



**ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education
January 2012**

History

Assessment Unit A2 1

[AH211]

THURSDAY 26 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. Evaluation may be limited.
3	contain appropriate examples with illustrative and supportive factual evidence and show understanding and ability to engage with the issues raised by the question in a clear and coherent manner.	display good breadth of understanding of the topic and its associated concepts. Analysis is generally informed and suitably illustrated to support explanations and judgements.	there will be an ability to present and evaluate different arguments for and against particular interpretations of an event or topic.
4	be accurate and well-informed and show ability to engage fully with the demands of the question. Knowledge and understanding will be expressed with clarity and precision.	display breadth and depth of understanding of the topic and its associated concepts. Explanations will be well-informed with arguments and judgements well-substantiated, illustrated and informed by factual evidence.	there will be appropriate explanation, insightful interpretation and well-argued evaluation of particular interpretations of an event or topic.

Synoptic Assessment

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

Generic Levels of Response for Synoptic Assessment

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

Level 1 ([0]–[5]) AO2(b), ([0]–[7]) AO1(b)

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

Level 2 ([6]–[10]) AO2(b), ([8]–[15]) AO1(b)

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

Level 3 ([11]–[15]) AO2(b), ([16]–[22]) AO1(b)

Answers at this level will recall and deploy knowledge accurately, drawing from all parts of the period with clarity and focus. Answers provide focused explanations and make links and comparisons which are developed and analysed, indicating an understanding of the process of historical change. Arguments are developed, substantiated, illustrated and reach a judgement **AO1(b)**. There is a satisfactory evaluation of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject **or** a partial evaluation of **both AO2(b)**. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation and 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 1509–1609AVAILABLE
MARKSAnswer **one** question.

- 1 “How far were Anglo-Spanish relations in the period 1509–1609 determined by economic considerations.”

Answers should focus on a number of factors which had a major impact on Anglo-Spanish relations. Economic considerations should be the driving factor but must be compared to political, dynastic and religious factors. Responses should consider how these considerations affected Anglo-Spanish relations across the period and if there is a consistency in the impact of each factor.

Top level responses will reflect on the entangled nature of the period that candidates are studying. Can each factor be considered as a stand alone idea or is there overlap between them? English development of its economic interests in the New World may have also had a religious motivation as England was no longer constrained by Papal Law. Was political interference in the Netherlands driven by a need to protect a valuable trading partner? As the “Divine Right of Kings” became more accepted can the ideas of religion and politics be separated at all? Answers must consider the intense rivalry which developed between England and Spain as the century progressed and consider this as another factor which influenced Anglo-Spanish relations in the period 1509–1609.

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) Economic considerations:

- strong economic ties had been established by the Treaty of Medina del Campo of 1489 and this grew with mutual successes in trade, especially in the Netherlands;
- trade embargoes were used by both countries in the early 1530s and these worsened Anglo-Spanish relations yet answers might question if this was driven by economic or dynastic considerations;
- the changing nature of the economies of each nation placed new strains on Anglo-Spanish relations. Factors that had made the countries natural trading partners began to change. The decline in the wool trade and damage to the Antwerp money market could be used as examples of how economic considerations determined Anglo-Spanish relations;
- the growing weakness of the Spanish economy due to poor agriculture, a parasitic nobility and church investment directed towards government bonds were overwhelmed by Philip II’s spending, particularly on war. Dependence on New World bullion, due to internal Spanish economic weakness, led to a greater clash with England as it developed its American interests;

- England's search for diversity in international trade to balance difficulties in Dutch trade, caused major clashes in the Americas. England was not prepared to follow Papal direction and let Spain have the New World to itself. Difficulties in the Netherlands led to English interference to protect its trade in this area and economic considerations undoubtedly influenced Anglo-Spanish relations.

(b) Political/dynastic considerations:

- the changing nature of Anglo-Spanish relations is clearly shown during the reign of Henry VIII. The strong relationship of the 1510s and early 1520s deteriorated over the divorce issue. Answers might suggest that Charles I's (V) opposition to the divorce was caused by his desire to protect the Habsburg family name rather than maintain an alliance with England against the French. Responses might consider the recreation of this anti-French alliance in 1542 as proof that political need was the strongest factor determining Anglo-Spanish relations. Good relations during the reign of Mary I continued into the 1560s and it was only later in Elizabeth I's reign that relations began to decline. Answers might consider a range of factors for this decline but might suggest that a growing political rivalry was a leading consideration determining Anglo-Spanish relations;
- answers might suggest that England's need to rebuild its international position in the 1510s and 1520s caused it to oscillate between France and Spain and so its political aims influenced Anglo-Spanish relations. The marriage of Catherine of Aragon to Henry VIII could also have had a direct impact on relations. Answers might suggest that the Anglo-Spanish alliance against France in 1512 was aided by Catherine's prompting of Henry. Responses should consider the possible decline of Spain during the reign of Philip II and how his difficult Imperial position was likely to cause conflict with an increasingly powerful and expansive England;
- responses should consider the political impact of clashes in the New World. The raids of Drake and Hawkins damaged the prestige and authority of Philip II and necessitated action for image rather than economic motivation;
- politically, the unrest in the Netherlands was likely to affect Anglo-Spanish relations. As an area close to southern England, the Netherlands was a possible invasion route to England. England was generally happy with Charles I's (V) style of administration of the Dutch but Philip II's more autocratic form of government threatened political stability. Revolt in the Netherlands finally drew English involvement, especially with a Spanish army in the Netherlands. English interference caused Spanish retaliation with support for Mary Stuart and her English Catholic backers. The Treaty of Nonsuch in 1585 could be described as an attempt for dynastic survival on Elizabeth's part and so confirms how political considerations influenced Anglo-Spanish relations.

(c) Religious considerations:

- religion had little influence during the reign of Ferdinand of Spain and the early part of Charles I's (V) reign. The divorce issue of the late 1520s influenced Anglo-Spanish relations but it was the failure to gain a divorce from the Pope which was to have lasting religious effects. The split from Rome allowed Henry VIII to gain divorce but removed England from the Roman Catholic Church and this religious difference was to determine Anglo-Spanish relations over the rest of the period;
- Edward VI's moves to Protestantism underlined existing differences and provided the basis for future conflict. Despite this, Anglo-Spanish relations remained good in this period;
- the restoration of Roman Catholicism under Mary I removed a large range of religious legislation. Persecution in this period became associated with a Spanish influence as Mary had married Philip Habsburg, the future King Philip II of Spain. Mary's Counter-Reformation in England was to have a major impact on Anglo-Spanish relations. The hard line Catholic core created in England was to have strong links with Spain and their combined actions had a major impact on Anglo-Spanish relations;
- the religious attitudes of both England and Spain during the Elizabethan period went a long way to determining Anglo-Spanish relations. Philip II saw himself as "the sword" of the Counter-Reformation and England saw itself as an "Elect nation";
- many Englishmen, like Drake, were no longer prepared to accept a Papal division of the New World. Their privateering was justified as a reaction to Spanish injustice and religious persecution, yet Philip II saw them as heretics who challenged his authority;
- Spanish interference in Irish rebellion and in support of Mary Stuart can be identified as a religious motivation. Elizabeth's support for Dutch rebels had a strong religious motivation with English Protestants like Robert Dudley and Walsingham supporting intervention;
- Anglo-Spanish relations were affected by the French Wars of Religion. Both nations interfered, fearing a France with a different religious belief to them which might threaten their own interests. Both the Treaties of Joinville (1584) and Nonsuch (1585) could be seen to have a religious motivation which caused war to break out between England and Spain in 1585 so determining Anglo-Spanish relations;
- Spain's support for English Catholic rebellion caused resentment in England and damaged relations. Thus, religious considerations had a major impact on Anglo-Spanish relations.

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:

- William Cecil’s opinion that England needed to expand its trading partners or Hawkins’ desire to develop trade in the Americas;
- religious pressures from groups like the “Puritan Choir”, the Inquisition and individuals like Cromwell or Robert Dudley;
- political pressures from Wolsey or Alva seeking to influence their monarchs in a particular direction;
- popular opinion which was anti-Spanish or anti-English in the respective countries.

Examples of later interpretations could include:

- the debate over Wolsey’s motivations for his conduct of foreign policy;
- discussion of the impact of Mary I’s reign and her union with Philip II;
- the motivation for Elizabethan foreign policy and the impact of the Netherlands;
- the impact of religion on the policies of Elizabeth and Philip II.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately

[50]

50

- 2** “Spain was the loser in Anglo-Spanish relations in the period 1509–1609.”
To what extent would you accept this verdict?

This question requires an assessment of the aims of each nation and a discussion of whether Spain was the loser in Anglo-Spanish relations. Answers should attempt to identify how relations and success varied as the sixteenth century progressed.

Top level responses will reflect on the difference in status of each nation and how this impacted on relations. Answers should explain that England was attempting to rebuild its international position in the early part of the century and that Spain did not regard England as an equal. Spain’s aims were focused on victory over France and England was merely a tool in this process. Responses should develop England’s growing strength in the later part of the century and this, along with the decline of France, created greater conflict with Spain.

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) Ferdinand 1509–1516.

As the ruler of the newly created Spain, Ferdinand wished to build its international standing. The Treaty of Medina de Campo (1489) gave England and Spain combined benefits but by 1509 Ferdinand's powers far outshone the newly crowned Henry VIII. In conflict with France in 1512, Ferdinand used Henry VIII's inexperience to distract France and gain Navarre for Spain. This was clearly a victory for Ferdinand's diplomatic skills and a setback for England.

(b) Charles V 1516–1609.

Answers will show the success of Spain under the kingship of Charles V. As ruler of both Spain and the Holy Roman Empire, Charles dominated most of Europe and was in almost permanent conflict with Europe's other major force, France. England played a major part in this conflict as both an ally of Spain and old enemy of France. Responses might also identify Charles V's major victory over France at Pavia in 1525 and how England played an important distracting part in Northern France. Answers might balance this argument with Charles V's defeat in his opposition to Henry VIII's divorce of his aunt Catherine of Aragon. Charles V's failure to stop the divorce must be regarded as a defeat. The marriage of Charles V's son, Philip, to Mary I could be seen as a major victory, despite the restriction placed on it by the English Parliament. Charles V was prepared to accept the restriction as the marriage might benefit his dominions in the short term against France and in the long term by giving his family control of England. Spain had not suffered a defeat but some humiliation at the marriage terms and had made long-term gains.

(c) Philip II 1556–1598.

Philip's inheritance of all but the Holy Roman Empire from Charles V made him one of Europe's most powerful kings. Answers may point to the Golden age of Spain and support this with Spain's possessions and wealth from the Americas. This international position might be contrasted with Spain's economic and military weakness. Responses might show the development of England under Elizabeth I and link this to rising conflict with Spain. Answers will point to Spain's failure to restore England to the Catholic fold and the defeat of three separate Armadas. The failure of the Spanish-supported rebellion in England and Ireland and the success of the Dutch rebellion could further develop this point. Candidates could consider how far Philip II achieved his aims. Philip failed to expand his Empire but held on to most of the possessions given to him by his father. In religious policy Philip strengthened Catholicism in Spain but failed to renew it in England. Certainly Spain suffered huge military defeats and lost prestige, achieving little in this period. Philip failed to control England and its rise was to coincide with the decline of Spain and so answers might support the proposition. Despite this, Philip II was able to maintain most of his possessions and Spain was still a major force in Europe.

(d) Philip III 1603–1609.

The Treaty of London of 1604 brought peace between England and Spain. Answers might suggest failure in Spain's war aims but that Philip III was more successful in peace than his father had been in war. Concessions at the peace negotiations might be regarded as failure but Philip III was able to stabilise his country's position and this could be regarded as a major victory

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:

- Machiavelli's views of Ferdinand;
- the views of Charles V's councillors such as Nicholas Perrenit, Mercurino Gattinara and Francisco de los Cobos;
- pressures and influences on Spanish monarchs by the Papacy;
- the influences of men like Spinola, Granvelle and Pernia on Philip II and Francisco Gomez, Duke of Lerma on Philip III;
- the aggressive pro-war viewpoints of Englishmen like Drake and Robert Dudley.

Examples of later interpretations could include:

- the views of some historians that Charles V was an old-style ruler but was amateurish in his manner;
- opinions of historians that Spain did not have the capabilities to deal with its territories from 1556 onwards;
- descriptions of Philip II's policy as being similar to the "Weltpolitik" of Germany in 1914;
- the view that Philip III was more successful in peace than his father was in war.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately

[50]

50

Option 1

50

Option 2: Crown and Parliament in England 1603–1702

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Answer **one** question.

- 1 “Clashes over finance caused the most significant changes to the relationship between Parliament and the King in the period 1603–1702.” How far would you agree with this verdict?

This question requires an assessment of the extent to which clashes over finance caused the most significant changes to the relationship between King and Parliament.

Top level responses will analyse the importance of other factors such as religion, foreign policy or the liberties of the subject (in the seventeenth century this was largely taken to be the liberties of the property owner). Parliament secured the greatest concessions from the Crown in the Constitutional Revolution, at the execution of Charles I, the Restoration Settlement, the Glorious Revolution and during the Nine Years’ War in Europe.

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 position of Parliament before 1640

Although the reign of James I (1603–1625) saw some significant clashes between King and Parliament, notably over monopolies and foreign policy, there was little significant change to their relationship. James had faced some criticism, in Parliament, over his financial policies, such as impositions and the disastrous Cockayne Scheme, and his personal spending habits. His pro-Spanish policies and flexible approach to religious policy had also provoked criticism. However, the Crown was not forced to make any major concessions to Parliament before 1640. Foreign policy had been a highly contentious issue between 1621 and 1629 and there was some criticism of Charles I’s Hispanophile tendencies under Personal Rule. Certainly the 1630s saw increasing tensions over Charles’s controversial money raising methods, notably ship money, and his Laudian changes to the church.

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

The Constitutional Revolution was not predominantly due to Charles I’s money making actions and Parliament’s demands were not focused on financial reform. Although this “revolution” did result in the abolition of the Crown’s prerogative financial devices, the King retained his right to collect customs duties and was able to become financially independent if his revenues increased due to an expansion of trade. While finance was certainly an area of concern for Parliament, the Constitutional Revolution focused more on attacking the King’s ability to rule without it and his controversial changes to the church. It could be argued that

MPs feared that, if Charles was able to attain financial independence, he could dispense with Parliament, introduce Catholicism unhindered, use any surpluses to build up a standing army and, in a Catholic, absolutist state, ride roughshod over his subjects' liberties.

The Triennial Act and the Act Against Own Dissolution were designed to avoid a repetition of Personal Rule and the abolition of the prerogative courts restricted the King's independence in the legal system. Even the removal of the prerogative financial devices could be viewed as an attempt to restrict the King's ability to rule without his Parliament.

However, there were limits to Parliament's success in attempting to reform its relationship with the Crown; for example, it failed to secure the right to choose the King's ministers or exert any control over the Anglican Church. The control of the armed forces also remained a royal prerogative.

Financial concerns had played their part in creating the conditions for this clash between King and Parliament. However, other factors were arguably more significant and, in any case, the changes to their relationship hardly merits the term "revolution".

(c) The Execution of Charles I, 1649

The failure to the King to reach a settlement with Parliament after the end of the Civil War ultimately resulted in his execution. While financial issues were involved in this decision to remove the monarchy, they were by no means the crucial factors. The attempts to reach agreement with the King failed because Charles could not be trusted over religion. Charles had proved himself unable, or unwilling, to reach a settlement with his conquerors and must bear some responsibility for his own downfall. The 1640s had seen the emergence of a politicised army and the growth of religious, social and political radicals. These new forces in the country, and the beliefs they had fought for, contributed to the creation of a new form of government in England. Of course, the eventual collapse of the republic and the restoration of the monarchy suggest that the change to the relationship between Crown and Parliament was not as radical or long lasting as it had appeared.

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

The return of Charles II came out of a period of economic, political and social turmoil. However, the change in the relationship between the King and his Parliament was not one of restructuring but of restoration. The Restoration Settlement may have confirmed all the reforms passed by Parliament up to the end of the 1641 session but it represented a triumph for the monarchy. The position and prerogative power Charles II inherited in 1660 remained almost the same as that which his father had received in 1625. The King's execution had not resulted in any long-term change and Charles was able to use his loyal Cavalier Parliament to further strengthen his position. An act was passed to

allow censoring of the press and it became treason to imprison or restrain the king. A weakened Triennial Act restored the monarch's ability to choose when, and if, he called Parliament, as Charles was able to exploit from 1680. Although financial restrictions had been set, Charles was financially independent of Parliament by the end of his reign due to the customs boom and subsidies he received from France. These hugely significant changes to the power and position of both Parliament and its King were not the result of financial clashes but from the need for the political stability which monarchy could provide. Although Charles II had an unpopular foreign policy between 1672 and 1674, he capitulated to the demands of his subjects and stayed out of wars after 1674. When trouble came, most notably during the Exclusion Crisis, it was over religion and the constitution.

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

James II had inherited a financially stable throne from his brother and initially he enjoyed a good relationship with his Tory dominated Parliament. While Parliament was worried by the monarch's financial strength, James II's strong position was ruined not primarily by his financial policies but by clashes over the liberties of his subjects and, most contentiously, his religious policy. By retaining a standing army after the Monmouth Rebellion and promoting Catholic officers, James created alarm. His desire to secure political and religious equality for Catholics by controlling Parliament resulted in a complete breakdown in his relationship with the gentry and ultimately his removal in the Glorious Revolution. It was James II's evangelical approach to his personal religion which caused most opposition to his reign and the birth of a potential Catholic heir made his position, in some of his subjects' eyes, untenable. Good answers will examine the changes to the relationship between King and Parliament created as a result of the new coronation oath, the Bill of Rights, the Mutiny Act, the Toleration Act and the revised financial arrangements.

(f) Changes to the relationship between Parliament and the King during the reign of William III

In the 1690s, William's commitment to a pan-European alliance to resist Louis XIV meant that he had to make substantial concessions to ensure that Parliament continued to authorise taxation to finance the war. Parliament was able to achieve royal dependence and accountability through the Commission of Accounts and Civil List. The Act of Settlement ensured an independent judiciary and determined the religion of the monarch, and a new Triennial Act established the duration of a Parliament as three years. This new style of government gave Parliament a permanency that allowed it to become more efficient and effective in its operation. It might be argued that the most significant changes to the relationship between King and Parliament in the seventeenth century came about as a result of foreign policy rather than finance. Of course, it was the need for adequate military funding that shaped the political reforms made during William's reign. Arguably, therefore, it was this period of financial "agreement", rather than

conflict, that was most significant in changing the relationship between the two. It may be noted that the monarchy remained in a powerful position and was not usurped by Parliament in this period.

By the end of the seventeenth century the relationship between Parliament and the King had changed considerably. The King had lost a degree of financial independence even if the actual level of supply from Parliament had in fact increased. Parliament had become a permanent, integral part of central government and was able to determine the succession and religion of the monarch. Even foreign policy was now within Parliament's sphere of influence. Clashes over finance had provoked many of these changes although religious issues and conflicts over the liberties of the subjects had played their part. Arguably it was the issue of foreign policy in the reign of William and Mary that was most significant in creating the circumstances for change.

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:

- views of the King, ministers of the Crown or MPs at the outset of the century;
- the views of the Stuart monarchs on the issues of conflict in the period;
- the views of the King's ministers on the issues of conflict with Parliament;
- the views of MPs during the Constitutional Revolution, Execution, Restoration, Glorious Revolution and final decade of the century;
- the views of Parliamentarians on their position and power at the end of the century.

Examples of later interpretations could include:

- the Whig interpretation of the pivotal moments in the century;
- revisionist and post-revisionist challenges to the "Whig myth";
- the Marxist interpretation of change in the seventeenth century;
- historians' opinions on the causes of conflict in the period in question;
- historians' opinions on the power and position of Parliament at the outset and at the end of the century.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately

[50]

50

- 2 “James II (1685–1688) weakened the power of the Crown more than any other monarch in the seventeenth century.” To what extent would you accept this statement?

This question requires an assessment of the reign of James II and the extent to which he damaged the relationship between King and Parliament. A comparative analysis should be made with the reigns of James I, Charles I, Charles II and William and Mary.

Top level responses will reflect on the breakdown in the relationship between James and his Parliament that resulted in the Glorious Revolution and the loss of his crown. James II’s actions and attitudes were perceived to be pro-Catholic and pro-absolutist.

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) James II (1685–1688/9)

While James may have intended to secure religious and political toleration for Catholics, his actions were, perhaps understandably, interpreted as a concerted attempt to convert England to Catholicism and create an absolutist state modelled on Louis XIV’s France. Despite inheriting a strong political and financial position, James quickly alienated his supporters in Parliament by maintaining a standing army and using his dispensing power to promote Catholic officers. His establishment of the Court of Ecclesiastical Commission and Declarations of Indulgence were perceived by his loyal Tory supporters to be an attack on the Anglican Church. His subsequent wooing of the Dissenters, in a misguided attempt to secure toleration for Catholics, only succeeded in uniting his opponents against him. While the prerogatives of the monarchy were not directly changed by the events of James II’s reign, it was his abuse of these powers that led to the Glorious Revolution and the creation of a new settlement between King and Parliament.

(b) James I (1603–1625)

Although James I clashed with Parliament over his financial, economic and foreign policies, his reign saw no significant changes to the position or power of the monarchy. He faced some opposition, particularly early in his reign, towards his use of impositions, his overspending and the rewarding of his favourites. His attempt to pursue a balanced religious policy led to some criticism particularly from the Puritans. By the end of his reign clashes over monopolies, the impeachment of Cranfield and the Protestation revealed a Parliament prepared to challenge its monarch even though his actual prerogative power remained undiminished.

(c) Charles I (1625–1649)

In the early years of Charles I's reign Parliament was alienated by the catastrophic failure of his foreign policy and by the methods he employed to fund it. The Petition of Right (1628) demonstrates the extent to which the relationship was strained although the document itself did not seek to change the prerogative power of the King. Personal Rule was to have an important impact upon their relationship, with Charles's abuse of his prerogative financial devices, changes to the church and the closed nature of his court all contributing to gentry perceptions of Catholicism and absolutism.

The Constitutional Revolution, 1640–1642, witnessed substantial losses for the monarchy. Parliament made inroads into the royal prerogative of appointing and retaining ministers when Laud and Strafford were impeached by Parliament and Strafford was executed by the Act of Attainder. The Commons took more control over the Church when it declared that Convocation had no power to bind clergy or laity without the consent of Parliament, by the abolition of the Court of High Commission, and when Bishops were excluded from the House of Lords. Royal powers to call, prorogue and dissolve Parliament were weakened by the Triennial Act and further acts effectively prohibited the raising of revenue without Parliament's consent. Parliament also increased its power over the judiciary by the abolition of the Star Chamber and other prerogative courts. However, many of the major Parliamentary reforms never made the statute books and the Crown retained its most important prerogative powers.

It could be argued that the execution of Charles I represented the ultimate victory of Parliament and a telling blow to the power and prerogatives of the Crown. However, Charles was not executed by the Long Parliament but by the Rump and the restoration of his son to the throne in 1660 suggests that it was an attack upon the person of Charles rather than the institution of monarchy or at least that Parliament was unable to find a workable settlement without the involvement of the monarchy.

(d) Charles II (1660–1685)

Charles inherited virtually the same powers as his father although the reforms of the "Constitutional Revolution" remained in place. He was able to call, prorogue and dissolve Parliament, suspend or veto legislation and dispense individuals from the law. He still chose his own ministers, retained sole responsibility for foreign policy and remained Head of the Church. Given that his father had been executed and he had spent his formative years in exile, it was a remarkable comeback. It is arguable that the Restoration Settlement actually saw a strengthening of the position of the monarch. Charles II's loyal Cavalier Parliament passed a series of censorial and protective Bills that lessened the likelihood of Charles facing opposition like his father. The Triennial Act of 1664 weakened the Act of 1641 stating that Charles only "ought" to call Parliament. The Militia Act reasserted the Crown's

sole right to control the armed forces and the power and stability of the monarchy was further enhanced by the alliance of gentry, Crown and the church created by the Clarendon Code. The strength of the King's position is evident in Charles's ability to survive the Exclusion Crisis, without compromising his prerogative power, and the steps he took to strengthen the Crown's position under his period of personal rule, 1680–1685. By crushing the Whigs and creating an alliance with the Tories, he left his brother, James, a stronger and more stable throne than he himself inherited. Answers may note the huge expansion in trade and the accompanying benefits for the Crown in customs duties. While Charles II left a strong throne to his brother, James, his Declarations of Indulgence and links with Louis XIV's France had aroused fears and suspicions of Catholicism and absolutism that were to come to head in the Glorious Revolution.

(e) William and Mary (1689–1702)

The Glorious Revolution represented a significant change to the power and position of monarchy. The invite to William and Mary to replace James II and become joint monarchs of England challenged the very concept of the divine right of kings. The new Coronation Oath and the agreed Bill of Rights signalled a new relationship between Crown and Parliament. The Crown's dispensing power and abuse of legal proceedings was ended and taxes were not to be levied nor a standing army called without parliamentary consent. Good answers will note that, while this might represent a revolution in the personnel of monarchy, it was not a revolution in its powers and prerogatives. The Bill of Rights required William and Mary to recognise the existing rights of Parliament rather than to give up any of their actual powers and was designed to fix the abuses of the reign of James II. William and Mary agreed to the terms of their coronation rather than having them imposed upon them; in fact, it was William who insisted on the creation of a joint monarchy.

The most significant weakening in the power of the monarchy came in the final decade of the seventeenth century and was a result of the "King's War" into which William III was to lead England. A revised Triennial Act of 1694 limited the royal power of dissolution and ensured the regular calling of Parliament. The establishment of the Commission of Accounts and a Civil List allowed Parliament a degree of control over how the King spent his income. By servicing the Crown's National Debt, with the newly founded Bank of England, Parliament became an essential and permanent institution of government. The Act of Settlement of 1701 determined the religion of the monarch and ensured a Protestant succession.

The reigns of William and Mary saw the creation of a new form of government in a partnership between King and Parliament. Arguably James I had enjoyed a similar working relationship with his Parliament at the outset of the century and, although the prerogative position of the monarchy had changed, it was arguably not substantially different. The

Crown retained the right to choose ministers and judges, to determine foreign policy and to call, dissolve and prorogue Parliament. It could even be argued that the increased financial strength of the monarchy, allowed by the Civil List and Bank of England, actually meant the Crown was, in some respects, stronger than ever before. Most historians, though, would recognise the reigns of William and Mary as being of crucial significance in changing the power and position of both the monarchy and parliament.

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 James II and his leading parliamentary critics during his reign;
- views of royal officials and MPs on the actions of James I;
- the views of leading MPs, such as John Pym, during the Constitutional Revolution;
- the views of leading opponents of the monarchy, such as Oliver Cromwell, at the time of Charles I's execution;
- William III's and his ministers' views on relations with Parliament.

Examples of later interpretations could include:

- Whig historians' analysis of the long-term weaknesses in the relationship;
- historians' opinions on the power of James I at the beginning of the century;
- historians' opinions on the importance of James II's reign for damaging relations;
- historians' opinions on the importance of William and Mary's reign for creating a working relationship between King and Parliament;
- historians' opinions on the relative importance of finance, foreign policy and religion.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately

[50]

50

Option 2

50

Option 3: Liberalism and Nationalism in Europe 1815–1914

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Answer **one** question.

- 1 “In 1815 there was little support for liberalism in Europe; by 1914 it was widely accepted.” How far would you accept this verdict?

This question requires an assessment of both political and economic liberalism across the entire period. Answers will note the difficulties faced by liberalism in the years before 1850, culminating in defeat during the 1848 revolutions. There should be reference to the growth of individual rights and representative government, as well as to the widespread acceptance of free trade in the years after 1850, also observing that after 1875 protectionism returned as a result of economic depression.

Top level responses will reflect on early, if limited, successes for liberalism, as well as the stubborn continuance of forms of authoritarianism in the years leading up to 1914.

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) 1815 marked a low point for liberalism. The Treaty of Vienna restored pre-revolutionary monarchies and their authoritarian regimes across Europe. Those members of the middle classes who had secured government employment under the influence of the French Revolution were forced to accept the return to power of the nobility and see their modest liberal gains eradicated. Central Europe fell under the sway of Austrian Foreign Minister Metternich, who saw liberalism and nationalism as twin evils to be quashed. In the spirit of the Holy Alliance liberal stirrings were ruthlessly crushed in 1820 and 1831, when Austrian troops were used to quell uprisings in Piedmont, Naples and the duchies. In 1823 the restored Bourbon Louis XVIII sent an expedition to Spain to restore the authoritarian Ferdinand VII, while Metternich’s influence was to the fore when the Carlsbad Decrees and Six Articles were passed by the Diet of the German Confederation, suppressing academic freedom in the wake of pro-liberal demonstrations. Within the Habsburg Empire an elaborate system of surveillance and espionage made life difficult for those who wished to see a more liberal regime. In France Charles X appeared to be making good his declared intention of restoring power to the monarchy, the nobility and the church, and, even when he was overthrown and replaced by the more liberal Louis Philippe, the new regime clung on to a narrow franchise when there was an obvious case for cautious extension and revealing liberalism in a more selfish and less idealistic light.

- (b) Better answers will note that the picture was not an entirely gloomy one for liberal progress. Although they were members of the generally repressive German Confederation, the southern states of Bavaria, Baden and Württemberg introduced and maintained constitutions throughout the *Vormärz* period of 1815–1848. The economic dimension of liberalism also made progress, with major moves towards free trade both in Britain and in Germany, where the *Zollverein*, a free trade movement which began in Prussia, had by the early 1840s drawn most of the states of the Confederation into its orbit. Although Charles X had acted in an illiberal manner, he had never repudiated the Charter, granted in 1814, which gave France the most liberal form of government of any major power in continental Europe, a freedom which was built on and extended when Louis Philippe was elected King of the French in 1830. For all Metternich's efforts, liberal ideas persisted and were particularly popular with students and the professional middle classes. Indeed, as the commercial bourgeoisie grew, many saw liberalism as a means of achieving political recognition to match their new economic status.
- (c) In 1848 liberalism for a short while seemed to sweep all before it. In France a republic was put into place. Metternich, the architect of reaction, was forced to flee Vienna, and across Europe panicky rulers conceded constitutions. Briefly liberals were in the ascendancy, but their lack of experience, pragmatism and military might confounded their best efforts. They also faced the dilemma of how best to deal with radical and working class demands for empowerment. Reluctant to share power, many of the largely middle class liberals were alarmed by displays of working class militancy, particularly in Paris and Vienna, and this division in the ranks of the revolutionaries helped the old rulers eventually to regain power. This was a savage blow for the liberal cause, yet paradoxically after 1850 the ideology made steady progress. The best answers will highlight the reasons: the old rulers were ostensibly back in control, but their thrones had been shaken during 1848, and moderate concessions seemed politic if they were to remain in power. In addition, those liberals who stuck with the cause developed a new hard-headed approach which would better promote the wide acceptance of liberal values.
- (d) Initially the post-1848 period was unpromising for liberalism, with reaction triumphant in Austria during the Bach era, Frederick William's Prussian constitution watered down by the three-tier voting system, and the Second French Republic replaced by the Second Empire. But France had at least preserved universal suffrage after 1848, and, although Napoleon III laid more stress on "order" than liberty for most of his reign, he introduced a series of reforms in the 1860s which led to what was dubbed a "liberal empire." Cavour was one of the new, tougher breed of liberals, who not only modernised Piedmont while preserving its liberal ethos, but also drove the Austrians out of Italy and played the major role in unifying the country. He has been accused of mere Piedmontese expansionism, but he ensured that the new

Kingdom was governed by a constitution, with guaranteed individual rights and a system of parliamentary government. In Prussia the Liberals were a leading voice in the Diet, and, although Bismarck outmanoeuvred them in the 1860s, the more pragmatic of them formed the National Liberals, who became Bismarck's main allies in the new German Reich. In the Habsburg Empire liberals gained some influence over the government, and von Schmerling served as Minister of Justice. When the French Third Republic was established, its constitution was impeccably liberal, with the veteran liberal leader Thiers instrumental in defeating attempts to decentralise the country (the Paris Commune), and to restore the Bourbon monarchy. Free trade became widely accepted, its high point arguably being the Franco-British Cobden Treaty of 1860.

- (e) As the period wore on, liberal insistence on the right to vote, to join trade unions, and to express opinions freely was established more and more widely. But traditional liberalism was not always successful after 1870, and more nuanced answers will point to this. Although the Third Republic was maintained, the desire for a more authoritarian form of government was apparent throughout the Dreyfus Affair, while the strikes of the years just before 1914 pointed to the rise of the anti-liberal syndicalist movement. In Germany the National Liberals' support for the illiberal *Kulturkampf* could be seen as a betrayal of their principles, and Bismarck unceremoniously ditched them when he abandoned free trade in 1879. As the post-1875 depression continued there was a Europe-wide stampede to re-introduce protection, a body blow to a liberal article of faith. Again emanating from Germany, the early Welfare State policies of the period ran counter to classical liberalism, with its emphasis on individualism as opposed to collectivism. In Italy the liberals were tarnished by their use of *trasformismo*, a system of centrist coalitions which did little for the wellbeing of the country but served to enrich corrupt deputies. After 1900 Germany may have possessed a universally elected *Reichstag*, but its powers were limited, while in the Habsburg Empire Franz Joseph was perceived as having returned to autocratic rule in these years.

Any other relevant and accurate material should be rewarded appropriately.

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

Examples of contemporary interpretations could include:

- Metternich's opinions of liberalism;
- the liberal perspective on economic freedom;
- Napoleon III's ideas about liberalism;
- the National Liberals' justification for working with Bismarck.

Examples of later interpretations could include:

- historians on the social background of liberals;
- historians' analysis of why the liberals failed in 1848;
- the historical debate as to whether Napoleon III always intended to introduce liberal reform;
- historians' opinions as to the widespread acceptance of liberal values.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately

[50]

50

2 How far would you agree that Italian unification was the greatest achievement of nationalism in Europe between 1815 and 1914?

This question requires an assessment of the obstacles overcome to achieve Italian unification, and the differing contributions made by Cavour and Garibaldi. Other nationalist triumphs from across the period, in countries such as Greece, Belgium and Bulgaria, but especially in Germany, should be considered, and a judgement made as to which of these newly created states was in fact the greatest achievement for nationalism.

Top level responses will reflect on whether or not the Kingdom of Italy was a success, looking at issues such as its domination by Piedmont and the glaring contrast between north and south. Other nationalist achievements should similarly be analysed.

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) In 1815 there were many obstacles in the way of a united Italy. The topography of the peninsula, linguistic differences and the economic and social gulf between north and south all militated against unification. The Congress of Vienna had redivided the peninsula, and its various rulers were, not unnaturally, unwilling to lose power by subsuming their states in a united Italy. The Habsburgs, having absorbed Lombardy and Venetia into their Empire, and with indirect control over most of the rest of the peninsula, were determined to maintain that control, and on a number of occasions between 1815 and 1848 sent troops into Italy to quell uprisings. But Italian nationalism continued to attract a loyal following, with secret societies and later the influential Mazzini in the forefront. In the 1830s his idealistic conception of a united, democratic Italy won over a new generation who joined the Young Italy movement, but its efforts to drive out the Austrians and establish an independent Italy were easily defeated. The great upsurge of nationalist feeling in 1848 attracted insufficient enthusiasm from the peasant classes, and Charles Albert's gallant leadership against the Austrian army culminated in defeat, while the withdrawal of support from Pope Pius IX was a bitter blow for Italian nationalists.

- (b) Yet success would come within a decade, the different approach adopted by Count Camillo Cavour being the key factor. Determined to extend Piedmontese rule across Italy, he played a leading role in the political and economic modernisation of Piedmont, making it attractive to Italian patriots and a potential focus for eventual unification. Scorning the belief that Italy could go it alone against the Austrians, he secured an ally in the opportunistic Napoleon III, and went on to liberate Lombardy in 1859. Even when Napoleon pulled out of the war and a disgusted Cavour resigned, the National Society, with which the Piedmontese Prime Minister had clandestine links, campaigned throughout the duchies for union with Piedmont. When Garibaldi raised the more traditional banner of revolt in Sicily and swept all before him during his progress north through Naples, a reinstated Cavour confronted the revolutionary hero before he could invade the Papal States, and Garibaldi handed over the southern part of Italy to Victor Emmanuel. The Kingdom of Italy was declared in 1861, adding Venetia and Rome to its possessions within the decade.
- (c) Top answers will recognise the contrast between Cavour's success and the failure of his predecessors, citing his willingness to abandon the *Italia fara da se* mindset and the consequent recruitment of France as an ally. Although he may well have preferred a solely Northern kingdom, he was pragmatic enough to absorb Garibaldi's southern conquests when they were available. Some answers may query whether a Piedmontese takeover of Italy was really a triumph for nationalism, and point to the difficulties experienced by the Italian state in succeeding years.
- (d) Germany ought also to be considered in the context of nationalist success. Like Italy, it was redivided in 1815, the treaty makers constructing a Confederation in which Austria held sway. Nationalist activity did continue, but Metternich ensured that it would not succeed. A French invasion scare of 1840 stimulated nationalist feeling, with a surge in patriotic music, poetry and newspapers. When the 1848 revolutions broke out one of the main aims was a united Germany, but the liberal nationalists who gathered at Frankfurt proved indecisive, squabbling over the extent of the putative state and divided by religious affiliation. Hampered by a lack of military firepower, they were overwhelmingly dependent upon Prussia, and when Frederick William chose to go his own way, eventually rejecting the offer of the German throne from the Frankfurt Assembly, the nationalist rebellion was over, Austria reimposing its control with the Treaty of Olmütz. This was the unpromising background against which Bismarck united Germany under Prussian leadership. Determined to confront and, if necessary, fight Austria, he embarked on a wily diplomatic campaign which saw Prussia ally with the Habsburg Empire in a war against Denmark (which allowed Bismarck to demonstrate his nationalist credentials), before manufacturing a situation in which Prussia went to war with its erstwhile ally. The resulting victory allowed him to force the northern and central German states into a North German Confederation. For the

time being the southern states remained aloof, but when Bismarck lured France into war in 1870 those states were obliged to offer support to Prussia, and at the successful conclusion of the war the German Empire, incorporating Bavaria, Baden and Württemberg, was proclaimed.

- (e) Some answers may argue that this was a greater nationalist success than Italy, pointing to Bismarck's defeat of his two main enemies without recourse to an alliance with a major power (Italy was of limited use to Prussia in 1866). Better answers may suggest that this was less a triumph for German nationalism than an example of Prussian expansionism, and that Bismarck's unification had little in common with the more liberal version of German nationalism seen before 1850. This contrasts with Italy, which, despite, or perhaps because of Piedmontese domination, retained a liberal tinge throughout.
- (f) Other nationalist successes should receive a mention. In 1829 Greece became the first Balkan territory to obtain independence from the Ottoman Empire, after a long drawn out rebellion was finally settled when Britain, France and Russia intervened on its behalf. The establishment of Belgium's independence from the Dutch-dominated Kingdom of the Netherlands in 1831 was significant in that this was the first successful challenge to the Treaty of Vienna, although the Belgians did receive diplomatic support from Britain and military aid from France when the Dutch king attempted to reconquer his lost possessions. The creation of the Dual Monarchy in 1867 granted the Hungarians self-government within the Habsburg Empire, but it also allowed them to rule the eastern half of the Empire and deny the nationalist claims of the Croats. Bulgaria achieved its independence in the wake of the Russo-Turkish War of 1877, adding further territory in 1885 and later in the aftermath of the Balkan Wars. These same wars saw the creation of Albania in 1912, while Norway gained its freedom from Sweden in 1905. It is likely that most answers will deal predominantly with Italy and perhaps Germany in the context of "the greatest achievement of nationalism", but there may be reference to the impact of cultural developments, which, despite their undoubted influence, did not always lead to the creation of nation-states during the period under study, but which nevertheless helped to foster a growing awareness of nationalism and a climate where multi-national empires were seen as archaic and nation-states the political unit of the future.

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 those Italians who believed Italy needed no outside help to free itself;
- Cavour on the need for foreign help;
- Mazzini's ideas on the ideal nation-state;
- Garibaldi on the compromises necessary to achieve Italian unification.

Examples of later interpretations could include:

- the historical debate surrounding the traditional view of the Risorgimento;
- the views of historians as to whether or not the Kingdom of Italy was a success;
- historians who believe that Germany, for example, was nationalism's greatest achievement;
- historians' views on the importance of cultural nationalism.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately

[50]

50

Option 3

50

Option 4: Unionism and Nationalism in Ireland 1800–1900

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Answer **one** question.

- 1 “Irish nationalists gained only small victories but suffered huge defeats.” How far would you agree with this assessment of constitutional and revolutionary nationalism in Ireland in the period 1800–1900?

This question requires an assessment of the fortunes of constitutional and revolutionary nationalism in this period. Top level responses will examine the proposition clearly, explaining the extent to which nationalists experienced **small victories but huge defeats**.

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.

Top marks will be awarded to answers which link the activities of nationalists in this period to the proposition. For example, when is the term “small victory” valid? What can be viewed as a “huge defeat?” The definition of these terms remains open for a wide interpretation, which will be rewarded provided they are plausible.

Answers may deploy some of the following knowledge:

- (a) **Constitutional nationalism experienced a mixture of small victories and huge defeats.**

Daniel O’Connell contributed to the success of Catholic emancipation through his charismatic and inspirational leadership. Answers may reflect that this was a **huge victory, not a small one**. The emancipation campaign was ground breaking in its creation of modern day pressure group activity. The Lichfield House Compact with the Whigs brought about some limited reforms, such as tithe, the administration of Thomas Drummond, reform of local government and the Poor Law. It can be argued that this Compact merely yielded **small victories but was a huge defeat**, as each aspect of the Compact had some disappointment for O’Connell. When O’Connell returned to his ultimate objective – the repeal of the Union – he suffered a **huge defeat in 1843 at Clontarf**, denied by a resolute government and undermined by flaws in his own campaign.

Parnell took the opportunity to use 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 and embraced former members of the Fenian movement in what became known as the New Departure in Irish politics. These actions contributed to the Land Act of 1881 and the Arrears Act of 1882. These events invite comment about **small victories but huge defeats**. 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. By 1885 Parnell had an efficient political machine organised by the Irish National League, and nearly 80 home rule MPs in the

Commons. 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. Answers may reflect on the suitable application of “**small victories but huge defeats**” to this phase of Parnell's career.

(b) The appropriateness of “small victories but huge defeats” can be directed towards the activities of revolutionary nationalists.

Emmet's revolt in 1803 was badly planned and bordered on the farcical. His force of 100 failed to capture Dublin Castle and other strategic sites in the capital. Aid from France was not forthcoming. Similar risings in Ulster and Wicklow failed to materialise. **Huge defeat** may be the verdict here. However, the legacy of Emmet in Irish physical force traditions may produce a more favourable assessment. **Young Irelanders** such as **John Mitchel** failed miserably in their revolt of 1848, which was badly planned. Yet the writings of their founder, Thomas Davis, were to provide an inspiration for some of the key personalities involved in the Easter Rising of 1916. 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 the 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. Hostile censure from the Catholic Church in Ireland and indirectly from the Vatican, combined with a resolute yet appropriate response from government, proved fatal to the Fenians' prospects. However, while suffering a huge defeat in 1867, they did bestow a legacy for future generations of revolutionary nationalists.

Gladstone was influenced in part by the Fenian revolt to address Irish issues in a more positive way: “My mission is to pacify Ireland”, indicating some short-term achievement.

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 or Parnell's speeches;
- 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 successes and defeats of the various strands of nationalism;
- views on the role of key individuals, such as Peel, Parnell, Gladstone.

[50]

50

- 2 “The supporters of the Union in the north and south of Ireland in the period 1800–1900 were motivated only by religious considerations and the determination to use force to protect their own interests”. To what extent would you accept this verdict?

This question requires an assessment of the motivation of unionists in the north and south of Ireland in this period.

Top level responses will reflect on the proposition, addressing the extent to which religion was the most prominent motivating force for unionism.

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) **Religious motives for wanting to uphold the Union were apparent in the north and south of Ireland, though there were differences in emphasis.**

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. For example, the occasion of the first and second home rule bills of 1886 and 1893 witnessed sectarian tension. 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. Contemporary statements from W. H. Lecky and the ILPU stressed that the Union was beneficial for everyone in Ireland. *Candidates may link this difference in religious outlook to the geographical distribution of unionism.* Ulster Protestants comprised a population of 800 000 out of 1.25 million, and could feel secure enough to speak of religious issues in a more direct manner. However, their southern counterparts made up only 25% of the 2.25m population in the remaining three provinces. Since many southern unionists came from the agricultural and landlord class, they inevitably depended upon their Catholic neighbours to provide employment and engage in commerce. While Denis Henry was an exceptional example of a Catholic Unionist in Ulster politics, William Kenny, who won the St. Stephen’s Green constituency in Dublin in 1892, represented a wider trend of Catholic Unionists in the south and west.

- (b) **Imperial concerns** if the Union was broken indicate that religion was not the most important motivating factor for the supporters of the Union, though reflections about imperial considerations 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. Men like Lansdowne and Midleton served the

empire in administrative and diplomatic roles. And their experiences of a having a wider world view undoubtedly influenced their regard for keeping the Union intact. 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.*

- (c) **Supporters of the Union in the north and south of Ireland shared powerful economic concerns, which motivated their desire to keep the Union intact.**

In the north, the industrial prosperity brought about by shipbuilding, linen and the ropeworks dominated unionist comments about the benefits of the Union. Ulster unionists were very proud that their industrial power base set them apart from the rest of the country, and were in no doubt about the role of the Union in the maintenance of their commercial strength. In the south, economic apprehensions about the union were centred around agriculture. Key events during the period, such as the Land Acts of 1870 and 1881, as well as the activities of the Land League, appeared as a threat to the welfare of the landlord class. Hence, there was a belief that only strong links with Westminster could guarantee their financial security.

- (d) **The methods used by the supporters of the Union in the north and south indicate that force was only one of several options.**

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 to their **differences**. 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**. The **Property Defence Association** aimed to defend property rights. 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 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. *Candidates 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 differences in methods used by the supporters of the Union. A clear minority of the unionists in the south and west of Ireland realised that force was as unattractive as it was unrealistic. However, secure in their majority position in Ulster, unionists could present a more formidable threat to any government intending to dismantle 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 their social, economic or political wellbeing if the Union was broken
- comments about perceived threats/challenges to their position, and attitudes regarding methods.

Examples of later interpretations could include:

- historians' views on the motivation behind the supporters of the Union
- historians' opinions on the kind of methods used to defend the Union.

[50]

50

Option 4

50

Option 5: Clash of Ideologies in Europe 1900–2000

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Answer **one** question.

- 1 “The aims of Soviet foreign policy in the twentieth century were aggressive rather than defensive.” How far would you accept this verdict?

This question requires an assessment of how far the Soviet Union adopted an aggressive foreign policy rather than a defensive one in the years 1917–1991.

Top level responses will reflect on the motivations of Soviet foreign policy and consider what other perspectives could be used to understand its actions, assessing the nature of the proposition at the heart of the question.

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

The early years of Soviet foreign policy offer candidates ample opportunity to discuss the proposition at the heart of the question. The withdrawal from World War One, the cancellation of foreign debts, the subsequent Civil War and foreign intervention, as well as the establishment of the Comintern and promotion of revolution abroad could all be considered. Equally the Russo-Polish War and Lenin’s subsequent more pragmatic approach with the establishment of traditional diplomatic relations with Britain, France and Germany could all be assessed.

(b) 1924–1941

The change in leadership which was firmly established by the late 1920s produced a change in policy. A range of possibilities are open to students at this point – they could emphasise Stalin’s turning away from world revolution to “socialism in one country”. Others could argue that this was temporary and by 1936 Soviet aggression is again at work with regard to the Spanish Civil War.

The years preceding the Second World War offer another opportunity to assess whether the Soviet Union was inherently aggressive or defensive. The attempts at collective security having failed, the Soviets turned to the Nazis. Responses, like the historiographical debate, can interpret these events in different ways: as part of a general Soviet plan that sought to see Western capitalist nations embroiled in war, or a series of reactions to events as they unfolded. Indeed, it could also be argued that the Soviets genuinely sought to stand up to Fascism only to be betrayed by capitalist powers.

(c) 1941–1945

The Second World War itself would generally be understood in defensive terms – after all 80% of Nazi forces were concentrated in the East. The concluding years of the Second World War and its immediate aftermath offer the next serious points of discussion. Responses could emphasise one aspect of the question and suggest that the Soviets acted mainly out of security and defensive concerns, drawing appropriate evidence to substantiate these claims. Equally responses could emphasise the orthodox view – after all it appeared that the Soviets were going back on the agreements of Yalta and expanding across Eastern Europe. Once again a more balanced and nuanced view could be articulated that emphasises that this was a series of actions and re-actions and that it is not readily obvious as to who were the aggressors.

(d) 1945–1968

From this juncture a range of events unfold from the Berlin Blockade in 1948 to the invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968. Answers would be expected to address these key events and also changes in leadership in a manner that allows them to challenge or support the proposition of the question. Responses may also want to distinguish between relations with capitalist powers and relations within the Eastern Bloc and argue that within the Eastern Bloc the Soviets were inherently aggressive, while their foreign policy was defensive towards the West.

(e) 1968–1985

The emergence of détente and the series of military and economic agreements that characterise the 1970s would seem to hint at a less aggressive Soviet Union and one that had taken its place in the family of nations. However, this is open to challenge and once Soviet interests were threatened in Afghanistan, the whole détente edifice came crashing down and the “evil empire” was revealed for what it was. Indeed, candidates may want to assert that, while there was détente in terms of relations with the West, there was no similar thawing of relations with states in the Eastern Bloc.

(f) 1985–1991

It was only then with the emergence of Gorbachev and the explicit renunciation of Marxism as a singular explanation of history, guiding principle for the conduct of foreign affairs and rejection of the Brezhnev doctrine that Soviet foreign policy ceased to be inherently aggressive. Alternative perspectives might argue that Afghanistan and the US determination to bankrupt the Soviet Union through military spending led Gorbachev to change policies. It may be argued that this period witnesses the most explicit evidence of the defensive nature of Soviet policies during this period – policies that were often unilateral and expressed the Soviet desire to bring the Cold War to an end.

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 and military figures from the period including General Secretaries, Foreign Commissars, central actors in particular events such as General Clay in Berlin after the Second World War;
- comment may also be attributed to national newspapers, speeches, memos.

Examples of later interpretations could include:

- historians' comments on the motivation of foreign policy across the relevant nations being considered;
- equally, attention could be given to key areas of historical debate – whether prior to the Second World War or debates concerning the origins and continuance of the Cold War.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately

[50]

50

- 2 “The opponents of communism in Europe were more successful before 1941 than in the period 1941–1991.” To what extent would you agree with this statement?

This question requires an assessment about the extent to which the opponents of communism in Europe proved to be more successful in the years prior to 1941 than they were in the period 1941–1991.

Top level responses will reflect on the different aims of the different opponents of communism in Europe and how this also changed after the Second World War.

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:

Responses will draw upon a range of material from across the period that allows them to address the proposition at the centre of the question.

(a) 1917–1941

Initially answers may argue that there was a large degree of failure. The intervention to support the Whites failed – the Soviets had cancelled all loans and had started supporting the international communist movement in its attempts to overthrow capitalism. It may be noted that, although the opponents of the Soviet Union failed to undermine the revolution of 1917, they themselves did not succumb to communism.

Opponents can also start to be differentiated – for example, Germany, given its international and geographical status, developed different relations compared to Britain. In this regard different strategies were adopted by different opponents of the Soviet Union.

However, the general position was to isolate the Soviet Union – which was largely successful.

The change in international context with the rise of fascism across Europe brought about a change in the aims of the opponents of communism. On the one hand, democracies were keen to cultivate diplomatic ties to provide a bulwark against fascism and as such the Soviet Union was re-integrated into the world community, most notably with regard to the League of Nations in 1934.

On the other hand, fascist countries, particularly Germany, made explicit their outright hostility to the Soviet Union, most notably through diplomatic pacts such as the the Anti-Comintern Pact and the general rebuffing of any Soviet overtures.

With the Nazis determining the nature of European events, the Soviet Union was in due course to find itself close to annihilation as the continent spiralled towards conflict.

The democratic countries' dealings with the Nazis in Munich led to a collapse in their relations with the Soviet Union, which then turned to the Nazis, providing them with the opportunity to launch their assault on Western Europe. In this regard, answers may argue that the opponents of communism failed if their plan was to isolate the Soviet Union and bring about the downfall of communism. Equally though, with Hitler reverting to type, he was to singularly fail with his war against the Soviet Union. In fact, responses could argue that this was the largest failure of any of the opponents of communism – and this was to occur between 1941 and 1945.

(b) 1945–1991

Answers could argue that, after the Second World War, it appeared that the Soviet Union was able to impose its will across half of Europe and thus the opponents of communism failed. However, responses may arguably suggest that the West was willing to accept a Soviet sphere of interest and in fact was successful in limiting that sphere of interest and opposing communist movements wherever else they appeared across Western, Northern or Southern Europe. Indeed, Eisenhower was arguing as early as the 1950s that the Soviet Union would decay from the inside.

Equally, answers may argue that the West successfully won the propaganda war against communism and thus planted the seeds for the collapse of the Soviet Union and its ultimate disintegration after 1989.

Evidence may be drawn from a range of examples – the Berlin Wall, the symbolism of Soviet aggression in 1956 and 1968 in Hungary and Czechoslovakia respectively, the human rights’ provisions within the Helsinki Final Act of 1975. Equally mention may be made of the triumph of western culture and the impact of US military spending in the 1980s in particular.

Alternatively answers could turn this on its head and argue that the West, while able to ensure the limited appeal of communism in Western Europe, most notably in Italy, was largely ineffectual with regard to Eastern Europe irrespective of who the leader of the Soviet Union was. This is evident with regard to Hungary in 1956 and Czechoslovakia in 1968. Equally responses may want to question how successful détente was and in many ways they were conceding the reality of communist dictatorship and oppression across Eastern Europe.

Alternatively, answers may seek to argue that the Helsinki Final Act of 1975 planted the seeds of human rights’ organisations within Eastern Europe that in time corroded the legitimacy of the regimes. A further point could be made that it was the bold increase in military expenditure, the ‘ratcheting up’ of the rhetoric and pressure on the Soviet Union in the 1980s that led it to engage in imperial overstretch and thus its implosion.

An alternative viewpoint might want to suggest that ultimately the Soviet Union imploded under the contradictions of Gorbachev’s policies in the late 1980s.

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;
- political or military figures from the Soviet Union or other relevant nations;
- comment may also be attributed to national newspapers, speeches, 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 prior to the Second World War or debates concerning the origins and continuance of the Cold War.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately

[50]

50

Option 5

50

Total

50