school and contrasting it with the Revisionist approach.

(c) 1948–1964
The Berlin Blockade of 1948 could be understood in a number of ways. Candidates may suggest that the Soviet Union was responding to policies its opponents were pursuing and was essentially defensive in character, or they could argue that it was primarily an aggressive attempt to ensure ideological control of East Germany or represents the first stage of an attempt to expand communism into Western Europe.

With the death of Stalin it appeared that Soviet foreign policy took on a more conciliatory tone. This may be analysed from a number of angles: it could be considered a return to the pragmatism of the Lenin years, a return to "peaceful co-existence," as Khrushchev expressed it, a reaction to the economic problems the country faced or merely a policy designed to placate the West, while remaining ruthlessly aggressive within Eastern Europe. Candidates will want to consider a number of events in relation to Khrushchev's rule, such as the development of the Geneva Spirit, the creation of the Warsaw Pact, events in Hungary in 1956 and the building of the Berlin Wall in 1961.

Candidates may seek to use the events mentioned to support or challenge the proposition. For example, the building of the Berlin Wall in 1961 can be viewed as an essentially defensive act in so far as it was attempting to preserve the integrity of East Germany. Equally, it could reasonably be argued that it was aggressive, most notably to the German population. However, as Evans and Jenkins have argued, there was a noticeable

difference between Khrushchev and his predecessor: "If his aims were much the same as those of Stalin, Khrushchev differed in his approach".

(d) 1964–1982

The replacement of Khrushchev with Brezhnev allows candidates to consider the reasons for the change of leader and the issues that confronted the new leadership. Candidates will be expected to consider Soviet relations with the nations of the Eastern Bloc, West Germany and the United States. Attention could be drawn to the events in Czechoslovakia in 1968 and the subsequent announcement of the Brezhnev Doctrine, suggesting that these were examples of aggression and could hardly be characterised as defensive in character. The emergence of *Ostpolitik* and subsequently détente provides opportunities for candidates to assess how such policies should be understood. Once again, a number of lines of argument could be pursued. Détente, it may be suggested, was merely the latest expression of co-existence and thus was defensive in character. As Mason has argued, "détente was a device to minimise tension and avoid dangerous crises." However, the Soviet Union remained ideologically committed to communism and improvements in relations were thus designed to maintain communism if not export it. Alternatively, candidates could argue that the Soviet Union was beset by economic problems it was unable to solve. Indeed, such problems were only going to get worse in the following decade. Candidates may thus want to challenge the limits that the notion of a defensive foreign policy places on the actual analysis of that foreign policy.

The end of détente occasions the consideration of Afghanistan. As with Cuba, it is perfectly legitimate to mention it and use it as an explanation of why détente in Europe came to an end, but there is no credit to be gained from any lengthy discussion of it. Further analysis could suggest that it was not Soviet actions that brought an end to détente but the emergence of a new regime in Washington which adopted a highly aggressive and ideological foreign policy towards the Soviet Union.

(e) 1982–1991

Candidates may point out that the tensions that had built up under Brezhnev had not been resolved by his immediate successors and it was these tensions that Gorbachev was to inherit and which were to have such a dramatic impact on Soviet foreign policy under his rule. As McCauley has argued: "If Lenin was the founder of the Soviet Union, Gorbachev was its grave digger."

While candidates may give due to attention to Gorbachev's domestic reforms, it was the changes he introduced to Soviet foreign policy which were of greater significance. His willingness to remove troops from Afghanistan, to unilaterally disarm and reject the Brezhnev doctrine will all require analysis. Candidates may decide that, while Gorbachev considered himself to be a communist, his refusal to maintain the buffer zone, his willingness to abandon the Brezhnev Doctrine and his rejection of Marxist-Leninism as an unassailable truth resulted in the most defensive foreign policy of any leader. Indeed, it was Gorbachev who oversaw the end of the Cold War and the subsequent collapse of communism throughout Europe and the Soviet Union.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.   [50]

50

2 "There were more similarities than differences in the aims and actions of the opponents of communism in Europe in the period 1917–1991." To what extent would you agree with this statement?

This question requires an assessment of both the aims and actions of the opponents of communism in the period 1917–1991.

Top level responses will reflect on both the aims and actions of different opponents of communism and assess to what degree they were similar, both in terms of what they tried to achieve and how they tried to achieve these aims.

The structure of the answer is immaterial: whether thematic or chronological, adherence to the issues in the question and the quality of evidence is the requirement for creditable marks.

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

(a) 1917–1933
Initially, one can observe a coherent policy of aggression from the opponents of communism that ranged from the diplomatic to the military in terms of its approach. Intervention by western powers during the Russian Civil War, the Polish attack on the USSR, the initial isolation at Versailles and omission from the League of Nations were evidence of this. For example, Hobsbawm argues that after the First World War the victorious allies wanted to "make the world safe from Bolshevism" by isolating it behind a *cordon sanitaire* of anti-communist states. However, this rapidly changed with the Treaty of Rapallo with Weimar Germany in 1922. Equally, mention could be made of the diplomatic ties that were established with Britain and France. No longer did their aim seem to be the destruction of the USSR, but rather an accommodation with the newest member of the international community.

However, British wariness could be highlighted as a consistent theme. Indeed, candidates may point out that the individual needs of different states varied throughout this early period. As Allan Todd has argued, Britain wanted stability in Europe so it could devote resources to managing its Empire.

(b) 1933–1939
From 1933 onwards Hitler made no secret of his loathing of Bolshevism and considered it to be an ideology that had to be destroyed. Candidates could note that Hitler, when writing about expansionism in *Mein Kampf*, stated: "If we speak of soil in Europe today, we can primarily have in mind only Russia". In other words, invasion of the USSR would bring the territorial expansion needed to gain living space for the German people and the regions of Eastern Europe would provide many of the raw materials needed for Germany to attain self-sufficiency. This could be regarded as the emergence of a new opponent of Soviet communism with distinctive aims and subsequently distinctive methods from other opponents.

Fascist opposition developed further with the Anti-Comintern pacts in 1936 between Germany and Japan and in 1937 when Italy under Mussolini joined. Here is quite clearly a return to the more aggressive approach that had existed in the early years after the October Revolution, although candidates may point out that the aims, and later the methods, were somewhat

different to those of the democratic states. This period also highlights that the original opponents of the Soviet Union were now adopting a policy of collective security with mutual assistance pacts established between France, Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union. However, with Munich, and indeed with regard to the Spanish Civil War, such diplomatic camaraderie lacked military teeth. With regard to the failure of collective security, candidates may point out that the democracies remained highly hostile to communism. As Todd has noted, Chamberlain was not alone in being extremely anti-communist. Answers might thus point out that there was in effect very little similarity of aims and methods amongst the opponents of communism but rather a period of turbulent change, which was to continue over the next six years.

(c) 1939–1945

The Nazi-Soviet Pact in 1939 failed to prevent the Nazi invasion of the USSR in 1941. This led to the democratic regimes joining with Stalin in "a marriage of convenience" to defeat the Axis powers. Here, in accordance with the greater threat presented to the former opponents of communism, it is quite evident that both the aims and methods had changed. Towards the end of the Second World War the democratic regimes were unable to prevent Stalin from liberating countries in Eastern Europe, even though initially there was some optimism that the war-time alliance might offer a longer lasting future of co-operation. Harry Hopkins believed that, after the Second World War, there was a "dawning of a new day."

(d) 1945–1953

The creation of a Soviet satellite empire behind an "Iron Curtain" led the capitalist democratic western powers to adopt a policy with the concrete aim of the containment, rather than the destruction, of communism. Greece is a notable exception. The methods employed were to be economic, diplomatic and military. Candidates can discuss the origins of the Cold War by expanding and integrating the competing interpretations of who was primarily responsible for the onset of the Cold War. The Truman Doctrine of 1947 illustrated America's determination to contain the spread of communism in Western Europe and the Marshall Plan gave vital economic aid to democratic states in Western Europe to produce stable economies, and thus reduce the chances of internal communist revolutions. The Berlin Airlift in 1948 secured the emerging German Federal Republic and the formation of NATO in April 1949 showed that the West was determined to limit the spread of communism to Eastern Europe. This is perhaps the most consistent period of policy from the opponents of communism, both in their aims and in the diplomatic and military means by which they attempted to achieve them. Obviously, candidates will note the pre-eminent role of the United States and some consideration could be given to the manner in which this facilitated a more coherent set of aims and means to be employed in order to achieve these objectives.

(e) 1953–1979

With the death of Stalin and the emergence of Khrushchev, candidates could argue that relationships and western foreign policy settled into a consistent pattern. The West was not prepared to intervene in the Soviet sphere of influence behind the "Iron Curtain" in Hungary in 1956 or Czechoslovakia in 1968 when the Soviets invaded. The acceptance of Eastern Europe as a Soviet sphere of influence was acknowledged in the Helsinki Accords of

1975. However, answers may argue that détente marked a shift in policy towards the Soviet Union, even if the protection of Western Europe remained central to US objectives. Stephen Ambrose viewed the United States' commitment to arms reductions as largely weak, pointing out that throughout the Nixon administration "the Pentagon added three new warheads a day to the MIRV arsenal."

(f) 1979–1991

The era of détente came to an end with the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan of 1979. United States President Jimmy Carter was to describe the Soviet involvement in Afghanistan as the greatest threat to world peace since the Second World War. This could be presented as a change in both the aims and methods of the opponents of communism as the US attempted to fuel the arms race and launched a renewal of the ideological battle. However, such policies were to change with the arrival of Gorbachev, as the Soviets effectively retreated from the international scene. In this regard the United States, as the primary opponent of communism, was caught unawares by the change in Soviet ambitions. The Americans were still operating under traditional Cold War assumptions and believed that the Soviet Union was still the "evil Empire" and found that they had to alter their own preconceptions. Once again, the methods changed and the West met the aspirations of Gorbachev to cut the respective nuclear arsenals.

Whether the aim of the opponents of communism was the destruction or containment of communism now became a moot point, for the eastern bloc collapsed, as the Soviet support system was withdrawn and the USSR crumbled internally.

Answers may point to periods when aims and methods were decidedly similar and observe that there was a recurrence of similar aims and methods at different junctures, depending on the broader historical scenario. Equally, certain periods stand out for their intensity of aggressive methods and distinctive aims, particularly the Nazi era.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.   [50]   50

	Option 5	**50**
	Total	**50**