



**ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education
2013**

History

Assessment Unit A2 2

[AH221]

WEDNESDAY 22 MAY, AFTERNOON

**MARK
SCHEME**

General Marking Instructions

Introduction

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

The Purpose of Mark Schemes

Examination papers are set and revised by teams of examiners and revisers appointed by the Council. The teams of examiners and revisers include experienced teachers who are familiar with the level and standards expected of students in schools and colleges.

The job of the examiners is to set the questions and the mark schemes; and the job of the revisers is to review the questions and mark schemes commenting on a large range of issues about which they must be satisfied before the question papers and mark schemes are finalised.

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

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

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

Level of response mark grid

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

AO1a recall, select and deploy historical knowledge accurately and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner;

AO1b present historical explanations, showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements;

AO2 In relation to historical context:

- interpret, evaluate and use a range of source material;
- explain and evaluate interpretations of historical events and topics studied.

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

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

OPTION 1: ENGLAND 1570–1603

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

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

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

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers will paraphrase the content of each source and make assertions that are not fully supported. For example, Source 1 mentions that there were different councillors offering advice to Elizabeth I. Source 2 mentions that William Cecil and his son, Robert, helped her to govern. Source 3 refers to several factors influencing her relations with the Privy Council.

Level 2 ([4]–[7])

Answers will comment on the value of the sources, using the content more fully. Source 1 is valuable because it is a source written in 1578 to Philip II of Spain. It mentions divisions among the members of Elizabeth's Privy Council. Source 2 is also valuable as it was written in 1596 when Elizabeth was clearly established as Queen. It is a private communication between father and son. Source 3 is valuable as it is a later interpretation of the Elizabethan style of government.

Level 3 ([8]–[11])

Answers will present a more sustained assessment of the value of each source and reach a credible conclusion. Source 1 is valuable as it is a private letter from the Spanish Ambassador to Philip II of Spain. It dates from the middle of Elizabeth's reign. He is commenting that there are divisions within her Privy Council. He states that he is finding it difficult to obtain an audience with the Queen as her Privy Council is protective of her and concerned about Philip's attitude towards Ireland. He states that there are two factions within the Court: those in favour of intervention in the Netherlands and those who are more cautious. Elizabeth has yet to decide what action to take. Source 2 is personal correspondence between Elizabeth's Chief Minister and his son. In it he outlines how he deals with Elizabeth. He is prepared to risk anger and rebuke from Elizabeth to put his point across. He maintains that he is a loyal servant of Elizabeth's but above all else he is loyal to his conscience and God. Source 3 is from Christopher Haigh who believes that Elizabeth controlled her Court and Privy Council through personal relationships, emotions and flirtation. He states that they are subject to her tantrums, as well as favour, yet they are also in an ideal position to offer advice.

Level 4 ([12]–[15])

Answers will use a wide range of criteria to assess value, commenting on the significance of the information provided, authorship, motive, viewpoint, audience and date. Contextual knowledge will be introduced to enhance the answer. Source 1 is valuable in commenting on the relationship between Elizabeth and her Privy Council as it is a private letter from the Spanish Ambassador to Philip II. Mendoza is working for Philip. At this time Elizabeth and Philip have become rivals due to a variety of factors. She has refused his marriage proposal and has established a Protestant Church. To improve the English economy she has sought to extend her trade routes. Her pirates have been attacking Spanish ships. Philip has become an opponent of Elizabeth since her excommunication in 1570. He has also become involved in plots regarding Mary, Queen of Scots. The source informs Philip that Elizabeth is taking advice regarding the Netherlands. Philip is facing rebellion from this part of his kingdom and wishes to find out Elizabeth's intentions. Like the Netherlands, England is a Protestant nation. More importantly, Elizabeth needs to protect English trade with the Netherlands. He implies that factions will present Elizabeth with proposals but in the end the decision is always left to her. He also claims that there is great loyalty towards Elizabeth and her Privy Council will protect her at all costs. The source is limited in that it is from an outsider at Court who would not have Elizabeth's confidence. It does not mention specific factions but only opinions on one specific area of concern. Source 2 is written in 1596, when Elizabeth has been on the throne for over 30 years. Her relationship with William Cecil has been the cornerstone of her reign. Elizabeth has always proved difficult to manage but, unlike other favourites, Cecil has always been willing to express his honest opinion regardless of the reaction he would receive. In this source he is offering advice to his son on how best to manage Elizabeth. This implies that Robert Cecil has some concerns regarding Elizabeth. It is limited in that it does not mention disunity within the Queen's Privy Council and it does not tell us what her relationship with Robert is like. Source 3 is from a revisionist historian, Haigh, who tells us a little bit more about Elizabeth's relationship with her Court and Privy Council. He maintains that she rules through a series of personal relationships, everything depending on her. He also mentions that, though she always appeared in control, on occasions she did heed good advice. [15]

- (b) Use all the sources and other evidence you have studied.** How far do the sources support the view that Elizabeth I managed her Privy Council through the use of factions in the period 1570–1603?

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

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

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

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

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement **AO1(b)**. For example, the sources suggest that Elizabeth controlled her Privy Council partly through the use of factions. From the beginning of her reign, Elizabeth played the factions off against each other and was therefore always able to remain firmly in control. Advisors were well respected and efficient but they were never in control of their own destiny. England, and the position of favourites, always depended on Elizabeth **AO2(a)**.

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

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgement are developed and substantiated **AO1(b)**. For example, the sources all suggest that Elizabeth's Court was full of tension and divisions. Elizabeth used these divisions to control her Privy Council. The answers will address the sources. Mendoza in Source 1 informs Philip that Elizabeth took advice in the Privy Council from different advisers and factions. Ministers were able to offer advice but in the end the decision was always hers. Mendoza informs us that this is how she continues to rule. In 1578 faction politics dominates foreign policy and the question of the Netherlands. Elizabeth takes advice from a variety of factions but the decisions remain with her. Source 2 expresses the views of William Cecil over the question of how to handle her. Robert Cecil is taking advice from his father who has been the only member of Court to work with Elizabeth successfully. Haigh informs us that Elizabethan government was based on the use of factions and personal relationships. The Privy Council would not survive without good relations with Elizabeth **AO2(a)**.

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

Answers at this level will consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are very well developed and substantiated **AO1(b)**. Elizabeth I was going to have difficulty ruling her Privy Council. A female, and seen by many as a heretic, she knew that she had to appear strong and forceful when dealing with her Privy Council. Elizabeth's Privy Council was full of able men, yet they never dominated. Elizabeth was always at the centre of government. Answers will interpret and evaluate the sources fully in relation to their historical context. For example, Source 1 gives us a glimpse of her

style of government. It not only supports the view that factions were present in her Court but that she was always in control. It also implies that, by keeping factions at a distance, she somehow created loyalty from her Court, as each faction sought her favour. Source 2 is dated just before William Cecil's death. He is handing the reins of government over to his son. He is offering him advice on how to manage Elizabeth. Source 3 looks at another side of Elizabeth's relationship with her Privy Council, the personal relationship. Elizabeth was wise and took advice but she was also known for losing control of her Privy Council. Factions witnessed the human side of Elizabeth through her tantrums and whims. The source also mentions that privy councillors were well placed and this implies that on occasions they were able to sway policy in their favour. The answer may also mention other methods Elizabeth used to manage her Privy Council. She used her presence and involvement in all decisions to manage it. By being present, many were often reluctant to oppose her. Elizabeth was a practical monarch and therefore made all the decisions herself. This often annoyed her Privy Council but kept her in control **AO2(a)**. [20]

35

- 2 (a) To what extent would you agree that Elizabeth I's policy towards Spain in the period 1570–1603 lacked consistency? Use relevant evidence you have studied including contemporary and later interpretations to support your answer.

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

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

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. Answers at this level may be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. There will be little or no awareness of contemporary or later interpretations of this subject. Answers may give a narrative account of Anglo-Spanish relations. They may focus on the Spanish Armada. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

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

Answers at this level will select and deploy historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. There will be some awareness of contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development. The answer will have supporting evidence, providing some examples of the inconsistency of Elizabeth I's policy towards Spain. In 1558 relations were good and there was even the prospect of marriage between Elizabeth and Philip II. However, as her reign progressed, tension grew and Elizabeth reacted to events as they occurred. This led to a declaration of war in 1585. Traditional interpretations comment on the inconsistency of Elizabeth I's policy towards Spain, arguing that it had no clear aim and, because of this, events led to war. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to illegibility, inaccurate spelling, punctuation or grammar; at times, the style of writing will be inappropriate. There may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

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

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. There will be a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject **or** a partial evaluation of **both**. Answers may focus on inconsistencies in Elizabeth I's policy but may also mention its consistency. In 1558, relations were good and Elizabeth looked to Spain as an ally. Once she was secure in her position, she ignored this alliance and looked to boost her economy by supporting her pirates against Spanish trading ships. She chose to ignore her pirates' actions, yet at the same time accepted their booty. However, it can be argued that Elizabeth's policy displayed consistency. At the heart of everything was Elizabeth's desire for internal security. This motivated her policy. Elizabeth did everything to avoid war and protect England. In the end, events were taken out of her hands.

Contemporary interpretations could include, for example, observations by members of Elizabeth's Privy Council and military forces who were frustrated with her. They believed that her policy towards Spain lacked consistency and, as a woman having little experience of war, she could not make an informed judgement. Historians' interpretations could include, for example, later interpretations which have been kinder to Elizabeth. Limited resources meant that she could not pursue an active policy towards Spain. Revisionists believe that Elizabeth's policy was the only one she could have taken. England was not a great nation and therefore had to follow rather than lead. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

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

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis are very well developed and substantiated. Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of this subject. Answers will attempt in a more definite and sustained way an assessment of how consistent Elizabeth's policy towards Spain was in the period 1570–1603. Relations developed from friend to foe and this can be used to highlight inconsistency. It appears that Elizabeth never had a clear aim in her policy towards Spain. She merely reacted to and exploited events as she thought fit. However, throughout the period she was only ever concerned with internal security, protection of England and the cloth trade. This is reflected in her policy towards Spain and illustrates consistency. Her main priority throughout this period was protection of the Netherlands. At all costs she wanted to avoid conflict with Spain and because of this refused to become involved in the Netherlands until pushed. She consistently offered aid to the Netherlands in the form of unofficial help and then official involvement. It was not until 1584, with Spain signing the Treaty of Joinville with France, that she became directly involved in the Netherlands. Throughout her reign she consistently tried to avoid becoming the Protestant champion of the Netherlands, and it was Philip's actions which altered this policy and drove her towards help in the Netherlands. Elizabeth consistently wished to avoid conflict and never officially sanctioned the actions of her pirates. However, as one of her aims was to strengthen England's economy, she did exploit their rewards. Elizabeth's stand towards Spain remained consistent, since she aimed to avoid war at all costs and strengthen and protect England's trade. It was Philip's attitude which altered and made war inevitable. At the beginning of her reign Philip had offered his hand in marriage, yet as time progressed his attitude changed. He supported internal religious rebellions and rebels in England, as well as in his dealings in the Netherlands, actions which Elizabeth could not ignore. Elizabeth had to strengthen and defend her nation, and this led to war. Contemporary interpretations could include, for example, the opinion of the anti-Spanish faction in her Court. It believed that Elizabeth I had no policy towards Spain. Ministers such as Cecil and Dudley urged her to defend herself against Philip II. Historians' interpretations could include, for example, traditional interpretations which maintain that her policy lacked direction and consistency. Many revisionists believe that Elizabeth I's policy was consistent in that she protected and secured trading with the Netherlands. Yet there are others who argue that Elizabeth's cautious approach to the Netherlands led to conflict. If her policy had been more decisive, war would not have occurred. Inconsistency led to conflicting signals which resulted in war. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate; there is very good organisation and use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. [35]

- (b) How far would you support the view that Catholicism posed a significant threat to Elizabeth I in the period 1570–1603? Use relevant evidence you have studied including contemporary and later interpretations to support your answer.

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

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

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. Answers at this level may be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. There will be little or no awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject. The answer may give a narrative account of Catholicism in Elizabethan England but fail to focus on the threat it posed. Meaning may not always be clear because of inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

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

Answers at this level will select and deploy historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. There will be some awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development. The answer will have supporting evidence. For example, it may focus on the assumption that Catholicism posed a significant threat because the Pope urged English Catholics to depose and attack Elizabeth. They may mention plots such as those of Ridolfi and Babington. They may also look at the role of Mary, Queen of Scots. The answer will fail to analyse how significant a threat Catholicism posed to Elizabeth I and it will be a narrative response. Contemporary and traditional interpretations believe that Catholicism posed a significant threat to Elizabeth I. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to illegibility, inaccurate spelling and punctuation or, at times, the style of writing will be inappropriate. There may be occasional flaws, with defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

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

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. There will be a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject **or** a partial evaluation of **both**. Answers may focus on a range of Catholic threats coming from inside and outside Elizabeth I's kingdom. Not only will the answer deal with internal threats posed by the various plots and Mary, Queen of Scots, but will also mention the impact of missionary and seminary priests. It may look at their role and popularity in England. The answer may also look at the role of the Pope and his excommunication of Elizabeth I. It may also mention the involvement of Spain in England and Ireland. The answer may look at Elizabeth's handling of the Catholics through policy and legislation. She chose a Church Settlement to try to avoid confrontation. Answers may also address Elizabeth's handling of the Catholics and assess whether this increased the threat they posed. Contemporary interpretations could include, for example, contemporary opinion which believed that Catholicism posed a significant threat to Elizabeth I. This was partly due to the legacy of Henry VIII's anti-Catholic propaganda to ensure that his Reformation was accepted. Traditional interpretations by historians also maintained that Catholicism posed a significant threat to Elizabeth I. Answers may assess how significant these threats were, not just in terms of religion but also politics. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

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

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis are very well developed and substantiated. Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of this subject. Answers will address the question by looking at the significance of the threat posed by Catholicism. Most of Elizabeth's subjects remained loyal to her as her Church Settlement was used as a political tool rather than a religious manifesto. She had learnt from the mistakes of her sister, Mary I, and was not concerned with the religion of her subjects as long as there was uniformity. Plots were not great in number and, once Mary was executed, the majority of Catholics were content. Although her Council feared a European Catholic conspiracy, this failed to materialise, despite the signing of the Treaty of Joinville. The Catholics had the potential to become a significant threat but, due to Elizabeth's handling of them, they remained loyal. Contemporary interpretations could include, for example, the opinion of Elizabeth's Court and Privy Council and how they believed that Catholics were a significant threat. They may also

include the opinions of those in Europe. Historians' interpretations could include, for example, traditional historians who were in favour of the Protestant Reformation and therefore exaggerated the threat posed by Catholicism. Revisionists believe that their threat was not that significant. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate; there is very good organisation and use of specialist vocabulary. [35]

Option 1

AVAILABLE
MARKS

35

70

OPTION 2: IRELAND 1607–1691

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

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

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

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers will paraphrase the content of each source and make assertions that are not fully supported. There may be some reference to the role of Tyrconnell, but it will lack any depth or development.

Level 2 ([4]–[7])

Answers will comment on the value of the sources, using the content more fully. Source 1 is valuable because it is from the Earl of Clarendon, who was Lord Lieutenant in Ireland in the early part of James II's reign (1686–1687). His comments on his successor are extremely revealing. The author of Source 2 is also a key observer of events in this period and, as Louis XIV's ambassador to the Court of St James, will wish to keep his master fully informed of developments in relation to his royal ally. The third source, from Mark Kishlansky, gives a succinct assessment of the impact of Tyrconnell – James's appointee – as Lord Deputy of Ireland.

Level 3 ([8]–[11])

Answers will present a more sustained assessment of the value of each source and reach a credible conclusion. Answers at this level will note that in Source 1 Clarendon provides a damning assessment of the character of the man to whom James has seen fit to entrust with the government of Ireland. This obviously reflects negatively on Tyrconnell but also on the King, whose judgement is called into question. In Source 2 Barillon notes that, while many leading English Catholics look with disdain upon Tyrconnell, he clearly has the complete confidence of the King, both personally and in relation to the reforms he is introducing in Ireland. Source 3's main value is perhaps that it gives more information on these policies, which are obviously applied in the King's name and therefore directly relevant to the question.

Level 4 ([12]–[15])

Answers will use a wide range of criteria to assess value, commenting on the significance of the information provided, authorship, motive, viewpoint, audience and date. Contextual knowledge will be introduced to enhance the answer. For example, Source 2 is valuable because of the quality of the informant. Candidates may note that

Barillon is a very able and intelligent man whose observations are both sharp and reliable. Answers may elaborate on some of the points raised at Levels 2 and 3, but there will generally be more balance in relation to the value of the sources. While Source 1 gives an assessment of the key figure responsible for royal policy in Ireland, more astute candidates will note that the author, Clarendon, the victim of Tyrconnell's machinations to undermine him and have him removed, is not a dispassionate commentator. Good candidates may make a cross-reference with Source 3. Source 2's value is somewhat limited by the fact that its date means that it cannot comment on events in 1688 (as is also the case with Source 1), but reference can be made to Source 3 in relation to the role of the Irish Parliament in putting the general policy of Catholicisation into effect. The replacement of sheriffs and borough charters, which Kishlansky comments on in Source 3, is the necessary first stage in preparing for the meeting of a suitably pliant Parliament (eventually to convene between May and July 1689). Therefore all the sources have some value, even though none makes explicit mention of 1688. Judgement would be expected from top-level candidates, who may nominate Source 3, because of its scope, detail and objectivity, although this does not preclude a contrary assessment. [15]

- (b) Use all the sources and other evidence you have studied.** How far do the sources support the view that James II's appointment of Tyrconnell as Lord Deputy in 1687 was the most important mistake he made in his handling of Irish affairs in the period 1685–1688?

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

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

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement **AO1(b)**. For example, there may be a generalised reference to Tyrconnell's appointment by James but there will be no substantive argument. Answers may rely on paraphrasing the sources or provide a narrative of the subject with little reference to the sources **AO2(a)**.

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

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement **AO1(b)**. All three sources (but especially Sources 1 and 3) support the view that the appointment of Tyrconnell as Lord Deputy was James II's most important mistake in his handling of Irish

affairs in the period 1685–1688 by raising real questions about Tyrconnell’s character and his suitability for such a demanding and sensitive position. Source 3 would suggest that James’s personal relationship with Tyrconnell clouded his judgement, but in Source 2, the French ambassador reports that Tyrconnell is very much carrying out the King’s will in Ireland, and by extension his appointment as Lord Deputy was quite a calculated one **AO2(a)**.

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

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgement are developed and substantiated **AO1(b)**. The elevation of Tyrconnell to the position of Lord Deputy in 1687 can be seen as James II’s most important mistake in his handling of Irish affairs in the period 1685–1688 in that it alienated Protestant opinion and created opposition to the King, especially in the north of Ireland. Although James demonstrated some awareness of Protestant sensitivities, in that Tyrconnell was made Lord Deputy rather than Lord Lieutenant (the latter position remaining vacant), the bestowal of this title was probably seen by most Irish Protestants as simply a gesture to placate them, while Tyrconnell pursued on all fronts a policy of ruthless Catholicisation – with the King’s unqualified approval. The sources might be used to support these arguments, such as Source 3’s mention of Protestant refugees fleeing Ireland on the arrival of the new Lord Deputy, and Source 2’s reference to James’s “great satisfaction” with Tyrconnell’s “measures”. Candidates might also begin to refer to other mistakes made by James II in relation to Irish affairs in the period in question, such as the dismissal of Clarendon as Lord Lieutenant, an able and loyal servant to the King, under whom Ireland might have remained quiet **AO2(a)**.

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

Answers at this level will consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are very well developed and substantiated **AO1(b)**. For example, good candidates might argue that it was not Tyrconnell’s appointment as Lord Deputy that was James II’s most important mistake in his handling of Irish affairs in the period 1685–1688, but rather his appointment of Tyrconnell as Lieutenant-General in command of the Irish army in 1685. Thus begins the remodelling of the Irish army as a Catholic force, raising fears among Irish Protestants for their security, and exactly matching James’s own actions in relation to the army in England. However, while there is a case to be made that Tyrconnell intended to go much further than James ever intended as Lord Deputy, envisaging a complete break with England, there is a plausible argument that in the period 1685–1688, Tyrconnell was hand-picked by his royal master to ultimately dispense with Protestant privilege and rule in Ireland. Indeed, at the outset of the reign he was marked for distinction by being raised to the peerage. Candidates might also note that James’s relationship with Tyrconnell was of long standing, and probably

influenced the King in the power and influence he was prepared to grant his friend. This all adds up to the appointment of Tyrconnell as Lord Deputy in 1687 indeed being James II's most important mistake in his handling of Irish affairs in the period 1685–1688, although this does not preclude an opposing argument and conclusion. Answers will interpret and evaluate the sources fully in relation to their historical context. For example, Source 3 refers to the essential elements of the “new Ireland” being fashioned by Tyrconnell: a Catholic army and a Catholic Parliament, which would ultimately be tasked with reversing the land settlement of previous reigns. Source 2's mention of the leading English Catholics' view of Tyrconnell could be interpreted as a fear that the pace of Tyrconnell's reforms will result in a political backlash by the political establishment, to its own cost, and perhaps shows an insight into Tyrconnell's anti-English as well as anti-Protestant position **AO2(a)**. [20]

35

- 2 (a) “The unofficial plantation of Antrim and Down was a total success, but the official plantation in other counties was a total failure.” How far do you agree with this assessment of the Plantation of Ulster up to 1636? Use relevant evidence you have studied including contemporary and later interpretations to support your answer.

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

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

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. Answers at this level may be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. There will be little or no awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject. Candidates may be aware of the influx of Scottish settlers into the eastern counties, but this will lack depth and development. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

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

Answers at this level will select and deploy historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. There will be some awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations

of the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development. The answer will have supporting evidence. For example, reference may be made to the contribution of the Scottish entrepreneurs, James Hamilton and Hugh Montgomery, in promoting Scottish settlement in Antrim and Down, and how this contrasts with the difficulties some undertakers had in attracting sufficient settlers to the official plantation. There may be some reference to an historian such as Bardon, or contemporary opinion from a Crown official, in providing a contrast between the plantation in Antrim and Down and that further west. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to illegibility, inaccurate spelling, punctuation or grammar; at times, the style of writing will be inappropriate. There may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

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

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. There will be a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject **or** a partial evaluation of **both**. Answers may focus on the greater density of settlers in Antrim and Down, which is what really sets them apart from the official Crown colonisation of counties Armagh, Donegal, Cavan, Londonderry, Fermanagh and Tyrone. Although the settlement of Antrim and Down was not an official Crown operation, it might be noted that, as a Scottish King, James I showed special favour to his fellow-countrymen Hamilton and Montgomery in their private enterprise, and certainly did nothing to hinder their attempt to extract a title to vast areas of north Down from the unfortunate native landowner, Con O'Neill. While the Scottish settlement thrived, particularly in south Antrim and north Down, the pattern of settlement was much more patchy, and much less dense, in the official plantation counties to the west. The specific problem was that many undertakers failed to fulfil their settler quotas, while many would-be colonists (especially from England) gave up after a short time and returned to Britain. Candidates could employ contemporary material such as official government correspondence or private letters from colonists or those advertising the Plantation. Candidates may include an observation by an historian such as Robinson about particular aspects of the impact of British settlement, such as the spread of the English language and the Protestant religion. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

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

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis are very well developed and substantiated. Answers will provide a

good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of this subject. Answers will attempt in a more definite and sustained way an assessment of the outcome of plantation in Antrim and Down, as well as the official plantation. Candidates might argue that, in support of the proposition, the counties of Antrim and Down had a geographic advantage over the planted counties to the west in their closer proximity to the British mainland, and especially Scotland, which in essence provided the backbone for the plantation. However, answers at this level will provide a more balanced argument in relation to the proposition, noting that while, for example, a government survey of 1622 (an example of contemporary evidence that a candidate might deploy) recorded a British population in the official plantation of around 13000, and the Antrim and Down plantation was estimated to have a British population of 7,500 in the 1620s, these figures do not tell the whole story. The British (mainly Scottish) settlement in the eastern counties was concentrated in north Down (Hamilton and Montgomery) and south Antrim (Chichester), but the Glens of Antrim and south Down remained largely in Gaelic Irish hands. Conversely, the official plantation was notably successful in attracting British (again mainly Scottish) settlers to places such as east Donegal, Londonderry (where the new towns of Londonderry and Coleraine were established) and west Tyrone. It could also be argued that population statistics are not the only relevant measure by which to judge the success or failure of either plantation, with the spread of the Protestant religion (especially the Presbyterian Church), the English legal system, British culture and a new commercial and economic infrastructure providing evidence that success in the plantation enterprise was not limited to Antrim and Down, nor its failures exclusive to the six counties of the official plantation. Here candidates could refer to the observations of historians such as Falls or Canny in comparing the official and unofficial plantations. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate; there is very good organisation and use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. [35]

- (b) “In view of the course of the Williamite Wars, the terms of the Treaty of Limerick (1691) were relatively generous to the Jacobites.” To what extent would you agree with this statement? Use relevant evidence you have studied including contemporary and later interpretations to support your answer.

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

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

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

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

Answers at this level will select and deploy historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. There will be some awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development. The answer will have supporting evidence. For example, candidates may demonstrate some awareness of the clauses that made up the treaty, such as the right of Jacobite soldiers to return to their homes without any penalty being imposed on either their person or property. With regard to interpretations, candidates may be able to deploy some quotations from the Treaty of Limerick itself, or make reference to the comments of historians such as Beckett on the treaty. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to illegibility, inaccurate spelling and punctuation or, at times, the style of writing will be inappropriate. There may be occasional flaws, with defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

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

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. There will be a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject **or** a partial evaluation of **both**. Answers may focus on the fact that, despite losing the war against the forces of William III, the Catholic Jacobites were “allowed such privileges in their exercise of their religion as are consistent with the laws of Ireland, or as they did enjoy in the reign of King Charles II”. Furthermore, they were not required to take any oath other than the oath of allegiance to William and Mary; in other words they were not required to deny their faith. Candidates could employ contemporary material such as the comments or views of those serving with the Jacobites, that is, the perspective of the defeated. Candidates may include the views of an historian such as Simms to give an overview of

the Williamite Wars and explain why this treaty was in everyone's interests at that moment. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

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

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis are very well developed and substantiated. Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of this subject. Answers will attempt in a more definite and sustained way an assessment of the treaty and may be prepared to challenge the proposition. On the surface, the Treaty of Limerick did indeed appear generous to an enemy who had been defeated in every major engagement of the war since the Siege of Derry. However, one of the main clauses of the treaty – that permitting Jacobite troops and their families to take a ship to the continent (12 000 of whom did so – the “wild geese”) – was arguably a calculated move on the part of the government to avert further guerrilla resistance to William's cause in Ireland. Candidates might here apply contemporary interpretations in the form of opinions of those who negotiated the treaty on behalf of William III – in other words, the perspective of the victors. This might lead to consideration of the treaty in the context not just of the war in Ireland but of the wider European conflict, of which this was a part. Arguably, William was prepared to grant generous terms at Limerick in order to close this theatre of the war and allow him to focus on the struggle against Louis XIV on the continent and at sea. This analysis could be supported by the deployment of the observations of historians such as Hoppit and Foster. Better informed candidates might argue that the treaty was also fundamentally flawed in relation to what has come to be known as the “missing clause”, which would have extended the terms to all Irish Catholics and not just those in arms in October 1691. Such a clause had indeed been drafted, but was omitted from the final version of the treaty. It could also be pointed out that it was some considerable time before the Irish Parliament actually ratified the Treaty of Limerick, and then only in a much diluted form. More able candidates will acknowledge that there is a case to be made on both sides of the proposition. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate; there is very good organisation and use of specialist vocabulary. [35]

Option 2

35

70

OPTION 3: IRELAND 1775–1800

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

- 1 (a) Consult all the sources and your knowledge of this period. Which of the sources would an historian value most as evidence in a study of the development of the United Irishmen in Ulster?

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

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers will paraphrase the content of each source and make assertions that are not fully supported. There may be a basic awareness of the development of the United Irishmen in Ulster but without detail or depth.

Level 2 ([4]–[7])

Answers will comment on the value of the sources, using the content more fully. Source 1 is valuable because it is written by a contemporary observer who is seeking to inform the local great landowner. The value of Source 2 is also linked to its authorship, as John Lennon has experienced at first-hand the violence in Armagh and been forced to flee the area. The third source, by the established historian Marianne Elliott, gives a useful overview of the subject and notes how recruitment to the United Irishmen benefited from sectarian tensions.

Level 3 ([8]–[11])

Answers will present a more sustained assessment of the value of each source and reach a credible conclusion. Answers at this level will note that Source 1 gives a significant range, if not depth, of information. Dr Richardson will want to be as accurate as possible in his account to the Duke of Abercorn, one of the greatest landowners in County Tyrone and someone concerned about any possible threat to his property. Source 2 provides a graphic picture of the terror being experienced in County Armagh and how Catholics such as John Lennon want to seek protection wherever they can find it. Marianne Elliott (Source 3) places these developments in a wider context, showing how the United Irishmen were able to exploit not just present fears but long-time animosity to attract new members from the beleaguered Catholic tenantry in general and the Defenders in particular.

Level 4 ([12]–[15])

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

value in terms of content and authorship, none of the sources gives any detail about the size of any of the factions, or the numbers joining the United Irishmen as a result of these disturbances. Furthermore, Source 2 was not published until 1843, some 50 years after the events being described. This calls into question the reliability of the author, both in terms of accuracy of memory but also impartiality. Good candidates might also argue that, while the County Armagh disturbances were an important factor in stimulating the growth of the United Irishmen in the mid- to late-1790s, it was not the only one. In fact, Source 1 alludes to two other such factors – the prospect of French intervention (Dr Richardson is writing shortly after a French expedition had almost landed in Ireland at the end of 1796), and the inequities of the system of justice (the latter also referred to in Source 2). Source 3 also refers to the impact of the United Irishmen's propaganda and the French Revolution on recruitment. At this level, a clear judgement would be expected from candidates, and a case can be made for Source 1 as the most valuable of the three, but a credible argument can also be mounted for Source 3, while Source 2 is not necessarily precluded from nomination. [15]

- (b) Use all the sources and other evidence you have studied.** How far do the sources support the view that sectarian unrest was the main factor in the development of the United Irishmen in Ulster in the mid-1790s?

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

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

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement **AO1(b)**. For example, there may be an awareness of sectarian strife in County Armagh, but there will be no depth or development. Answers may rely on paraphrasing the sources or provide a narrative of the subject with little reference to the sources **AO2(a)**.

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

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement **AO1(b)**. For example, all three sources refer to the sectarian faction fights that characterised this period, especially in County Armagh. Source 1 provides some detail on the Peep o' Day Boys, their successors, the Orange Order, and the Defenders, noting that the United Irishmen interjected themselves into this situation ultimately to boost their membership. Source 3 corroborates Source 1

to an extent, remarking that “fears of Orangeism drove” Catholics/Defenders into the ranks of the United Irishmen. For its part, Source 2 clearly shows the desperate circumstances in which many Catholics found themselves, without recourse to the protection of the law, a situation where other options would have to be sought for self-preservation **AO2(a)**.

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

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgement are developed and substantiated **AO1(b)**. For example, candidates might note that the civil unrest in Ulster had been endemic since the mid-1780s, if not earlier, and that United Irish leaders saw the potential to expand their movement by offering refuge and hope to the Catholics and Defenders under attack. Indeed, an expanded movement was essential if an insurrection were to succeed. The answers will address the sources, and in relation to the previous point, Source 1 can be usefully deployed, with its references to “the threat of insurrection” and the promise of “French support”. Both Source 1 and Source 3, however, suggest that the main agency in this recruitment drive was not the United Irishmen but rather, albeit unintentionally, the Orange Order. Either way, the evidence presented can be utilised to support the proposition. Source 2 adds that there is no legal redress to be sought due to the pro-Orange sympathies of most magistrates, which by implication leaves Catholic victims to seek alternative solutions to their plight. Initially, this was offered by the Defenders, but with the Orange onslaught after the Battle of the Diamond (referred to in Sources 1 and 3), the opening was now there for the United Irishmen to offer a way out of the crisis **AO2(a)**.

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

Answers at this level will consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are very well developed and substantiated **AO1(b)**. For example, candidates may note that, while the sectarian disturbances in Ulster remained the backdrop to the growth of the United Irishmen, a formal alliance with the Defenders had in fact been sought and secured before the Battle of the Diamond in 1795, so there was a degree of strategic thinking behind United Irish activities, not just a fortuitous presence “on the ground” when Peep o’ Day/Orange violence created a Catholic surge towards the revolutionary movement. Having said that, the Battle of the Diamond (21 September 1795, with a death toll estimated between 25 and 45) was a turning point in terms of the intensification and escalation of the sectarian conflict in County Armagh and adjacent areas (indeed, the county had been relatively quiet for some months up to this clash), and the United Irishmen, partly by design, but also partly by accident, found their ranks swelling with new recruits. In a two-month period alone, an estimated 7000 Catholics fled County Armagh. Candidates will have to consider other factors relating to the growth of the United Irishmen in the

mid-1790s, such as the alliance with France (referred to in Source 1). The prospect of French intervention, especially after the “near-miss” at Bantry Bay in December 1796, undoubtedly encouraged many to join the movement, while the failure of the government to grant Catholic emancipation pushed many moderate Catholics away from constitutional politics and onto a revolutionary path. Answers will interpret and evaluate the sources fully in relation to their historical context. For example, while all the sources focus on the sectarian unrest, they also highlight other factors relevant to the growth of the United Irishmen in these years, such as the inequity of the existing system of “justice” (Sources 1 and 2), which led many to conclude that only revolution would bring reform. Other factors include French aid (Source 1), propaganda and the ideals inspired by the French Revolution (Source 3). In addition, Source 3 recognises that the ideal of uniting all Irishmen in the revolutionary cause was unrealistic in many places, while the Catholic Defenders offered at least numbers and an improved chance of a successful rebellion – in theory, at least. Since 1793, when war with France broke out and the United Irishmen were proscribed, revolution had been their goal. The unrest in southern Ulster, by boosting the number of United Irishmen (to an estimated 50 000 in 1797, the so-called year of lost opportunity), made that goal realistic. It might be anticipated that candidates will on the whole support the proposition, but this does not preclude alternative verdicts; all answers will be assessed on the quality of argument presented **AO2(a)**. [20]

35

- 2 (a) “The American War of Independence was the most important influence on the Patriots’ campaign for reform during the period 1775–1782.” How far would you agree with this assessment? Use relevant evidence you have studied including contemporary and later interpretations to support your answer.

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

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

AO1(b): Knowledge:

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. Answers at this level may be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. There will be little or no awareness of either contemporary or later interpretations of the subject. There may be a

general awareness that the Patriots identified with the cause of the American colonists. Meaning may not always be clear because of inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

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

Answers at this level will select and deploy historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. There will be some awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development. The answer will have supporting evidence. For example, reference might be made to the many family ties that existed between Ireland, more particularly Ulster, and the American colonies, and how there was a sense of shared grievance against British rule between Irish Patriots and American rebels. In terms of contemporary interpretation, reference may be made to the views of Irish opposition MPs, or in terms of later interpretation, to the opinions of historians such as Beckett. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to illegibility, inaccurate spelling and punctuation or grammar; at times, the style of writing will be inappropriate. There may be occasional flaws, with defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

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

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. There will be a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject or a partial evaluation of both. Answers may focus on how the American War created the circumstances in which the Patriots had some leverage to exact concessions from the British Government. This is perhaps best exemplified by the creation of the Volunteers – due to Britain having to withdraw troops stationed in Ireland to fight in America – who applied extra-parliamentary pressure in support of the Patriot campaign for free trade, which was achieved in December 1779. It was also the case that the American plea for “no taxation without representation” resonated with Irish Patriots and may have prompted them to seek further legislative reform. Candidates could employ contemporary material such as the views of the Earl of Buckinghamshire, who was the Lord Lieutenant for most of this period. Candidates may include the views of an historian such as Smyth in considering the impact of the American War on Irish politics and society. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

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

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis are very well developed and substantiated. There will be a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of this subject. Answers will attempt in a more definite and sustained way an assessment of the motivating factors behind the reform campaign of the Irish Patriots. While acknowledging and developing the factors referred to above, candidates at this level will recognise that there were other factors influencing the Patriots. One of these influences was the Volunteers, who became in effect the Patriots' extra-parliamentary pressure group. Candidates may refer to the views of historians such as Smyth to support their analysis of the Volunteer movement. However, the Volunteers soon acquired their own identity and momentum as a political reform group, pushing the Patriots further and faster than they may have wished to go. Reference may be made here to contemporary opinion in the form of the resolutions passed at the various Volunteer conventions in this period, for example, that held at Dungannon in February 1782. Candidates may also note longer-term or residual influences on the Patriots, such as the ideas of Swift and Molyneux. Another factor that may be referred to is the economic depression in Ireland at this time – a direct consequence of the severing of trade links with North America due to the war, but a factor with its own points of reference and its own particular impact on Irish politics in this period and Patriot arguments in Parliament. Good candidates may offer a judgement as to what was the main influence on the Patriots, but there will be an acceptance that a range of factors was at play. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate; there is very good organisation and use of specialist vocabulary. [35]

- (b) “The prospect of greater security against internal unrest was what persuaded the Irish Parliament to vote itself out of existence in 1800.” How far do you agree with this assessment of the passing of the Act of Union? Use relevant evidence you have studied including contemporary and later interpretations to support your answer.

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

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

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

form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. Answers at this level may be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. There will be little or no awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject. There may be a general reference to the Irish Parliament reacting to the Rebellion of 1798. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

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

Answers at this level will select and deploy historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. There will be some awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development. The answer will have supporting evidence. For example, reference might be made to the role of Castlereagh and Cornwallis in influencing Irish parliamentary opinion. There might also be a more detailed focus on the shock suffered by the Protestant Ascendancy due to the United Irishmen's rising and the prospect of greater security that the Union appeared to offer. In terms of contemporary interpretations, reference may be made to the views of Irish MPs during the debates on the Union Bill or in terms of later interpretations, to the opinions of historians such as Geoghegan. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to illegibility, inaccurate spelling, punctuation or grammar; at times, the style of writing will be inappropriate. There may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

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

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. There will be a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject **or** a partial evaluation of **both**. Answers may focus on the fact that it was the parliamentary classes – the Ascendancy – that clearly were the most threatened by the 1798 Rebellion, as they had the most to lose. A new constitutional arrangement which could provide greater security against internal unrest, as some supporters of the Union argued, clearly had its merits for this group. Yet the fear of revolution was not sufficient to persuade a majority of the Irish House of Commons to support the idea of a Union. When a motion opposing a proposed Union was debated on 23 January 1799, it was passed by 111 votes to 106. Candidates might argue that other factors were more important in swaying parliamentary opinion, such as the dispensing of patronage, the prospect of economic and commercial progress and, for the Church of Ireland, a guarantee that it would retain its status as the Established

Church. Candidates could employ contemporary material such as the views of the principal manager of the Union Bill through the Irish Parliament, the Chief Secretary Lord Castlereagh. Candidates may include the views of an historian such as Hinde to gain an insight into the debates on the Union question. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

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

AO1(b): Knowledge:

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis are very well developed and substantiated. Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of this subject. Answers will attempt in a more definite and sustained way an assessment of the factors that persuaded the Irish Parliament to accept Union with Britain. Consideration of contemporary opinion might include reference to the man who is generally credited with the conception of the idea of an Anglo-Irish Union, the British Prime Minister William Pitt. In relation to the proposition, it could be argued that the threat of internal unrest remained a potent one while war continued with France, especially bearing in mind the not insignificant involvement of Britain's enemy in the Rebellion of 1798. Although the rebellion had been defeated, Napoleon continued to plan an invasion of Britain, so no one, including Ireland's ruling classes, could afford to let their guard drop. Therefore, the prospect of greater security against internal insurgency, encouraged by France, can be presented as a credible argument for the passing of the Union. However, candidates may also choose to emphasise the government's use of patronage and financial reward to secure the Irish Parliament's acquiescence in its own demise – and here Castlereagh is the key player. The Irish Chief Secretary set to work energetically to address the personal interest of MPs (and their patrons) and ensured that the Union was carried by having seats in Parliament purchased from the borough owners for supporters of the Union and by giving out promotions in the peerage to others. He also held out the prospect of the employment of government influence to ensure that others would be returned as representative Irish peers in the House of Lords. In addition, he compensated those, whether Unionist or anti-Unionist, who would lose by the abolition of Irish constituencies (the value of a borough was calculated to be £15,000, so that over £1 million was paid out in compensation alone) and by the provision of ecclesiastical and legal positions to the families of others who had voted for the Union. Later interpretation of Castlereagh's role might include reference to his most recent biographer, John Bew. Cornwallis and Castlereagh had virtually a free hand in the distribution of honours, with the result that 16 peerages were created, 15 promotions in the peerage were promised,

and a host of more minor pensions and places were dangled in front of the loyal or undecided. When a motion was debated, in January 1800, proposing that Ireland retain its free and independent Parliament, it was defeated by 138 votes to 96 – a reversal of the result a year earlier. Better informed candidates may not necessarily dismiss this as the outcome of naked corruption but instead consider it as representative of the methods of parliamentary management in that era. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate; there is very good organisation and use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. [35]

Option 3AVAILABLE
MARKS

35

70

OPTION 4: PARTITION OF IRELAND 1900–1925

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

- 1 (a) **Consult all the sources and your own knowledge of the period.** Which of the sources would an historian value most as evidence in a study of the rise of Sinn Féin in the period 1916–1918?

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

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers will paraphrase the content of each source and make assertions that are not fully supported. For example, the sources reveal some of the problems facing the Irish Parliamentary Party.

Level 2 ([4]–[7])

Answers will comment on the value of the sources, using the content more fully. Source 1 is valuable because it indicates the growth in Sinn Féin’s support after the Easter Rising. Source 2 shows how the conscription crisis helped Sinn Féin. Source 3 reveals how the impact of the War helped Sinn Féin.

Level 3 ([8]–[11])

Answers will present a more sustained assessment of the value of each source, and reach a credible conclusion. Answers at this level will examine the authorship and content more closely. Source 1 is from Dillon, the deputy leader of the Irish Party, which makes him well placed to comment on his Party’s problems and the fortunes of Sinn Féin. Moreover, its content is valuable, as he identifies reasons for the rise of Sinn Féin “for the past year and a half”. The Lloyd George talks, he declares, have poisoned our supporters. Moreover, British statesmen can no longer be trusted. He reveals that these feelings of disillusionment are more prevalent among the young, who are flocking towards Sinn Féin in the belief that force is the only argument that will prevail. Atholl in Source 2 clearly enjoys the confidence of government, since his confidential report came at the request of Lloyd George. Atholl links the support for Sinn Féin to the conscription issue. Indeed, the anti-conscription campaign has solidly united nationalist Ireland. The lack of consultation with the Irish Party correlates with Dillon’s feelings of being let down. Source 3 is valuable as the historian provides a wide-ranging retrospective view on the issues. Again, conscription is associated with Sinn Féin’s rise. Additional factors are given, such as government policy in the form of the “German Plot”, as well as the “respectability” which Sinn Féin enjoyed in its relationship with the Catholic Church.

Level 4 ([12]–[15])

Answers will use a range of criteria to assess value, commenting on the significance of the information provided, authorship, motive, audience and date. Contextual knowledge must be used. Source 1 reflects the transformation in Irish politics in an eighteen month period from a well-informed insider who was in Dublin during the Rising. Dillon accuses the government of “manufacturing” the rise of Sinn Féin by antagonising many young voters. Interestingly, his timescale includes the period *before* the Rising. Redmond’s consent to temporary exclusion at the Lloyd George talks antagonised the Catholic Church and alienated loyal supporters. Carson, once a Home Rule rebel, now sits in government. Source 2 indicts the attempt to enforce conscription: “such recruits would do more harm than good”. The mobilisation of all nationalists and the rejection of Home Rule which conscription has incurred came at a time of reviving Irish Party fortunes. Reference to lack of consultation endorses Source 1’s bitterness, especially since Redmond had pledged support for the war effort at Woodenbridge. Source 3 reveals how Sinn Féin shaped its own destiny. De Valera led the anti-conscription movement, and the “new respectability” alludes to the Sinn Féin tactic of contesting by-elections such as North Roscommon and East Clare. Government policy too has assisted Sinn Féin; new members, mentioned in Source 1, have joined in spite (or because of) an illusory “German Plot” in May 1918 which saw the arrest of most of its leadership, followed by a government ban. [15]

- (b) Use all the sources and other evidence you have studied.** How far do the sources support the view that the rise of Sinn Féin in the period 1916–1918 was due to dissatisfaction with the Irish Parliamentary Party?

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

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

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement **AO1(b)**. For example, Source 1 suggests disillusionment among young voters towards the Irish Party. Answers may rely on paraphrasing the sources or provide a narrative of the subject with little reference to the sources **AO2(a)**.

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

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis

and judgement **AO1(b)**. For example, Source 1 comments on the impact of the Lloyd George talks on declining Irish Party support, and reflects that many have turned to Sinn Féin because Redmond's party has failed to act "in a more forceful manner". This theme is implied in Source 2, where the Irish Party is compromised by the government's move for conscription. Source 3 indicates how the Party's association with the war effort had become a liability. In this sense, dissatisfaction with the Irish Party is a factor in Sinn Féin's rise **AO2(a)**.

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

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgement are developed and substantiated. **AO1(b)** Answers will address the sources in more detail, perhaps confining their analysis to concurring with the proposition. Source 1 links the decline in the Irish Party to its participation in the Lloyd George talks, as well as the perception in the minds of "young men" that the Party has been weak and ineffective. Source 2 suggests that the fact that the government did not consult the Party over conscription shows how ineffective it had become since 1916. However, Atholl links the policy of conscription to a universal anger among nationalists who have now forgotten their desire for Home Rule and, by implication, aspire to the Republican ideal. Source 3 suggests that Sinn Féin's fortunes benefited from its own efforts after 1916 – such as taking the initiative in the anti-conscription campaign – as well as disillusionment with an Irish Party which had previously endorsed an unpopular war **AO2(a)**.

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

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are very well developed and substantiated **AO1(b)**. For example, answers will interpret and evaluate the sources fully in relation to their historical context **AO2(a)**. Source 1 refers to the failed Lloyd George talks in which Redmond conceded the temporary exclusion of Ulster and in the process conceded the principle of Irish unity and alienated the Catholic Church. The Coalition government since 1915 meant that the opponents of Home Rule such as Carson and Bonar Law were strongly placed to ensure that their interests would be upheld when the final Irish settlement was reached. The rush of so many young men to Sinn Féin reflects antagonism towards the government after the Rising, for example, the manner of the executions. Source 2 suggests another factor in Sinn Féin's rise: Ireland is "solidly united against conscription". Dillon had warned that all Ireland would unite against conscription, while his walking out of Parliament duplicated the Sinn Féin policy of abstention. The fact that the Irish Party was not consulted about conscription suggests not only government ingratitude for Irish Party support, but foretells its eventual collapse. Source 3 places more emphasis on the efforts of Sinn Féin to shape its own political destiny by 1918. De Valera drafts the anti-conscription pledge; Sinn Féin's anti-war stance is vindicated. Clerical misgivings about Sinn Féin's constitutional credentials have given way

to a new respectability, which was also achieved by Sinn Féin's electoral successes in 1917–1918. Sinn Féin leaders allowed themselves to be arrested during the “German Plot”, and their electoral machinery was rapidly put in place in time for the general election of 1918. These sources outline the key elements of the rise of Sinn Féin: misfortunes of the Irish Party; impact of war; government policies and Sinn Féin's opportunism. [20]

35

- 2 (a) To what extent did the Liberals, Conservatives, Irish Parliamentary Party and the Ulster Unionists achieve their political objectives during the Home Rule crisis by September 1914? Use relevant evidence you have studied including contemporary and later interpretations to support your answer.

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

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

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

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

Answers at this level will select and deploy historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. There will be some awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development. There may be limited reference to the two parties involved. There may be some contemporary interpretations from one of the leaders of the main parties, such as Carson or Bonar Law, conveying their attitudes towards Home Rule. A later interpretation could come from Beckett, explaining what motivated Carson to lead the Ulster Unionists. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to illegibility, inaccurate spelling or punctuation or grammar; at times, the style of writing will be inappropriate. There may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

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

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. There will be a satisfactory analysis of either contemporary or later interpretations of this subject **or** a partial evaluation of **both**.

Answers may address the issues raised by the question but focus in greater depth on some parties than others.

The Conservatives wanted to wreck Home Rule completely, in keeping with their traditional stance. Their leader, Bonar Law, saw the crisis as an opportunity to force Asquith to call a general election by convincing him that his Home Rule policy would result in disaster for himself, his party and his country. Law also wanted to reunite his party after its catastrophic split over tariff reform. Home Rule presented his party with an issue to restore credibility following its general election defeats in 1906 and in 1910, the battle over the “People’s Budget” and the constitutional clash over the Parliament Act of 1911. Law was prepared to justify a campaign of civil disobedience and rebellion in order to force Asquith to dissolve parliament. Law’s strategy had mixed success. Home Rule for all Ireland was not implemented. Ulster exclusion was a partial victory, since it meant abandoning the Southern Unionists who enjoyed considerable influence in his party. Asquith was still in office. The role of the Conservatives in the Home Rule crisis, Army Annual Act and Curragh Mutiny brought Britain to the edge of a civil war which was only averted by the international crisis of August 1914.

The Ulster Unionists mobilised successfully to resist Home Rule. Carson proved a dynamic leader, whose undisputed high profile and oratorical skills meant that the Ulster Unionist cause enjoyed a wide profile during the crisis. Craig’s organisational skills ensured that the Ulster Unionist cause was enhanced to its maximum potential. The Craigavon rally of 1911 was but one of several gatherings which articulated the unionist resolve to resist Home Rule. The Solemn League and Covenant of September 1912, the formation of the UVF in January 1913 and its Larne gun-running of 1914 attested to Craig’s organisational skill. In September 1913 the UVF became the “Army of Ulster” when the UUC appointed a “Provisional government” to rule Ulster in the event of Home Rule being passed. While all of the aforementioned were highly credible, answers could reflect upon how satisfied Ulster Unionists were by September 1914. The original objective of smashing Home Rule completely had not been achieved. Instead, the outbreak of the First World War created the climate for a compromise whereby Home Rule would be postponed upon the ending of hostilities, whereupon the bill would be passed with some provision for excluding Ulster. In this sense Craig had more reason to be satisfied than Carson. For the former, saving Ulster from Home

Rule was his aim. For the latter, using Ulster to destroy Home Rule and save the Union was his object. Answers could also discuss the Liberals and the Irish Parliamentary Party in less depth or may focus in detail on three parties but omit the fourth.

Contemporary interpretations could include the views of Craig or leading Conservatives such as F. E. Smith. Historians' interpretations could include, for example, opinions on the objectives and role of the Conservatives, and an assessment of their success. Interpretations from Lyons or Buckland could be employed to show how, by 1913, both Carson and Law had become drawn to a form of compromise involving Ulster exclusion. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

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

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

Answers will attempt in a more definite and sustained way an assessment of how far the objectives of the main parties were realised. In addition to the material on the Conservatives and the Ulster Unionists set out in Level 3, answers should address in some depth the other parties mentioned in the question.

As regards the Irish Parliamentary Party, Redmond's objective of achieving Home Rule was only partially achieved by September 1914. While the Home Rule Act was on the statute book, there were the nagging implications of the amendment of special treatment for Ulster when the Act was implemented after the war. Moreover, Redmond had already conceded temporary exclusion of Ulster by March 1914, when under pressure from Asquith to compromise. The crisis had seen the formation of the Ulster Volunteers followed by Irish Volunteers. The Curragh Mutiny and gun-running at Larne and Howth demonstrated how militancy was accompanying constitutionalism. Anything less than a Home Rule parliament for all Ireland would be an incomplete victory for Redmond. Thus, Redmond's position by September 1914 hinged upon events beyond his control such as the duration of the war, the response of the government to nationalist participation and the details of how Home Rule would be established when peace returned.

Asquith's Liberal government was damaged by the crisis and was ironically saved from the consequences of its indecisiveness and misjudgements by the outbreak of the war in August 1914. Asquith

had failed to devise a strategy for resistance to Home Rule, and mixed public assurances to Redmond with private doubts, culminating in the compromise of exclusion in March 1914. He had failed to anticipate the seriousness of the opposition to Home Rule, and embarked on a process of promising everything to Redmond only to gradually relent in the form of piecemeal compromises, culminating at the Buckingham Palace Conference of July 1914. The Curragh Mutiny effectively removed the option of employing the British Army to enforce Home Rule on Ulster. Henceforth, the opponents of Home Rule would have to be accommodated with some form of compromise. In one sense, the outbreak of the war in August 1914 meant that the Liberals did not have to confront the consequences of their failings: civil war in Ireland, with armed conflict in parts of Britain too. The Home Rule issue had dominated British politics in the period 1912–1914, much to the advantage of the Conservative Party. That Party, which had united on the Ulster issue following its internal divisions over the Parliament Act and tariff reform, had clearly strengthened its position by 1914. Answers at the top of this level will provide a sustained assessment of each of the four parties, while low Level 4 responses will have minor lapses. Contemporary interpretations could include, for example, comment from any prominent members of the groupings referred to in the question. Candidates could use comments from Redmond or Dillon to convey the Irish Parliamentary Party's response to events, especially in relation to Ulster exclusion. Candidates could also give the response of Liberals such as Asquith, Lloyd George or Churchill. Historical interpretations could include, for example, historians' opinion on the outcome of the Home Rule crisis for the main parties involved. Reference could be made to Beckett and Buckland, who debate the outcome for Carson and Craig. Rees assesses Bonar Law's position by 1914, while Jalland explores the status of the Liberals by September 1914. 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 will be most appropriate; there is very good organisation and use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. [35]

- (b) How far did the Anglo-Irish Treaty of 1921 achieve the objectives of the British Government and Sinn Féin? Use relevant evidence you have studied including contemporary and later interpretations to support your answer.

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

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

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. Answers at this level may be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. There will be little or no awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response. There may be comment that Sinn Féin wished to achieve an Irish Republic.

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

Answers at this level will select and deploy historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. There will be some awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject but this will be limited and need of further development. There may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary. The answer will have some supporting evidence. For example, there may be limited focus on the aims of Sinn Féin during the Treaty talks, with some comment about a Republic, the Crown and Empire. Regarding interpretations, for example, candidates could refer to de Valera's aspirations for the negotiations, such as Irish unity, and his perception of the future relations between Ireland and the British Empire. Answers at this level may have some lapses in knowledge due to illegibility, inaccurate spelling or punctuation or grammar; at times, the style of writing will be inappropriate.

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

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. There will be a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject **or** a partial evaluation of **both**. Answers may focus on a narrow range of objectives of the participants, providing an incomplete account of their aspirations, with tentative reference to the extent to which they were realised. On the British side, they were determined that, in the final Treaty settlement, Ireland would remain within the Empire. Sinn Féin would, under no circumstances, be granted an Irish Republic in the final Treaty. Rather, Ireland would be offered Dominion Status, subject to certain undertakings regarding defence, trade and finance. Ireland would be able to enjoy autonomy in taxation and finance, retain its own courts of law, as well as maintaining its own military forces for home defence. The Treaty would guarantee the defence of British interests by land and sea, and the British made it clear that the Royal Navy alone would

have control of the seas around Great Britain and Ireland. Sinn Féin wanted to achieve a 32-county Irish Republic. Moreover, it wanted to see an end to partition, following the establishment of Northern Ireland in the Government of Ireland Act of 1920. De Valera had a divided cabinet, between those such as Griffith who were attracted to Dominion Status and hardliners such as Brugha who refused to contemplate any dilution of the Republic. Hence, de Valera suggested “External Association”: Ireland would enjoy the freedom of an independent state but be externally associated with the British Commonwealth. There may be a limited assessment of the extent to which these objectives were achieved. For example, the British ensured that Ireland did remain inside the empire; a Republic was not acknowledged in any form in the final Treaty. The “Irish question” was resolved for the next fifty years. Contemporary interpretations could include comments from de Valera’s correspondence with Lloyd George, in which he stressed his views on Ulster and Ireland’s relations with the Crown and Empire. Lloyd George emphasised the position of Ulster under the 1920 Act and refuted any attempt to permit the establishment of an Irish Republic. Historians’ interpretations could include an assessment about the objectives of the two negotiating sides. For example, Pakenham examines the correspondence between de Valera and Lloyd George prior to the commencement of the negotiations. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

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

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are very well developed and substantiated. Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of this subject. There will be a full explanation of the objectives of the British Government and Sinn Féin, as well as an assessment of the extent to which they were realised in the Treaty. The British regarded allegiance to the Crown as an essential part of the Treaty. A key British objective was the preservation of the status and powers of Northern Ireland, and it was made clear to de Valera that any settlement must allow for full recognition of the powers and privileges of the Parliament and Government of Northern Ireland. Regarding financial matters, the British resolved that they and the Irish governments would agree to impose no protective duties upon the flow of trade between the two countries. Ireland would assume responsibility for a share of the present debt of the United Kingdom. De Valera’s communications with Lloyd George before the Treaty talks prompted him to devise the compromise of “External Association”: the voluntary association of an independent sovereign state with the British Empire. Sinn Féin wanted the British government to put pressure on the Ulster Unionists to end partition. The Treaty

fulfilled these aspirations in various ways. Ireland was to be known as the Irish Free State, and not a Republic. The Irish Free State would enjoy the same constitutional status in the British Empire as Canada. All members of Dáil Éireann had to swear an oath of allegiance to the Crown. However, Sinn Féin had managed to dilute the symbolism of the oath by promising to swear true faith and allegiance to the Constitution of the Free State and not allegiance to the King George V. There was no reference to External Association in the Treaty. British security was assuaged by guaranteed access to “Treaty” ports. There would be a representative of the Crown in Ireland in the form of a Governor-General. The Free State would contribute towards the Public Debt of the United Kingdom. The powers of the Government of Northern Ireland were to remain unaffected until one month after the ratification of the Treaty by an Act of Parliament. The Treaty did contain a concession to Sinn Féin in the form of a Boundary Commission, to determine the boundaries between Northern Ireland and the rest of Ireland. Griffith and Collins had been assured by Lloyd George that this would lead to the essential unity of Ireland, by reducing the northern state to an unworkable four counties which, having collapsed, would move naturally under Dublin’s authority. Contemporary interpretations could include, for example, the views of some of the British and Irish negotiating teams, or even the opinions of critics who were dissatisfied with the outcome. Candidates could refer to de Valera’s criticism of the Treaty, or the hostility of Cathal Brugha. Lloyd George, too, faced anger from many Conservatives. Historians’ interpretations could include, for example, opinions about the significance of the key elements of the Treaty settlement, and the extent to which each side benefited. Candidates could refer to the views of Rees, Pakenham or Kee who assess which side had better reason to be satisfied with the Treaty. 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 will be most appropriate; there is very good organisation and use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. [35]

35

Option 4**70****Total****70**