ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education
January 2011

History

Assessment Unit A2 1

[AH211]

THURSDAY 20 JANUARY, MORNING

MARK
SCHEME

Level of response mark grid

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

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

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

AO2   In relation to historical context:

- interpret, evaluate and use a range of source material;

- explain and evaluate interpretations of historical events and topics studied.

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

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. Evaluatiion may be limited.
3	contain appropriate examples with illustrative and supportive factual evidence and show understanding and ability to engage with the issues raised by the question in a clear and coherent manner.	display good breadth of understanding of the topic and its associated concepts. Analysis is generally informed and suitably illustrated to support explanations and judgements.	there will be an ability to present and evaluate different arguments for and against particular interpretations of an event or topic.
4	be accurate and well-informed and show ability to engage fully with the demands of the question. Knowledge and understanding will be expressed with clarity and precision.	display breadth and depth of understanding of the topic and its associated concepts. Explanations will be well-informed with arguments and judgements well-substantiated, illustrated and informed by factual evidence.	there will be appropriate explanation, insightful interpretation and well-argued evaluation of particular interpretations of an event or topic.

Synoptic Assessment

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

Generic Levels of Response for Synoptic Assessment

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

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

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

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

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

Option 1: Anglo-Spanish Relations 1509–1609

Answer **one** question.

1   How far were Anglo-Spanish relations in the period 1509–1609 determined by the royal advisers rather than monarchs?

This question requires an assessment of the impact royal advisers had on the policies of England and Spain. The policy of each nation is usually associated with the desires of their monarchs and the question requires an assessment of the respective influence of both monarchs and their royal advisers. A chronological approach to this question seems the most likely way to discuss the issues.

Top level responses will reflect on the historical debate which rages about most of these royal advisers and candidates must maintain an analytical focus.

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

Answers may deploy some of the following knowledge:

(a) Henry VIII 1509-29. Candidates will focus on the rise of Thomas Wolsey, in 1514, due to his ability to deliver the war policy that Henry sought, rather than the pro-peace policies of advisers like Richard Fox. The period 1514–1528 should focus on how Wolsey maintained England in a pivotal position in Europe, considering the Treaty of London and The Field of Cloth of Gold. Candidates should consider Wolsey's personal aggrandisement and his attempts to become Pope, with its resulting links to Charles V. This point might be used to suggest that Wolsey had his own agenda which shaped English policy and did not serve Henry. Consideration of the reasons for the fall of Wolsey and his failure to deliver a divorce should be used to show how his power was linked to the support of his master.

(b) Henry VIII 1529–1547. Discussion of this period should be led by discussion of the "split from Rome" and the impact of More, Cranmer and Cromwell. More, a supporter of Catherine of Aragon, served Henry well but failed on the divorce issue, eventually leaving government due to his opposition to the King's desires on this issue. Both Cranmer, and especially Cromwell, delivered Henry's aims, divorce and a ready supply of money, due to the Dissolution of the Monasteries. These servants might be questioned over the Protestant nature of their reforms which might show a personal motivation to their actions. Answers might consider some of these Acts, such as the Ten Articles of 1536. The fall of Cromwell, in 1540, the role of the conservative faction, and the failed marriage to Anne of Cleves should be considered.

6

AVAILABLE
MARKS

(c) Charles V 1516–1556. Answers should consider Charles V's policy and the influences that advisers had on his early Spanish policies. Answers might consider Charles's mistakes, as an inexperienced King, due to following advice of "grandees" who had their own motivations.

(d) Edward VI and Mary I 1547–1558. Answers might consider the amount of influence Edward VI had during the Protectorates of Somerset and Northumberland. Mary, as England's first female Queen, was in a difficult position, and candidates should discuss her success, and her dependence on Pole and Philip Habsburg.

(e) Elizabeth I 1558–1603. This period was marked by a gradual decline in Anglo-Spanish relations, eventually leading to war in 1585 and the Armada in 1588. A defining feature was Elizabeth's failure to marry and the uncertainty that this created. Responses must consider the influences and motivations of Cecil, Walsingham and Dudley on both the marriage and war issues. The government of Elizabeth must be studied to decide her policy, or lack of one, and the extent to which the Queen dominated events.

(f) Philip II 1556–1598. Philip's attitude to Elizabeth, England and the Netherlands must be evaluated including the reasons for war with these two countries. Responses might consider the impact of the Alva, Eboli/Perez and Margaret of Savoy on Philip's policies and the effects of his father's advice, to trust no one but yourself.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately

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

Examples of contemporary interpretations could include:
• attitudes of the nobility to Wolsey;
• the views of Henry VIII and Englishmen towards the religious changes of the 1530s and 1540s;
• Puritan opinion in relation to the Dutch revolt;
• Catholic opposition and the threat to Elizabeth.

Examples of later interpretations could include:
• historical debate on Wolsey and his desire to be Pope;
• the debate on the Mid-Tudor Crisis and the influence of Edward VI and weakness of Mary;
• the discussion on the motivation of Elizabethan foreign policy;
• the "Black Legend" of Philip II and his motivations for war in both the Netherlands and England.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately [50]

50

2 "Religious tensions determined Anglo-Spanish relations in the period 1509–1609". To what extent would you accept this verdict?

This question requires an assessment of how far religious changes affected relations between England and Spain in the period 1509–1609.
An explanation of the quality of the relationship is multi-causal and better answers will be able to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of religious, political and economic influences. Given the nature of the period, it is difficult to disentangle political and religious motivation. As the rulers of this period believed that their political position was granted by God then they were only accountable to God. Some rulers felt that they had a role to fulfil for God and hence there is an overlap in religion and society in general. The initial focus should be on religion and its influences should be considered.

Top level responses will reflect on an intensification of rivalry between the powers as the century progressed and should consider the importance of religious tensions in determining Anglo-Spanish relations.

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

Answers may deploy some of the following knowledge:

(a) Religious influences on Anglo-Spanish relations.

- Henry VIII's divorce from Catherine of Aragon initiated the English Reformation. This was resisted by Charles V, for dynastic reasons, and this added religious differences to dynastic and political ones;
- Edward VI's move toward strong Protestantism deepened divisions;
- a return to Catholicism under Mary I was linked to dynastic union, Mary and Philip. Religious persecution under Mary became associated with a Spanish influence on politics and tainted future relations;
- Philip II saw himself as "the sword" of the Catholic Reformation, while England saw itself as an "Elect nation". Both countries believed that they had a divine mission to further God's will and work. After initially limiting Papal action against Elizabeth, Philip supported her excommunication;
- after the English Reformation, and especially in Elizabeth's reign, Englishmen were no longer prepared to accept the papal division of the non-European world. Their privateering was justified as a response to an injustice while Philip saw the privateers as heretics and their activities added insult to injury. Also he had a sense of mission to "Catholicise" the New World;
- England, a Protestant country, sympathised with the Protestant rebels of the northern Netherlands, while Spain, a Catholic country, saw the rebellions as a religious revolt and therefore saw English interference as religiously motivated;

6684.01

8

- events in France also had religious dimensions. As the Dutch revolt matured, Calvinism became identified with resistance. Philip feared that a France controlled by the Calvinist Huguenots would be anti-Spanish and would intervene in the Netherlands to support their co-religionists. Similarly, Elizabeth was concerned that France, led by the Catholic Guise, would support Spain and allow Philip to complete the re-conquest of the Netherlands;
- Spanish interference in English internal policies was linked to support for Catholicism and the Catholic champion for the English throne, Mary of Scots.

(b) Economic influences on relations.

- Spain's economic weaknesses, poor agriculture, lack of industry, a parasitic nobility and Church, and investment directed towards government bonds, were overwhelmed by Philip's foreign policy. The imbalance of payments from within Philip's empire left Castile carrying a heavy tax burden and being dependent on New World bullion. Clashes with English privateers damaged this lifeline and led to a strain in relations;
- England wanted to expand trade by establishing new markets and sources of raw materials and find new homes for a surplus population. It was not content to let Spain have the New World more or less to itself. England was also concerned for the security of its traditional markets in the Netherlands. It was a market for English exports. Antwerp was the European base for the Merchant Adventurers who controlled the vital woollen trade.

(c) Political influences on relations

- the changing dynastic links between the two countries. Henry VIII divorced Catherine of Aragon, the aunt of Charles V, and Elizabeth refused to marry Philip II. Philip meddled in English politics in order to topple Elizabeth, supporting Mary Stuart, the Revolt of the Northern Earls, the Ridolfi and Babington Plots;
- during the course of the century the role of France in shaping Anglo-Spanish relations changed. In the first half of the century France was a common enemy that united the two countries but when France was consumed by the Wars of Religion each side interfered in France to further its own interests and this increased tension. For example, Elizabeth interfered in France with the intention of inducing France to intervene in the Netherlands against Spain. Money was given to the Duke of Anjou and troops were sent to the aid of Henry of Navarre for this purpose;
- whoever controlled the Netherlands was of interest to England because it was the natural invasion route from the continent. The ports of the Netherlands were only a day's sailing away from England. For such interests of national security, England preferred the Netherlands to be largely self-governing. Spain's increasing military presence from the 1560s posed a threat to national

AVAILABLE
MARKS

security. Elizabeth's support for the Dutch rebels in the Treaty of Nonsuch (1585) was a trigger for the war between Spain and England. The treaty committed England to sending a force of 6000 under the Earl of Leicester;

- English privateering raids from Hawkins and Drake in the New World were an attack on Philip's authority and prestige, revealing the vulnerability of his overseas empire and forcing him into costly projects for their defence.

Answers should conclude that relations were influenced by a range of factors and reach their own conclusion. Arguments must reflect the period and may put different emphasis at different parts of the century and with different monarchs.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately

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

Examples of contemporary interpretations could include:
- the views of pro-Protestant councillors such as Cromwell, Cranmer, Somerset, Northumberland, William Cecil, Robert Dudley and Walsingham;
- the Parliamentary influence of the "Puritan Choir";
- the influence of the conservative faction, especially More, Norfolk and Bishops like Gardiner, Fisher and Pole;
- pressure on Charles V and Philip II from the Papacy, Inquisition and the Spanish factions of Alva and Eboli/Perez.

Examples of later interpretations could include:
- historical debate on the importance of the "Puritan Choir" and Parliament's influence on English Government;
- debate on the importance of the split with Rome;
- revisionist interpretation of the importance of Elizabethan foreign policy and its links to dynastic rather than religious aims.

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

                                                          Option 1   **50**

Option 2: Crown and Parliament 1603–1702

Answer **one** question.

1   "The Restoration Settlement marked the most significant change in the role and status of Parliament in the seventeenth century." How far would you agree with this verdict?

This question requires an assessment of the changing role and status of Parliament throughout the course of the seventeenth century.

Top level responses will reflect on the ways in which the Restoration Settlement might be considered the most significant change in the role and status of Parliament. Having examined this proposition, the best answers will suggest alternative significant changes to the position of Parliament, such as the "Glorious Revolution" of 1689, the Civil Wars and execution of Charles I, the Constitutional Revolution of 1640–1642 or the reign of William III (c1690–1702). Responses may refer to the reign of James I to establish the role and status of Parliament at the beginning of the century. It would be legitimate to argue that the change in the role and status of Parliament was a gradual process. Alternatively, it may be noted that the "Whig myth" of an organic, gradual rise of Parliament has been discredited by revisionist and post-revisionist historians who have interpreted the change in Parliament's status to be less inexorable than first thought. The seventeenth century was not simply a victory of Parliament over the King, and candidates might even argue that, while the role and status of Parliament changed throughout the period, it is debatable if the actual prerogative power of Parliament was substantially altered.

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

Answers may deploy some of the following knowledge:

(a) The role and status of Parliament in 1603.

When James I came to the throne in 1603, Parliament met infrequently. In fact, it was only in session for some three years during James I's 22-year reign. In 1603 the monarch could not raise money without the consent of Parliament. However, Parliament had no say in the appointment of ministers. It could not determine the succession to the throne, while the making of foreign policy was a prerogative of the Crown. It also had no influence over the religion of the monarch.

(b) The Restoration Settlement 1660–c.1665.

Since King Charles I had been defeated in the Civil War and executed, and his son and heir had been invited back on terms dictated by Parliament, it might be expected that this settlement would mark a significant strengthening in the role and status of Parliament. Crucially the Restoration Settlement confirmed all the reforms passed by Parliament up to the end of the 1641 session. The prerogative taxation and courts of Charles I's reign remained illegal and the King could no longer collect taxes without Parliament's consent. Parliament restrained the monarch's financial independence by setting the King's permanent revenue at a level, £1.2 million, which was designed to ensure the need for Parliament to meet and vote additional supplies. Parliament also saw its influence over the Church of England restored and strengthened by the Clarendon Code and the later Test Acts. Despite this improvement in the position of Parliament, the monarchy still retained many of its most important prerogative powers. For example, the making of foreign policy; the calling, proroguing and dissolving of Parliament; a veto on legislation and the choosing of ministers. Charles II's Cavalier Parliament further strengthened his position by making it treason to imprison or restrain the King, censoring the press and passing a weakened Triennial Act. Charles was also able to end his reign in personal rule as a trade explosion and his links with France enabled him to survive financially without having to call Parliament. The strong position of monarchy restored in the settlement of 1660–1665 and enhanced by Charles II during his period of personal rule, 1680–1685, shatters the Whig myth of a gradual, inexorable rise in the role and status of Parliament during the seventeenth century.

(c) The "Constitutional Revolution" of 1640–1642.

It is legitimate to argue that the "Constitutional Revolution" marked the most significant change in the role and status of Parliament in the seventeenth century. During this period a number of successful attempts were made to impose limits on royal power and secure an increased and more permanent role for Parliament. The Triennial Act and the Act Against Own Dissolution ensured that Parliament was to be called on a more regular basis and should have prevented the monarchy employing personal rule in the future. This "revolution" saw the abolition of the Crown's prerogative financial devices increasing the need for monarchy to rely upon finance from Parliament. The abolition of the prerogative courts helped to protect the nobility from the King's abuse of the judicial system.

However, there were limits to what was actually achieved by Parliament in this period. The demand that the appointment of royal ministers should be subject to parliamentary approval was never agreed by the Crown. The Root and Branch petition, that proposed the abolition of the episcopacy, was never implemented. Parliament did not insist on a general election if it was still in session. There was nothing

to prevent a monarch from becoming financially independent if his revenues increased due to an expansion of trade, as Charles II was to exploit. There was also no widespread acceptance that the armed forces of the state should be subject to Parliament rather than the King.

There is little doubt that the events of 1640–1642 changed the position of Parliament significantly. The failure to reach a settlement with Charles on a number of these issues resulted in the outbreak of Civil War and the eventual defeat of the King. The fact that many of the changes brought about by the Constitutional Revolution remained in place at the Restoration confirms its importance in permanently transforming the role and status of Parliament.

(d) The Execution of Charles I, 1649.

It is legitimate to argue that England was never the same after the execution of the King in 1649 and that the status of Parliament reached its pinnacle at this point in the seventeenth century, as it became the ruling political force in the country. Good answers will note that the execution of the King was not supported by all of Parliament, noting the significance of Pride's Purge, or even how the country had been divided during the Civil War. Furthermore, the execution resulted in a period of interregnum rather than the death of monarchy, and the restoration of Charles II in 1660 suggests that the change in the role and status of Parliament was only temporary. Some historians have argued that, although the execution did not result in major long-term changes to the status of monarchy, the concept of a Parliament standing against an unjust, unpopular monarch re-emerges in the events of the Glorious Revolution.

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

Answers may argue that the most important change in the position of Parliament came as a result of the Glorious Revolution. The pro-Catholic and absolutist policies of James II resulted in his loss of power and the creation of a joint monarchy. Certainly Parliament played a prominent role in the replacement of the Catholic James with his Protestant daughter and son-in-law. Good answers will examine the changing prerogative power of the monarchy as a result of the new Coronation Oath, the Bill of Rights, the Mutiny Act, the Toleration Act and the revised financial arrangements. For example, in the Bill of Rights of 1689 Parliament insisted that the monarch had to be Protestant. Despite the fact that Parliament had played a prominent role in the creation of new monarchs and a new style of monarchy, in reality the Crown retained its power and resources. It is arguable that the period does not deserve the title "revolution" and that little had changed in the role and status of both monarchy and Parliament.

13

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

At the end of the century, Parliament asserted itself more decisively in the realm of finance, achieving royal dependence and accountability through the Commission of Accounts and Civil List. The Act of Settlement achieved the independence of the judiciary, determined the religion of the monarch and the succession to the throne, and a new Triennial Act established the duration of a Parliament as three years. William's desire to defend his homeland from the expansionism of Louis XIV committed England to a costly war in Europe. He was willing to enter into a partnership with the gentry to ensure a regular supply in return for a regular Parliament, with a direct involvement in how subsidies were to be spent. This new style of government gave Parliament a permanency that allowed it to become more efficient and effective in its operation. Answers may note the emergence of political parties rather than factions and the impact this had upon the changing role and nature of Parliament. By 1700 the Crown was coming under pressure to appoint ministers who could command a majority in the House of Commons, although even at this late stage there was no legal obligation to do so and Parliament still had no authority over the appointment of the monarch's ministers. Parliament also clarified its role in foreign affairs. Parliament was upset when it was not shown the Partition Treaties of 1698 and 1699, and The Act of Settlement of 1701 dictated that the Crown could not go to war in defence of its foreign dominions without parliamentary support. In 1701 William thought it best to ask Parliament's approval for his treaty of Grand Alliance.

The final reign of the century had seen the greatest change in the role and status of Parliament even if most of the changes had been on the monarch's terms. Parliament had become a vital, almost permanent, instrument of government. It now met almost annually and held the King's purse strings more tightly than ever before. Even foreign policy and the Church were now under Parliament's influence.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately

14

AVAILABLE MARKS

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

Examples of contemporary interpretations could include:
- the views of Parliamentarians such as Pym during the Constitutional Revolution;
- Clarendon's views on the execution of Charles I, the Restoration Settlement and the reign of Charles II;
- the views of the King and his minsters on issues of prerogative power and the role of Parliament;
- the views of MPs on issues of Parliament's changing role and status;
- William of Orange's attitude towards war in Europe and his willingness to compromise with Parliament.

Examples of later interpretations could include:
- the "Whig myth" interpretation of the seventeenth century as a period of the gradual, inexorable rise of Parliament;
- the revisionist analysis of the Restoration Settlement as a strengthening of monarchy;
- historians' opinions on the significance of the Constitutional Revolution;
- historians' views on the importance of the reign of William and Mary in creating a working partnership between King and Parliament. [50]

50

2 "William III's willingness to compromise with Parliament, in order to wage war in Europe, resulted in the most significant changes to the powers of the monarchy in England in the seventeenth century." To what extent would you accept this judgement?

This question requires an assessment of the extent to which William's willingness to compromise with Parliament in order to wage war in Europe resulted in the most significant changes to the power of monarchy in the seventeenth century.

Top level responses will reflect on the changes made during William's reign and, having examined this proposition, will suggest alternative events which were significant, such as the "Constitutional Revolution" 1640–1641, the Civil Wars and execution of Charles I, the Restoration Settlement or the Glorious Revolution. Alternatively, answers may choose to examine each monarch's reign, making a comparative analysis with William's, rather than analysing events. Good responses should seek to debate the merits of the proposition in comparison with the other factors they identify as significant in changing the monarch's prerogative power.

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

(a) **The powers of the Monarch in 1603.**

When James I came to the throne in 1603, the powers of the monarchy were wide-ranging. Although he could not raise money without the consent of Parliament, he was able to generate some income through his prerogative powers such as wardship and purveyance and the sale of monopolies. He could summon, prorogue or dismiss Parliament when he chose and had sole power over the appointment of ministers. He could also dismiss judges without reference to Parliament. In 1603 the making of foreign policy was the prerogative of the monarch and James I also controlled the armed forces.

(b) **William III's willingness to compromise in order to fight war in Europe.**

William's desire to defend his homeland from the expansionism of Louis XIV committed England to a costly war in Europe. He was willing to enter into a partnership with the gentry to ensure a regular supply in return for a regular Parliament, with a direct involvement in how subsidies were to be spent. This new style of government gave Parliament a permanency that allowed it to become more efficient and effective in its operation. It also ensured that the monarch was dependent upon calling an annual Parliament to attain the supplies necessary for war. This allowed Parliament to play a more direct role in forming policy, even in foreign affairs. William was prepared to enter into a co-dependent relationship with the English Parliament because it suited his European ambitions. By the end of the century, Parliament asserted itself more decisively in the realm of finance, achieving royal dependence and accountability through the Commission of Accounts and Civil List. The Act of Settlement achieved the independence of the judiciary, determined the religion of the monarch and the succession to the throne, and a new Triennial Act established the duration of a Parliament as three years. By 1700 the Crown was coming under pressure to appoint ministers who could command a majority in the House of Commons although even at this late stage there was no legal obligation to do so and Parliament still had no authority over the appointment of the monarch's ministers. The Act of Settlement of 1701 dictated that the Crown could not go to war in defence of its foreign dominions without parliamentary support. There is little doubt that the reign of William III saw a weakening of the prerogative power of the monarchy as he bargained with Parliament. Answers may argue, however, that, despite a loss of independence, monarchy had actually been strengthened in some ways. The Civil List and creation of the Bank of England had enabled William to lead England into a major war in Europe. It could even be argued that the compromises made with Parliament in the 1690s laid the foundations for the British Empire and even helped to prevent the revolutions that affected more absolutist monarchies in the following century. Certainly the prerogative power had been significantly changed in William's pursuit of European success against Louis even if the extent to which monarchy was actually weakened is debatable.

(c) The "Constitutional Revolution" of 1640–1642.

It is arguable that the "Constitutional Revolution" was the most critical event in changing the power of monarchy in the seventeenth century. During this period a number of successful attempts were made to impose limits on royal power and secure an increased and more permanent role for Parliament. The Triennial Act and the Act Against Own Dissolution ensured that Parliament was to be called on a more regular basis and should have prevented the monarchy employing personal rule in the future. This "revolution" saw the abolition of the Crown's prerogative financial devices, increasing the need for monarchy to rely upon finance from Parliament. The abolition of the prerogative courts helped to protect the nobility from the King's abuse of the judicial system. The execution of the King's favourite, the Earl of Strafford, following an Act of Attainder, represented a major challenge to the King's authority. All these represented significant, often irreversible, changes to the prerogative power of monarchy, suggesting the period 1640–1642 was, if not revolutionary, at least extremely important.

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

(d) The Execution of Charles I, 1649.

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

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

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

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

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

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately

AVAILABLE
MARKS

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

Examples of contemporary interpretations could include:
- views of Parliamentarians and Royalists on the Constitutional Revolution and on the execution of the King;
- the views of the King and his ministers on the Restoration Settlement;
- William III's attitude towards war in Europe;
- MPs attitudes towards the political changes of the 1690s.

Examples of later interpretations could include:
- the Whig interpretation of 1688 as a "Glorious Revolution";
- the "Whig myth" that monarchy was gradually and inevitably weakened as the century progressed;
- the revisionist analysis of the Restoration Settlement as a strengthening of monarchy rather than a weakening;
- historians' opinions on the most significant event for changing the power of monarchy;
- historians' views on the importance of the final decade of the century in transforming the relationship between Crown and Parliament. [50]

50

Option 2 | **50**

Option 3: Liberalism and Nationalism in Europe 1815–1914

Answer **one** question.

1   "An economic success but a political failure." How far would you accept this verdict on liberalism in Europe in the period 1815–1914?

This question requires an assessment of the political aspects of liberalism, which is quite acceptable, but it is essential that economic aspects are treated as well.

Top level responses will reflect on the quotation used in the title and may be accepted or refuted, but the best answers will touch on the initial growth and later decline of economic liberalism and the somewhat patchy progress of its political counterpart.

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

While it is anticipated that knowledge and supporting evidence will be drawn from France, Germany, Italy and the Habsburg Empire, credit will also be given to relevant and appropriate examples from other European countries.

Answers may deploy some of the following knowledge:

(a)   Economic liberalism stemmed, *inter alia*, from a belief that among individual freedoms desired by liberals should be the right to enjoy one's property unhindered by the state. Backed up by the writings of Adam Smith, this became an argument for free trade and minimal state intervention in the economy. The abolition of internal customs duties in Prussia in 1818 led other North German states to join Prussia's free trade system, until by 1835 the *Zollverein* consisted of most of the German states, and was able to conclude trading agreements with Belgium and Sweden. Free trade became the new orthodoxy, its high point arguably the 1860 Cobden-Chevallier Treaty between Britain and France.

(b)   But, although free trade was making advances all over Europe, less economically advanced states and industries would have preferred the comfort of high tariff walls, and when the Great Depression began around 1875 they had their chance. Taking their lead from Germany, where Bismarck's return to protection in 1879 marked the first major setback for economic liberalism, most of Europe scrambled to seek economic security behind tariff walls, leaving Britain as the sole standard bearer for free trade by 1914. Economic liberalism suffered further blows as the period moved to a close, with the increasing electoral success for socialist parties, whose belief in a major role for the state pointed to a collectivist economic future, in direct contrast to the individualist beliefs of liberals. In addition, Bismarck's Germany

6684.01

20

AVAILABLE
MARKS

and, in the twentieth century, Britain began to make concessions to the new thinking with a series of welfare reforms now seen as forerunners of the Welfare State, but which, with their high-profile role for the state, ran counter to classical liberalism.

(c) In political terms 1815 represented a setback for liberalism, with the Treaty of Vienna restoring a number of despotic rulers, and the domination of central and Eastern Europe by Prussia, Russia and specially Austria, whose Foreign Minister, Metternich, saw it as his duty to root out liberalism not only in the Habsburg dominions but also in Italy and the German Confederation. Utilising the fear of revolution understandably affecting all post-war governments, his use of the Troppau Protocol allowed the Great Powers to launch invasions wherever revolution threatened the status quo. Thus, Austria itself successfully intervened in various Italian states in 1820 and 1831, as did France in Spain in 1823. Metternich's control over the German Confederation was such that he was able to persuade the Diet to pass legislation severely limiting academic freedom in Germany in the wake of the demonstrations at Wartburg and Hambach. In France, Charles X so defied the spirit of the Charter that he was overthrown. His successor, Louis Philippe, came to the throne with a liberal programme, but his government's unwillingness to contemplate even a modest extension of the franchise helped to lead to his overthrow as well. The events in France in 1848 raised liberal expectations across Europe, but a combination of the inexperience of liberals who were placed in governing positions, a naivete which led them to place more trust in the old rulers than was wise, the continuing loyalty of the armies to the old regimes, and above all a liberal nervousness about the danger of a more radical swing to the left than they had contemplated all combined to lead to a general return to autocracy.

(d) Yet to damn in its entirety the era before 1850 as "a political failure" would be to ignore the smaller signs of progress. Although few states obeyed the injunction, all members of the German Confederation were obliged to introduce constitutions, while the French Charters, limited though they were, marked clear attempts to introduce Parliaments to which the government had to pay at least some heed. Even in the immediate aftermath of 1848 some glimmers of hope remained. The Piedmontese constitution stayed on the statute book, as for a short time did a Prussian constitution granted by the King, while until 1852 the Second Republic survived, at least on paper, in France. Metternich had been overthrown, and for all the setbacks of the 1850s, when Napoleon III established an authoritarian Empire in France, and the Prussian constitution lost much of its appeal with the introduction of a three-class voting system, the year of revolutions had taught rulers across Europe that survival would require the making of some concessions to a growing liberal spirit.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

(e) The 1860s saw liberal progress in France, where Napoleon III belatedly introduced his "Liberal Empire", and in Italy, where the newly united Kingdom was the creation of the liberal Cavour and was governed by an only slightly modified version of the Piedmontese Statuto. By the next decade the German Liberals, who had engaged in a hard-fought if losing struggle against Bismarck's Prussian army reforms, became his partners in the new Empire, and Thiers, a veteran French liberal, was strong enough to head the government of the Third Republic, astute enough to defeat the French Royalist resurgence, and ruthless enough to crush the divisive Paris Commune. Individual freedoms continued to grow across Europe, and parliaments, some with considerable powers, others with less, extended across the continent of Europe.

(f) All this would seem to show a steady progress for political liberalism. To an extent this is true, especially as regards individual freedoms, but in terms of responsible government and parliaments with teeth, less so. The German Liberals condoned the anti-Catholic Falk laws, yet found themselves ditched as Bismarck turned back to protection, while the Reichstag was obliged to play second fiddle to a powerful central government. Italy saw parliamentary institutions undermined through bribery and corruption, as to a lesser extent did France during the Panama Scandal. Moreover, Franz Josef steadily rolled back the more liberal aspects of the Austrian constitution.

Answers which perceive the irregular progress of both political and economic liberalism should be rewarded accordingly.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately

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

Examples of contemporary interpretations might include:
- supporters of free trade – why did they believe in it?
- Metternich's hostility to liberalism and his association of the ideology with the French Revolution;
- the liberals' nervousness of, and reluctance to, ally with radicals.

Examples of later interpretations could include:
- historians' views on whether or not liberalism was only for the middle classes;
- historians' analysis of whether Napoleon III was really liberal;
- the historical debate on whether the German Empire was as illiberal as it is usually portrayed.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately   [50]

50

2 "Nationalism was more successful in Germany than other European countries in the period 1815–1914." To what extent would you agree with this statement?

This question requires an assessment of whether nationalism in Germany was more successful than in other European countries.

Top level responses will reflect on the success of nationalism in Germany in relation to a range of other European countries.

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

While it is anticipated that knowledge and supporting evidence will be drawn from France, Germany, Italy and the Habsburg Empire, credit will also be given to relevant and appropriate examples from other European countries.

Answers may deploy some of the following knowledge:

(a) Answers may set the scene by stressing the impact of the 1815 settlement on nationalist hopes. The steps towards unification in Germany and Italy taken by Napoleon gave hope to nationalists, but their division into a series of states more or less under the control of Austria dealt a savage blow to nationalism.

This was the starting point for those nationalists who wished to unify their scattered territories or rid themselves of foreign oppression. They tended towards liberalism in their aspirations for their own state, but found the Great Powers inimical, for the most part, towards both their nationalist and their liberal dreams.

(b) In Italy, the failures of Mazzini throughout the 1830s and 1840s, followed by the nationalist humiliation in 1848, made the successes of the 1860s all the more remarkable. Italy, thoroughly partitioned and directly or indirectly under the control of Austria, was rapidly united after the war of 1859, and its emergence as an independent state might be seen by some as an achievement to rank with the creation of Germany. Nationalist sentiment was well developed in Italy, but arguably the key to Cavour's success was that he made use of Italian feeling, recognising, however, that it needed leadership from Piedmont, which he had helped make the most advanced state in the peninsula. He also scoffed at the idea of "Italia fara da se", believing that Italy could not hope to oust the Austrians on its own, recruiting instead French, and later Prussian, help for the task. The conquest of the South was undertaken by Garibaldi, a more old-fashioned nationalist, but his heady progress north might arguably have been halted by Austria had it not already lost the war of 1859 and its Lombard possessions. Undoubtedly the slow decline of Austria aided the Italian

AVAILABLE
MARKS

cause, but Garibaldi's daring, Cavour's diplomatic courtship of
Napoleon III, and his cultivation of the National Society all contributed
to what answers may argue was a significant achievement.

(c) The emergence of Hungary as a self-governing state within the
Habsburg Empire may well be seen as another major victory for
nationalism, in that the Magyars had for some time been seeking some
form of independence, but were thoroughly crushed in 1849 after a
brief flurry of promise. But the deal negotiated by Ferenc Deak for his
country, which fell short of full self-government, was largely the result of
a new realism forced on those charged with preserving the integrity of
the Empire, given that it had recently suffered devastating defeats by
the French in North Italy and by the Prussians at Sadowa.

(d) The German achievement, given that a Confederation of 39 states,
largely under the heel of the Austrians, became a Prussian-led Empire
in less than a decade, commands the greatest respect, and, given the
nature of the question, should be dealt with in appropriate detail.
Bismarck's political and diplomatic abiility saw him stand fast against
vehement Liberal opposition as von Roon sought to increase the size
of the Prussian army and reduce the liberal influence of the *Landwehr*.
He enticed Austria into the Danish War, and contrived the terms of the
Convention of Gastein as a further trap for the Austrians, luring them
into a war which culminated in the establishment of the North German
Confederation. Similarly, Napoleon III was stampeded into a
declaration of war by a French public inflamed by Bismarck's
deliberately provocative editing of the Ems Telegram. Again, his careful
preparations for war deserve consideration. An Italian ally to tie Austria
up on its southern flank, deliberately vague promises to Napoleon III to
keep France neutral in 1866, and a Treaty of Prague which was
moderate enough to prevent an Austrian desire for a war of revenge –
all these exemplified Bismarck's diplomatic cunning. His appeal to
German nationalism, as in the carefully cultivated storm over Schleswig
in 1863, was usually a cover for Prussian aggrandisement, but served
to win over many German nationalists nonetheless.

German unification was not, of course, the work only of Bismarck. Von
Moltke proved a superb general in the field, while von Roon's rebuilding
of the Prussian army was vital. The speed of Prussian mobilisation, the
Dreyse needle gun, and the Krupp 6-pounder cannon all contributed to
Prussian/German military superiority. Much of this would not have been
possible without the coal and iron of Prussia, as well as its rapid
industrialisation.

(e) Answers may mention, by way of contrast with Germany and other
"successful" nationalist campaigns, that a number of nation-states had
to wait until the upheavals of the Great War for their moment. They
might also wish to consider whether "success" is to be found merely in
the foundation of the state, or whether other criteria, such as stability,
responsible government and treatment of minorities, should be

considered. Thus, Italy suffered from a corrupt parliamentary system, while Germany persecuted Catholics for a period and was arguably too heavily loaded in favour of Prussia. Finally, some might consider that a strong sense of nationalism developed through cultural means, whether a nation-state resulted or not, is a "success" for nationalism.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately

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

Examples of contemporary interpretations could include:
- Mazzini's views on nationalism as a means towards peace;
- other leaders' views on Bismarck – why did he usually outwit them?
- contemporary opinions on whether Bismarck was a German or a Prussian nationalist.

Examples of later interpretations could include:
- the historical debate on Bismarck's "master plan";
- historians' views on the similarities and differences between German and Italian Unification;
- historians' views on the importance of 1830 as a turning-point.

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

                                            Option 3   **50**

Option 4: Unionism and Nationalism in Ireland 1800–1900

Answer **one** question.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

1 "The successes and failures of Irish nationalism were determined by individuals." To what extent would you agree with this assessment of constitutional and revolutionary nationalism in the period 1800–1900?

This question requires an assessment of the role of individuals in the fortunes of both constitutional and revolutionary nationalism in this period.

Top level responses will examine the proposition clearly, explaining how each strand of nationalism was helped and/or hindered by individuals either in Ireland or in Britain. Answers will only be expected to deal with the most obvious and well-profiled "individuals", such as the leaders of constitutional groups, revolutionary movements or key members of the British Government.

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

Answers may deploy some of the following knowledge:

(a) The success of constitutional nationalism clearly benefited from the actions of individuals both in Ireland and England.

Daniel O'Connell contributed to the success of Catholic emancipation through his charismatic and inspirational leadership. He inspired the masses through his speeches; his rhetoric pushed an uncertain government to acquiesce**;** he harnessed the support of the clergy and the middle class, and utilised the potent weapons of the freehold vote and electoral strategy to mould the first real pressure group in Europe. *However,* O'Connell's political fortunes were also helped by the actions of individuals in the Tory Government. Wellington and Peel had to reconcile their political discomfiture following the death of Lord Liverpool with the potential of facing down the emancipation campaign, which reached its climax with the Clare election of 1828. O'Connell's political judgement and pragmatism in the 1830s over the unlikelihood of repeal contributed to the Lichfield House Compact with the Whigs, out of which materialised some limited reforms, such as tithe, and the administration of Thomas Drummond. *Yet*, it could be argued that the political plight of the Whigs in the 1830s, and the willingness of Melbourne and Drummond to make the Compact work, was also decisive.

Parnell, like O'Connell, undoubtedly contributed to the progress made by constitutional nationalists in the second half of this period. He possessed similar charisma, and provided a dynamism which Butt had lacked. He showed initiative by seizing on the land question as a means of ultimately harnessing widespread support for the constitutional issue of home rule. He co-operated with the Land League

26

and embraced former members of the Fenian movement in what became known as the New Departure in Irish politics. These actions contributed to land reforms, in the form of the Land Act of 1881 and the Arrears Act of 1882. At Westminster, Parnell created a modern day political party, whose members were the first in Europe to receive a salary and to be bound in a disciplined way by a pledge of unity. Parnell's efforts played a key role in pushing Gladstone towards the introduction of two Home Rule Bills in 1886 and 1893 which, although ending in failure, left a political legacy into the next century. *Gladstone's role was highly significant, as he placed the unity of his party and the existence of his government in jeopardy in pursuit of a solution to the question of home rule.*

(b) **The failures of constitutional nationalism were also influenced in part by the actions of individuals.**

O'Connell's failure to achieve repeal of the Union was partly due to his own political shortcomings. He allowed his contempt for Peel to underestimate his old political foe. His quarrel with Young Ireland undermined the unity of the repeal movement. By duplicating the tactics used to achieve emancipation O'Connell became predictable and easier to confront by the government. *Individuals such as Peel too* played their part. His mixture of firm resolve – as at Clontarf – and reforms, such as the Maynooth Grant, presented O'Connell with an unshakeable force which no amount of rhetoric could deter.

Parnell too, contributed to his own failures. His divorce scandal split his party, alienated the Catholic Church and forced Gladstone to abandon him.

(c) **It can be argued that the fortunes of constitutional nationalism were determined by factors other than individuals.**

The Catholic **middle class** provided organisational skill and funding for the Catholic Association in the pursuit of emancipation. The Catholic **Church** collected the penny rent, provided a network for communication and inspired O'Connell to utilise the 40s freehold vote. In the late1840s, any lingering prospects of a successful repeal movement were wrecked by the **Famine. O'Connell's quarrel with Young Ireland was in part a testimony to the ideological schism between the older man and a younger generation of nationalism**. The **Land League** was a formidable force which Parnell capitalised on. Moreover, the long-standing problems of agriculture and the difficulties faced by the majority of **peasantry** all existed long before the Parnell era. Parnell's demise, following the O'Shea affair, owed much to the hostile response of the Catholic Church in Ireland as well as the revulsion of **nonconformist** feeling in England which accelerated Gladstone's rejection.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

(d) The failures of revolutionary nationalists were also influenced by the actions of individuals.

Emmet's revolt of 1803 was badly planned and bordered on the farcical. His force of 100 failed to capture Dublin Castle. Similar risings in Ulster and Wicklow failed to materialise. **Young Irelanders** such as **John Mitchel** failed miserably in their revolt of 1848, which was badly planned. Similarly, the leadership of the **Fenians**, such as **Stephens** and **O'Mahony**, fatally compromised their prospects of a successful revolt by internal dissent and shortcomings in planning of their revolt of 1867. Arms were lacking; help from the USA did not materialise in any significant way, while even the weather conspired against them.

(e) However, other factors contributed to the failure of revolutionary nationalists.

A common theme in this period was the firm response of government, which took various forms: spies, informers, the police, the military and coercive legislation in a firm and appropriate way. A lack of **widespread support** was also evident. For example, Presbyterians and landowners had no sympathy for the ideas of the Fenians. The **Catholic Church** actively opposed the Fenians and used all its influence to dissuade Catholics from joining.

(f) Regarding the success of revolutionary nationalists, the role of individuals and other factors can be reflected on.

Emmet left a personal legacy to inspire future generations. The writings of Young Irelanders such as **Thomas Davis** played their role in the **cultural revival of the late 19th century** and in the ideas of some of **the leaders of the Rising of Easter 1916**. **Gladstone** was influenced in part by the Fenian revolt to address Irish issues in a more positive way: "My mission is to pacify Ireland".

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately

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

Examples of contemporary interpretations could include:
• extracts from O'Connell's speeches during his emancipation campaign;
• Peel's response to the repeal movement in the 1840s;
• clerical condemnation of the Fenian movement.

Examples of later interpretations could include:
• historians' assessments of the reasons for the success or failure of constitutional nationalists;
• views on the role of key individuals, such as Peel, Parnell and Gladstone;
• opinions about the impact of other factors on the fortunes of constitutional or revolutionary nationalists.   [50]

50

AVAILABLE
MARKS

2 "Before the Home Rule Bill of 1886 they were united and confident; afterwards, they became more divided and uncertain." How far would you agree with this assessment of the supporters of the Union in the north and south of Ireland in the period 1800–1900?

This question requires an assessment of the disposition and attitudes of unionists in the north and south of Ireland before and after the introduction of the first Home Rule Bill of 1886.

Top level responses will reflect on the proposition in the following way. While there are two propositions to debate, it is expected that there may be an imbalance of discussion, with a stronger focus on the second proposition, which embraces the period from 1886 onwards. This "imbalance" reflects the nature of the material available to candidates and also the historical importance in the study of the response of unionists to the reality that a British Government was considering a radical change to the Union.

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

Answers may deploy some of the following knowledge.

(a) **Before 1886, unionists in the north and south of Ireland were united in their ECONOMIC, RELIGIOUS and IMPERIAL motives for wanting to uphold the Union,** *though there were differences in emphasis***.**

Economic fears about their material well-being united all supporters of the Union. Ulster unionists believed that their industrial progress would be damaged by any attempt to repeal the Union. Southern unionists, many of whose leadership came from a landed background, claimed that their agricultural prosperity could only be guaranteed by keeping the Union intact. *Candidates may link this economic theme to the social structure of unionism.*

Religious motives were aired with a greater emphasis among Ulster unionists than among their counterparts in the south. The influx of Catholics into Belfast caused sectarian tensions, which became evident at times of great political activity. By contrast, it was a recurring theme among southern unionists that the Union was not a religious issue at all, and that both Catholics and Protestants enjoyed its benefits. *Candidates may link this difference in religious outlook to the geographical distribution of unionism.*

Imperial concerns if the Union was broken were more notable in the south than in the north of Ireland. Supporters of the Union in the south argued that the empire would be endangered if Ireland's ties with Britain were loosened. Northern unionists were also concerned about

the empire, but the literature and speeches of their southern counterparts devoted more time to the welfare of the "imperial ideal". *Answers may link the southern unionist affection for the empire to their background, education and experience as administrators in the empire.*

(b) **Before 1886 the supporters of the Union had good reason to be confident that the Union would be maintained, but there were several examples of this confidence, if not challenged, at least being tested.**

Daniel O'Connell's moves for repeal of the Union challenged this confidence. First, his motion for repeal in 1834 was overwhelmingly defeated in the House of Commons by a reassuringly united stance from both Whigs and Conservatives. Secondly, Peel securely endorsed by this same Parliamentary support, thwarted O'Connell's repeal campaign at Clontarf in 1843.

Confidence in the Union was tested by the activities of the Land League, which posed a direct challenge to the agricultural status of southern unionists. The Secret Ballot Act of 1872, the widening of the franchise by the Reform Acts of 1867 and 1884, along with the Local Government Act of 1898, all contributed to feelings of unease. The Protestant Colonisation Society upheld property rights in the north-west of Ireland, while in the south, the Property Defence Association was formed in 1880.

The formation of the Home Rule Association [forerunner of the Irish Party] and the subsequent election of 59 Home Rule MPs in 1874, and 69 by 1880, provided another challenge to the confidence of unionists. Before the introduction of the first Home Rule Bill by Gladstone in 1886, southern unionists had formed the **Irish Loyal and Patriotic Union**, while Saunderson had published his "Two Ireland's" in 1884.

(c) **In the period after 1886, supporters of the Union had good reason to be less confident, while the methods they used to maintain the Union indicated some differences.**

Gladstone's conversion to home rule, and his two Home Rule Bills of 1886 and 1893, represented the first real threat to the Union. Unionists had to confront the reality that a British Government was willing to contemplate repeal. However, the House of Lords' veto, along with its clear pro-Union majority, placed the Gladstone threat in some perspective, **thereby making the position of the supporters of the Union more certain**.

The methods used by the supporters of the Union reveal the extent to which their confidence was challenged and the differences in their approach.

6684.01

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Southern unionists' methods were quite different from their northern counterparts. The use of propaganda, the contesting of elections and the use of political connections at Westminster were prominent. Indeed, southern unionists were able to exploit their important social and political influence in the House of Lords where, by 1886, of 144 peers with Irish interest, 116 owned land in the south and west of Ireland. The speed with which unionists organised to meet the home rule threat testifies both to their *uncertainty and the differences* between them. The southern unionists' organisation, the ILPU, was superseded by the **Irish Unionist Alliance in 1891**. At a local level, the **Cork Defence Union** continued its activities after its formation in **1885**. **Ulster Unionists** used the threat of force in their response to the home rule threat. In 1886, the **Ulster Loyalist Anti-Repeal Union** was created as a rival to the ILPU. Members of **Young Ulster**, led by Frederick Crawford, possessed firearms and ammunition. The **Unionist Clubs**, under Lord Templeton, were formed in 1893, followed by the **Ulster Defence Union** in 1894. While the northern and southern unionists used many similar methods, the fact that force was hinted at during the great **Unionist Convention** in Belfast in 1892 demonstrated how far the north was prepared to go its own way in resisting home rule. While they were formally united with their southern brethren, northern unionists displayed a distinctly Ulster-based response. *Answers may reflect upon the titles of the various organisations and comment on the self-perception of the supporters of the Union.* Contrasts in geographical distribution explain the contrast in methods used by the supporters of the Union.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately

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

Examples of contemporary interpretations could include:
• Ulster and southern unionists' comments about their fears for the social, economic or political well-being if the Union was broken;
• comments about perceived threats/challenges to their position before or after the introduction of the First Home Rule bill in 1886;
• comments that indicate the degree of uncertainty and divisions among the supporters of the Union in this period.

Examples of later interpretations could include:
• historians' views on the motivation behind the supporters of the Union;
• historians' opinions on when and how the supporters of the Union were challenged.   [50]

50

Option 4   **50**

Option 5: Clash of Ideologies in Europe 1900–2000

Answer **one** question.

1 How far was Soviet foreign policy in the twentieth century motivated by economic considerations?

This question requires an assessment of the role of economic considerations and other factors in the development of Soviet foreign policy throughout the twentieth century.

Top level responses will reflect on economic considerations in relation to other factors, and come to a reasoned response as to where the balance lies.

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

Answers may deploy some of the following knowledge:

(a) 1917–1924.
Economic considerations were very important in the early years of Soviet foreign policy – whether in the form of withdrawal from the war or the renunciation of Tsarist loans – although it could be pointed out that this was equally ideological. Answers might also point out that Lenin set up the Comintern in 1919 with the goal of trying to spread communism internationally. In this regard it could be argued that foreign policy was motivated by a desire to expand communism. Equally, it could be pointed out that Kennan was subsequently to claim that communism was an inherently aggressive and expansionist ideology and there is some evidence for that claim. However, temporary capitalist intervention from western countries in the Civil War also demonstrated to the Bolsheviks that an isolated USSR was vulnerable and for a Communist regime to survive it would have to ensure its security in the future. Survival rather than any economic priorities or a desire to expand communism was the main priority in this phase, and in 1922 when it signed the Treaty of Rapallo with Weimar Germany, the USSR showed that it could be pragmatic and work with capitalist states if necessary for survival.

(b) 1924–1941.
Stalin continued the more inward-looking policies of Lenin and concentrated upon the economic reconstruction of the USSR. The policy of "Socialism in One Country" focused partly on industrialisation to develop its ability to increase its levels of re-armament to protect itself from potential attacks by capitalist states. Equally, diplomatic ties that were developed with Britain or strengthened with Germany also highlight the significance of economic considerations in Soviet foreign policy. As Stalin was to comment: "One Soviet tractor was worth ten foreign communists", highlighting his priorities. By 1933, with the rise to power of

Hitler, the USSR recognised the potential threat of Nazism. In 1934 the USSR joined the League of Nations to try to co-operate with capitalist states such as the UK and France to achieve collective security. Self-preservation was the clear motive. The involvement in the Spanish Civil War was limited in character and may indeed be viewed as a piece of opportunism by Stalin, whether this was to gain Spanish gold (economic) or the opportunity to wipe out Trotskyist opponents (ideological). After the Munich Conference in 1938, the USSR clearly realised that the West could not be relied upon, and in 1939 it agreed the Nazi-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact with its ideological enemy, Nazism. Although there were economic gains to be made with the Pact, it could be more readily argued that the Pact was essentially a measure to forestall Nazi attack. Such pragmatism revealed that the USSR needed to gain time to rearm more, but also partly in the interests of security it would be beneficial to acquire the Baltic states and Eastern Poland as a potential buffer zone against possible attack from the West. The USSR was also able to recover territory lost by the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk of 1918.

(c) 1941–1945.

The Nazi invasion of the USSR in June 1941 forced it into a temporary alliance with capitalist states to defeat the forces of Fascism, but during the Second World War Stalin decided that, after victory had been achieved, the USSR would never again have to depend on others for its own strategic security.

(d) 1945–1964.

The traditional interpretation of the origins of the Cold War suggests that the USSR occupied the states of Eastern Europe it liberated from Nazi Germany for ideological motives to spread communism. Here is the prime case that the Soviet Union wanted to advance communism wherever possible. Revisionist interpretations suggest that Stalin broke the 1945 Yalta Agreement more for reasons of security and survival. The USSR only narrowly escaped defeat during the Second World War and by 1945 it was near economic ruin. Its security and economic needs led it to seek the creation of governments in nearby states which were not anti-Soviet and to ensure that no military threat ever emanated from German soil again. Stalin not only wanted to maintain a sphere of influence in Eastern Europe amongst the People's Democracies through the Cominform in 1947 and Comecon in 1949, but he also wanted to prevent a united capitalist Germany rising up again to threaten the USSR. One can make a strong claim that economic considerations were a strong driving force at this point – be it in terms of reparations with regard to Germany or Stalin's belief that it was necessary to blockade West Berlin to prevent US attempts to create an independent Federal Republic of Germany that would undermine the workings of their occupied zone. After the creation of the Warsaw Pact in 1955 the USSR was determined to maintain the Iron Curtain. The uprising in Hungary was crushed to prevent states in Eastern Europe from leaving the alliance. Answers could interpret these actions with different degrees of emphasis, whether it be economic considerations or security.

(e) 1964–1982.

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

The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 led to the end of détente and was justified by the Soviets on the ideological grounds of the Brezhnev Doctrine of 1968. Most significant about the Soviet invasion was perhaps the economic impact it had on the Soviet Union.

(f) 1982–1991.

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

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately

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

Examples of contemporary interpretations could include:
• leading political figures from within the Soviet leadership;
• other political or military figures from Western or other relevant nations;
• comment may also be attributed to national newspapers, speeches, memos.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Examples of later interpretations could include:
- historians' comments on the motivation of Soviet foreign policy;
- equally, attention could be given to key areas of historical debate – whether pre-World War Two or debates concerning the origins and continuance of the Cold War. [50]

50

2 "Throughout the twentieth century the opponents of communism in Europe had similar aims but the means by which they attempted to achieve them were very different." To what extent would you accept this verdict?

This question requires an assessment of the degree to which the opponents of communism had similar aims but the means they used to achieve them were very different.

Top level responses will reflect on both aims and methods of different opponents and also patterns of similarity and/or difference, and come to a reasoned response as to where the balance lies.

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

Answers may deploy some of the following knowledge:

(a) 1917–1945.
Initially, the opponents of communism adopted aggressive means in their aim of destroying communism. This was primarily evidenced in their support of the Whites in the Civil War and subsequently the Polish attack on the USSR. However, this approach quickly altered as a result of its failure and a policy of diplomatic isolation was predominant, although answers may note that this was not necessarily the case for Weimar Germany. Weimar Germany adopted a policy of cooperation given the shared marginalised status in European affairs. This policy of cooperation was manifest in a series of treaties such as Radpallo and Berlin. Thus, it could be argued from an early stage that the opponents of communism did not necessarily share the same aims and certainly differed in the means they employed in their attempts to achieve them.

From 1933, Hitler made no secret of his loathing of Bolshevism and considered it to be an ideology that had to be destroyed. The invasion of the USSR would bring the territorial expansion required to gain the living space needed for the German people, and regions of Eastern Europe would provide many of the raw materials needed for Germany to gain self-sufficiency. Fascist opposition developed with the Anti-Comintern Pacts in 1936 between Germany and Japan, and in 1937 when Italy under Mussolini joined. Here is quite clearly a return to the more aggressive approach that had existed in the early years after the October revolution, which may also lead answers to argue that the opponents of communism now had distinctly different aims and were employing distinctly different means of achieving their goals.

Such divisions were further manifested with the development of collective security that saw the Soviets align themselves with their previous foes. Mutual assistance pacts were established between France, Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union. However, with Munich such a pact evaporated and the ensuing Nazi-Soviet Pact turned relations on their head. Answers might point out that there was in effect very little similarity amongst the opponents of communism with regard to either aims or indeed the methods employed. The characteristics of rapid change and switching alliances which were to be a prelude to war reflected the impact of fascist ideology in Europe – a turbulence that was to continue into World War Two. Answers will most likely point out that the opponents of communism now became allies in the fight against fascism.

(b) 1945–1979.
Democratic governments soon distrusted Stalin as he broke the Yalta Agreement of 1945 and did not allow free elections in the states of Eastern Europe. The emergence of the policies of the west headed by the Americans could clearly be seen as distinct from the war years and indeed the pre-war years. The policy of containment of communism was developed and this was pursued consistently through the post-war years by military and diplomatic means. This is most evident in the development of NATO and also the use of force in Greece. Answers may want to highlight the difference in policy towards areas of Europe the Soviets effectively controlled, and other states where there were prominent Communist parties such as Italy.

Equally the Truman Doctrine in 1947 illustrated America's determination to contain the spread of communism in Western Europe and the Marshall Plan of 1947 gave vital economic aid to democratic states in Western Europe to produce stable economies and thus reduce the chances of internal communist revolutions. The Berlin Airlift which began in 1948 secured the emerging Federal Republic of Germany and the formation of NATO in 1949 showed that the West was determined to limit communism to Eastern Europe. This is perhaps the most consistent period of policy from the opponents of communism, and it is possible to suggest that the aims of containing communism were once again consistent but the methods had now altered.

The policy of containment was further demonstrated when the West was not prepared to intervene in the Soviet sphere of influence behind the "Iron Curtain" in Hungary in 1956 or Czechoslovakia in 1968 when the Soviets invaded. The acceptance of Eastern Europe as a Soviet sphere of influence was acknowledged in the Helsinki Accords in 1975. Answers may seek to show that this represented a continuation, or a return to the nature of post-1918 and pre-World War Two relations. Alternatively, answers may want to argue that détente marked a shift in policy towards the Soviet Union even if the protection of western Europe remained central to US objectives.

AVAILABLE MARKS

(c) 1979–1991.

The era of détente came to an end when Reagan and Thatcher denounced the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan of 1979. This could be presented as a change in both aims and methods as the US attempted to fuel the arms race and launched a renewal of the ideological battle in an attempt to defeat what Reagan had termed "the evil Empire". However, such policies were to change with the arrival of Gorbachev as the Soviets effectively retreated from the international scene. In this regard the US as the primary opponent of communism was caught unawares by the scale of the change in Soviet policy. The Americans who were still operating under traditional Cold War assumptions and believed that the Soviet Union was still the "evil Empire" found that they had to alter their own preconceptions. Once again the means by which the West pursued its objective of countering what it perceived to be "the Soviet threat" changed and instead the West met the aspirations of Gorbachev to cut the respective nuclear arsenals.

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

Overall, answers may point to similarities in aims of the opponents at certain junctures but also differences in aims and methods. Equally top level responses will highlight how changing international circumstances limited consistency and states often acted independently of each other, even if they possessed the same aims.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately

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

Examples of contemporary interpretations could include:
- leading political figures from within the leadership of nation states that were opposed to the Soviet Union;
- other political or military figures from nations that were opponents of communism;
- comment from national newspapers, speeches and memos.

Examples of later interpretations could include:
- historians' comments on the actions and policies of nation states that were opposed to the Soviet Union;
- equally, attention could be given to key areas of historical debate – whether pre-World War Two or debates concerning the origins and continuance of the Cold War.

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

6684.01/2