Rewarding Learning

ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education
2011

History

Assessment Unit A2 1

[AH211]

TUESDAY 17 MAY, 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   "The actions of English and Spanish monarchs were solely responsible for the increased tension, and eventual war between England and Spain in the period 1509–1609." How far would you agree with this statement?

This question requires an assessment of the actions and aims of individual English and Spanish monarchs and how these correspond to increased tension throughout the century. Candidates should also consider a range of other factors which led to increased tension such as: religious change and difference, and economic rivalry.

Top level responses will reflect on the differences between monarchs and of the policy needs of each nation. Candidates will be able to analyse the impact monarchs had on policy and the influences of various factions or factors on increased tension.

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 1509–1547. Candidates will consider Henry VIII's desire to follow Henry V's example as a "warrior Prince" and claim the crown of France. This desire was to link Henry VIII's reign with conflict, with three wars being fought against the French but also to maintain the existing alliance with Spain. Good relations with Spain could be used to show that this English monarch did not increase tension. Henry's marriage to Catherine of Aragon in 1509 continued the alliance that his father had created yet it eventually led to increased tension. Henry's need for a divorce and Catherine's unwillingness to accede to this demand, led to increased Anglo-Spanish tension in the 1530s. Candidates might consider the impact that others had on policy and whether any tension was caused by Henry or by factions and men like Wolsey and Cromwell. Religious change in England might be considered as a reason for growing tension between England and Spain and consideration of what part Henry played in this will develop the answer. The Third French War of the 1540s could be used to show Henry's reign ending with the renewal of good Anglo-Spanish relations and decreased tension.

(b)   Edward VI and Mary I 1547–1558. The answer might consider the Protestant reforms of Edward as a cause of increased tension yet the dynastic needs of each monarch lessened their impact. During Edward's reign relations remained good despite increasing religious differences. Answers might consider the amount of influence that Edward, as a minor, had on relations. The impact of the Dukes of Somerset and Northumberland on relations might be considered as being more important than Edward's.

6826.01   **6**

AVAILABLE
MARKS

The reign of Mary is often considered to be the high point in Anglo-Spanish relations with her marriage to Philip of Spain. Answers should consider the opposition in Parliament to this marriage and Wyatt's rebellion of 1554 confirms xenophobia in England. Answers may use Mary's actions to show that relations were declining rather than improving.

(c) Elizabeth I 1558–1603. The outbreak of war in 1585 would seem to suggest that Elizabeth was responsible for a major increase in tension. Answers should consider the good relations of the early 1560s and the reasons for gradual decline. Elizabeth's Protestant faith did not deter Philip's matrimonial advances and even her rejection of these advances did not lead to an immediate increase in tension. Answers should consider Elizabeth's foreign policy and support for Calvinist rebels in Scotland, France and, most importantly, the Netherlands as a cause of conflict. Answers might point to Elizabeth's "borrowing" of Genoese silver, bound for Antwerp as pay for Philip's troops in the Netherlands, as a direct cause of conflict. Elizabeth's open support for English "privateers" and their activities in the Americas also increased tensions. Answers will clearly show declining relations until war was declared by Spain, on England after the Treaty of Nonsuch but they should also question Elizabeth's culpability in these events.

(d) Ferdinand and Charles I 1509–1556. Answers should consider the part played by these Spanish monarchs in causing conflict. In 1512 Ferdinand used the inexperienced Henry VIII in conflict with France. Charles I (V of the Holy Roman Empire) found himself in almost constant conflict with the Valois dynasty of France. Charles' relations with England were always driven by a need to gain an ally against his main enemy and so he sought to manipulate Anglo-Spanish relations in his favour. On a number of occasions Charles made separate peace deals which left England unrewarded for its actions and so increased tension.

(e) Philip II 1556–1598. Answers might consider the positive nature of Philip's actions towards England. His marriage to Mary I, proposal to Elizabeth and his limitation of Papal action against her would support this view. Consideration of his policies from the late 1560s onwards could identify him as a major cause of increased tension. Philip II's support for Catholic revolts and plots in England and Ireland raised tension and made Elizabeth fearful of a Catholic crusade against her. Philip's support for the Inquisition and his signing of the Treaty of Joinville forced England towards war. The conflict in the Netherlands and the existence of a Spanish army so close to England increased tension still further. Answers might point to neither Philip nor Elizabeth desiring war yet events and the actions of their subjects drew them unavoidably towards it.

(f) **Philip III 1598–1609 and James I 1603–1609.** Answers might consider the positive achievements of Philip III in signing the Treaty of London in 1604, despite its terms favouring England. Philip III may have achieved more in peace than his father did in war. Clearly better relations were restored by Philip's need for peace yet hostility remained between the nations, especially in the New World. James I's desire for peace can only be viewed as a positive factor in ending war in 1604 with his support for the Treaty of London.

(g) **Other factors.** Answers might consider to what extent Anglo-Spanish relations were driven by religious and economic issues. Answers might suggest that the split from Rome and later moves to the Protestant faith created differences between England and Spain that made a decline in relations inevitable. The economic importance of England's wool trade with the Netherlands maintained good relations but its declining importance, from the 1560s onwards, can be associated with worsening Anglo-Spanish relations. England's challenge to the Spanish monopoly of trade in the Americas could also be used to explain declining relations that were not solely the responsibility of 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 opinions and influences of individuals like Wolsey, Cromwell and Cecil on English policy
• the actions of privateers like Drake and Hawkins
• English Protestants who wanted to support their co-religionists
• Papal pressure on Philip II to deal with English heretics.

Examples of later interpretations could include:
• debate on who controlled English policy, Henry or his ministers (Scarisbrick, Elton, Loades)
• Philip's motivation for his foreign policy (Black Legend and historians like R Trevor Davies and H Kamen)
• debate on Elizabeth's foreign policy. Was it proactive or reactive?
• opinion on whether Charles I and Philip II were able to deal with the lands they possessed. (M Rady and I Thompson)

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

AVAILABLE
MARKS

2   "France had a greater influence than the Netherlands on Anglo-Spanish relations in the period 1509–1609." To what extent would you agree with this statement?

This question requires an assessment of the extent to which France and the Netherlands influenced Anglo-Spanish relations. Answers must also consider which of these two had most impact on relations and how this may have varied during the period 1509–1609.

Top level responses will reflect on the relative strengths and weaknesses of these nations and their influence over England and Spain. Answers might consider if these nations were equally as important to monarchs or their subjects.

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) England
  (i)   The importance of France.
       Henry VIII. As England's old enemy, France was of crucial importance to England. As an ally of Scotland, France was the greatest threat to the security of the Tudor monarchs. Henry VII had been driven by a desire to secure his Dynasty for his son and had fought one of the few English wars of this period with France to do so. The young King Henry VIII had been aware of this French threat and so much of his early focus had been on France. Henry VIII also hoped to build his reputation by military exploits and his claim to the French throne made it the obvious target. Henry VIII was to conduct three campaigns against France, spending over £2.5 million on his desire to be the French King. Henry's aims could only be achieved through alliance with France's main enemy, Spain, and so Anglo-Spanish relations remained good through most of the period. At some points Wolsey attempted to drive a more pro-French policy, seeking to keep England at the centre of European democracy. Charles I's failure to deliver on promises drove England towards France and damaged Anglo-Spanish relations. After Charles I's support for his aunt, Catherine of Aragon, during the divorce issue of the 1530s, relations recovered. Henry's war with Scotland and his attempts to marry his son to Mary Stuart further increased the importance of France. Mary Stuart had strong French links, as her mother, Mary of Guise, had strong links to the French monarchy. Answers should identify the importance of France during the reigns of Henry and Charles, as more important than religion or even a slight on family.

       Edward VI and Mary I. Continued war with the Scots and the escape of Mary Stuart to France maintained good Anglo-Spanish relations, despite the religious reforms of Edward's reign. The arrival of French troops in Scotland further threatened England and drove it

into Spanish arms. The marriage of Mary to Philip of Spain carried this relationship to its closest point which by 1558 had involved England in the Habsburg-Valois dynastic war. Mary I's loss of Calais was a direct result of this anti-French policy and damaged Anglo-Spanish relations. Answers should emphasise France as a key factor in English policy and in its relations with Spain.

Elizabeth I. Answers will focus on the increased French threat at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign due to questions over her legitimacy. The marriage of Mary Stuart to the French Dauphin and Henry II's proclamation of her as Queen of England placed intense pressure on Elizabeth. Invasion from France and Scotland and peace between Spain and France seemed to leave England in a dangerous position. Spain's fear of a pro-French England led Philip to propose to Elizabeth and, despite her rejection of this offer, he continued to be supportive in the early 1560s. Answers should identify the importance of France in maintaining good Anglo-Spanish relations despite Elizabeth's Protestant church settlement. The death of both Henry II and soon afterwards his son, Francis II, was to begin a transformation in the importance of France and so affect Anglo-Spanish relations. By 1561 Mary Stuart had returned to a mainly Protestant Scotland and so reduced the pressure on Elizabeth. The outbreak of the French Wars of Religion, in 1562, was to send France into turmoil and remove it as a leading European nation. Even in decline France had a major impact on Anglo-Spanish relations. Without the need to unite against France, Anglo-Spanish relations began a slow decline. Other factors now became paramount and conflict between the two nations increased. Despite its weakened position, France was still instrumental in creating war between England and Spain. Philip II's signing of the Treaty of Joinville with the French Catholic League in 1584 led Elizabeth to fear a Catholic crusade against England. Answers should show how France's decline was a key element in the outbreak of war.

(ii) **The importance of the Netherlands**. The Netherlands had long been an essential trading partner to England. England's main export was wool or basic cloth and Antwerp was the main trading centre for the wool trade. Geographically the Netherlands was important as it was close to the southern coast of England. As a possession of Charles I, the Netherlands encouraged good Anglo-Spanish relations as it was in the economic interests of both to see trade flourish. Charles I's style of government in the Netherlands allowed large amounts of autonomy and the presence of few foreign troops. Answers will identify the Netherlands as having a positive influence on Anglo-Spanish relations up to 1556 but that its impact was much less than France.

The Dutch revolt of the 1560s was to have a major impact on Anglo-Spanish relations. Elizabeth found herself in a difficult

position as she wanted stability to maintain trade but many of her advisors supported the co-religionists in the Netherlands. Elizabeth's dislike of Philip II's authoritarian government was magnified by the arrival of the Duke of Alva's Spanish army, just a few miles across the Channel. Elizabeth's expulsion of the "Sea Beggars" increased tension as did unofficial English support for Dutch rebels. Spain's failure to deal with the issue coincided with increasingly poor Anglo-Spanish relations and Elizabeth's signing of the Treaty of Nonsuch in 1585 was the final cause in the outbreak of war.

Spain

(i) The importance of France. The unification of Spain, brought about by the marriage of Ferdinand of Castile and Isabella of Aragon, had created a new challenge to France. Geographical proximity created conflict as Spain fought to develop its position in the world. When Charles I became King of Spain in 1516 he was already Duke of Burgundy and three years later he became ruler of the Holy Roman Empire. This range of possessions brought further conflict with France as Charles was now as important as Francis I of France. The Habsburg-Valois Wars developed out of France's attempts at conquest in Italy and of its fears of being surrounded by Habsburg possessions. This forty year conflict forced Spain to look for allies to counterbalance French power. Both Ferdinand and Charles sought numerous alliances with England from 1509 to 1556 and so answers should show that France was instrumental in maintaining good Anglo-Spanish relations. Charles' dynastic needs forced him to accept poor terms in the marriage treaty of his son, Philip, to Mary I of England. Spain's conflict with France left Spain in deep debt and forced it to maintain links with England whose religious reforms should have raised tensions in Anglo-Spanish relations.

When Philip II became King of Spain in 1556 he inherited major debt and sought a peace deal with France. After a failed truce both Spain and France signed the Treaty of Cateau-Cambresis. Philip abandoned his English allies who lost Calais and so answers could show how France damaged Anglo-Spanish relations. The French Wars of Religion allowed Philip II to conduct a Mediterranean based foreign policy and, with no need for English support, Anglo-Spanish relations began to decline.

(ii) The importance of the Netherlands. Answers should show the importance of this region to Spain as it was an outlet for the Spanish wool trade. When Charles Habsburg became Charles I of Spain he was already ruler of the Netherlands. As a centre for trade, the Netherlands was a key revenue creator for Charles and, as English wool played a major part in the Netherlands' trade, good Anglo-Spanish relations were important. Charles' use of the local nobility to govern the Netherlands maintained a stable position and even his efforts to stop the spread of Protestantism caused little conflict.

6826.01

11

AVAILABLE MARKS

Spain's difficulties with the Netherlands began with Philip II's attempts to improve his financial position by maximising his return from the Netherlands. Philip used external governors and created conflict with local nobles. The beginning of Rebellion in 1566 was to destabilise the area and its coincidence with the spread of Calvinism to the Netherlands was to make the issue doubly difficult. Instability and persecution of co-religionists caused England difficulties but it was the arrival of Alva's Spanish troops which really damaged Anglo-Spanish relations. Philip's inability to solve the issue either militarily or through diplomacy was to place a constant strain on Anglo-Spanish relations. English support, either unofficially by Elizabeth and her Privy Council, or, by individual Englishmen for the Netherlands further damaged relations between England and Spain. Philip's desire to destroy Protestant rebellion was one of the reasons for the Treaty of Joinville with the French Catholic League and this so enraged Elizabeth that she gave open assistance to Dutch rebels for the first time through the Treaty of Nonsuch. It was this Treaty which spurred Spain's declaration of war on England in 1585 and so the Netherlands could be regarded as crucial to declining relations.

Answers should attempt to assess the importance of each nation on Anglo-Spanish relations and could attempt to consider relations between monarchs or between their subjects. Certainly relations between monarchs were good during the reigns of Mary I and Philip II, yet anti-Spanish feeling was high in England.

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:
• Wolsey's attempts to use alliances with the French to gain a better deal with Charles I
• parliamentary opposition to Mary's marriage to Philip II
• William Cecil's and Robert Dudley's views on various marriage candidates for Elizabeth and on assistance for the Dutch rebels
• opinions of Spanish advisors to the monarch on foreign policy and dealing with heresy throughout Europe.

Examples of later interpretations could include:
• debate on the foreign policy of Thomas Wolsey and his motivations
• Elizabeth the Protestant crusader or defensive monarch
• Philip a religious crusader or set for territorial gain
• different views of historians on the nature of Elizabeth's Dutch policy.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately   [50]

50

Option 1   **50**

Option 2: Crown and Parliament 1603–1702

Answer **one** question.

1   "By 1702 Parliament had replaced the monarchy as the dominant power in the government of England." To what extent would you accept this assessment of the changing relations between Crown and Parliament in the period 1603–1702?

This question requires an assessment of how the relationships between Crown and Parliament changed throughout the course of the seventeenth century.

Top level responses will reflect on the extent to which the relationship changed and identify the decisive moments when it did. The Constitutional Revolution, the execution of Charles I, the Restoration Settlement, the Glorious Revolution and particularly the reign of William and Mary saw the power and position of Parliament fluctuate. However, the seventeenth century should not be seen as a simple victory of Parliament over the King.

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

Answers may deploy some of the following knowledge:

(a) The Relationship between Crown and Parliament in 1603
In early Stuart England Parliament's role involved obtaining the consent of the Kingdom's representatives and maintaining contact between the monarch and his subjects. It was responsible for providing the king with advice and supplies, and passing bills. The Crown could: appoint officials, advisors and bishops; make foreign policy and control the armed forces; summon, prorogue and dissolve Parliament; obstruct legislation; dispense individuals from or suspend law; issue proclamations and vary customs duties. As the meeting of Parliament was an irregularly occurring event rather than an annual institution and was entirely dependent on the monarch for its existence, it had limited status and influence in early Stuart England. It was further weakened by the predominance of factions rather than political parties with shared ideals and stated aims. Parliament's main strength was in its power to help the monarch change law and its control of the country's, and consequently the monarch's, purse strings. While 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.

(b) The "Constitutional Revolution" of 1640–1641
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 were designed to prevent the monarch employing

personal rule in the future and increase the co-dependency of their relationship. 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 restricted the King's independence in the legal system. However, there were limits to what was actually achieved by Parliament in this period. It failed to secure the right to choose the King's ministers and Charles refused to allow them to lessen his control of the Anglican Church. The King retained his right to collect customs duties and to become financially independent if his revenues increased due to an expansion of trade. The control of the armed forces also remained a royal prerogative. Despite these limitations, there is no doubt that the period 1640–1641 marked a significant change in the relationship between Crown and Parliament even if it is debatable if it deserves to be termed a "revolution". Certainly the balance of power between King and Parliament had been altered. However, it had not been reversed.

(c) The Execution of Charles I, 1649
The execution of Charles I and the creation of an English republic marked a total breakdown in the relationship between King and Parliament, although arguably the breakdown had occurred before the Civil War began. The interregnum was the only period in the century where England was not ruled by the monarch. Good candidates 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. While the execution certainly created a radical change in the government of England, the restoration of Charles II, in 1660, suggests that the change was only temporary.

(d) The Restoration Settlement and the reign of Charles II, 1660–1688
The Restoration could be viewed as monarchy returning on Parliament's terms. However, on close examination, the position and power of Charles II was almost identical to his father's. The Restoration Settlement did confirm 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. The King's permanent revenue was set at a level, £1.2 million, to ensure the need for Parliament to meet and vote additional supply. The Clarendon Code and the later Test Acts would reassert the supremacy of Parliament over the church. 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. By the end of his reign Charles was financially independent of Parliament due to the customs boom and subsidies from Louis XIV. Good answers may note that it was during the Exclusion Crisis that political parties emerged for the first time in England. The Whigs and Tories enabled a new form of politics to develop with an emphasis on policy rather than local or family interests.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

(e) The Glorious Revolution and The Revolution Settlement 1688–1689
The relationship between James II and his Tory dominated Parliament
had initially been good but was ruined by his retaining of a standing
army and particularly his promotion of Catholic officers. His desire to
secure equality for Catholics and his attempt to pack Parliament with
his supporters resulted in a breakdown in his relationship with the
gentry and ultimately his removal in the Glorious Revolution. While
these clashes did not alter the prerogative power of the Crown, they did
pave the way for a new style of monarchy under the joint leadership of
William and Mary. 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. The role of Parliament may have
altered but it was still not the "dominant power" in England.

(f) Changes to the power 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.
To fund his European conflict William was willing to allow Parliament a
say in how the subsidies it granted were spent. This new style of
government gave Parliament a permanency that allowed it to become
more efficient and effective in its operation. Candidates may note the
emergence of political parties rather than factions and the impact this
had upon the changing role and nature of Parliament. It could even be
argued that their existence allowed the monarch to exploit their
differences for his own ends. Nonetheless, the advent of political
parties did increase the effectiveness of Parliamentary politics. 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.

Conclusion
By the end of the seventeenth century the relationship between
Parliament and the King had changed considerably. Parliament now
met almost annually and had become a permanent and integral part of
central government. The Commons had supplanted the Lords as the
true seat of power and political parties were now the norm. Parliament
had also expanded its range of powers being able to determine the
King's income through the Civil List and having established its right to

6826.01

15

AVAILABLE MARKS

levy all taxation. The King had lost a degree of financial independence even if his supplies from Parliament had in fact increased. Parliament had also been able to determine the succession and religion of the monarch. Even foreign policy was now part of Parliament's sphere of influence. However, monarchy remained central to the rule of England and Parliament did not dominate government although the relationship had changed and a co-dependency now existed. Answers may argue that the relationship had always been co-dependent and that the financial and military strength of the monarchy in 1702 suggests that, far from being weakened, it had actually grown more powerful.

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 MPs at the outset of the century
• the views of the Stuart monarchs on their own power and position and their relationship with Parliament
• the opinions of the monarchs' chief ministers or royal favourites
• 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 gradual rise of Parliament in the seventeenth century
• revisionist and post-revisionist challenges to the "Whig myth"; for example the strong position of monarchy at the restoration
• historians' opinions on the power and position of Parliament at the beginning of the reign of James I
• historians' opinions on the dominance of Parliament at the end of the seventeenth century.

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

2 "The execution of Charles I in 1649 weakened the powers of the monarchy in England more than any other event in the period 1603–1702." How far would you agree with this verdict?

This question requires an assessment of the execution of Charles I, and period of interregnum that followed, and the suggestion that this event was pivotal in changing the powers and prerogatives of monarchy.

Top level responses will reflect on the argument that the Glorious Revolution was more significant in shaping the monarchy. It could also be argued that the Constitutional Revolution of 1640–1642 was of more long-term significance than the execution of 1649. The final decade of the century, and specifically the war in Europe, under the monarchy of William and Mary, will be analysed for the significant impact it had upon the prerogative powers of the monarchy and the emergence of a new form of government in England.

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

Answers may deploy some of the following knowledge:

(a) The execution of Charles I, 1649
Two civil wars and the eventual execution of the monarch are evidence of the extent of the breakdown in the relationship between the King and his Parliament. 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.

(b) The Constitutional Revolution, 1640–1642
The period 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 act which declared that the Long Parliament could not be dissolved without its own consent and by the Triennial Act which made arrangements for a General Election if a Parliament had not been in session for three years. Parliament's powers in public finance were displayed in legislation that effectively prohibited the raising of revenue without Parliament's consent. Parliament also increased its power over the judiciary by the abolition of the prerogative courts. There were limits to

what was achieved in each of these areas and it is highly debatable whether the period deserves its Whig title of a "Constitutional Revolution". Many of the reforms pushed through by John Pym in the Grand Remonstrance and Nineteen Propositions never made the statute books and the Crown retained many of its most important prerogative powers. Candidates may analyse the significance of the conflict between Crown and Parliament in the two civil wars of the 1640s and the significance of the defeat of monarchy on the battlefield.

(c) James I, 1603–1625
Candidates may use the beginning of his reign to outline the position and power of monarchy at the outset of the century. Although James I clashed with Parliament during his reign, usually over his financial and foreign policies, the early decades of the seventeenth century are more marked by co-operation and conciliation than conflict.

(d) 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.

(e) 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. It is arguable that the period does not deserve the title "revolution" and that little had changed in the role and status of either 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, candidates 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.

(f) The reign of William III and Mary
William 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 in its operation. Parliament was able to play a more direct role in forming policy, even in foreign affairs. 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. Responses may argue that, despite a loss of independence, in some ways monarchy had actually been strengthened. After all, the Civil List and creation of the Bank of England had enabled William to lead England into a major war in Europe.

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 MPs and royalists on the execution of Charles I
- the views of James II and William and Mary on the impact of the Glorious Revolution
- the views of Charles II's chief minister, the Earl of Clarendon, towards the restoration
- William III's attitude towards war in Europe and his willingness to create a new style of government with his Parliament.

Examples of later interpretations could include:
- Whig historians interpret the execution as a stepping stone in the road to parliamentary democracy; a gradual erosion of the position and status of the monarchy that can be traced throughout the seventeenth century
- revisionists have challenged the simplicity of such an analysis citing the Restoration Settlement as evidence that monarchy remained strong
- historians' opinions on the significance of the Glorious Revolution
- historians' opinions on the importance of the reign of William and Mary.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately [50]

50

Option 2 50

Option 3: Liberalism and Nationalism in Europe 1815–1914

Answer **one** question.

1 "Liberalism was more successful in France than other European countries in the period 1815–1914." How far would you accept this verdict?

This question requires an assessment of liberalism in France in particular, but must also involve the success or otherwise of the ideology in other countries.

Top level responses will make comparisons between the success of liberalism in terms of individual rights, responsible government and economic liberalism, in France and in various other states, coming to a closely argued conclusion, supported by a variety of evidence.

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) France
With liberal concessions made in the constitutions in 1814 and 1830, the granting of universal (male) suffrage in 1848, and a Third Republic which embodied many liberal values from 1870 on, France was at most stages of the period ahead of its continental neighbours in incorporating liberalism into its system of government. Elsewhere, liberals tended to suffer repression in the era before 1848, flourished briefly before being eventually outwitted and outgunned in the 1848 Revolutions. They went on to make more solid progress after 1850, but struggled to maintain liberal values in the face of the rise of collectivism and the subordination of parliamentary rights to governmental control in a number of countries.

Answers may well define liberalism, seeking a yardstick against which to measure "success". Liberalism sought personal freedoms, a ministry answerable to an elected parliament, and minimal government interference in trade. The middle class self-interest in these goals may be noted.

The Charter of 1814, even though the King insisted that it was only granted at his pleasure, not given as a right, nonetheless gave France the most liberal system of government on mainland Europe. However, Louis XVIII always struggled against the right-wing Ultras, and when his successor Charles X announced his intention of restoring power to the Church and the aristocracy, his lack of sympathy for liberal beliefs was all too clear. His overthrow was exploited by a liberal upper middle class which installed Louis Philippe on the throne. A widening of the franchise, at both national and local level, followed, but the bourgeoisie, i.e. who had now largely replaced the nobility were perceived as selfish and corrupt, with the King not only acting illiberally by limiting press

20

freedom, but also refusing the claims of a newly prosperous commercial middle class to the vote. The events of 1848 extended the civil rights of the Frenchman, but this gain for liberalism was partially offset by the democratic granting of universal suffrage, preventing a bourgeois monopoly of power. In addition, the short-lived National Workshops, with their welfare state connotations, greatly alarmed the liberals, who backed General Cavaignac's bloody campaign to end working class protests at their abolition.

The swing to conservatism which followed during the Second Empire was hardly a success for liberalism, with Napoleon III's promise of "order first, liberty later" put into effect. Yet, despite this, constitutional opposition was permitted, with the Emperor obliged to accept adverse election results, and working with the liberal Emile Ollivier to bring about a liberalisation of the regime in the late 1860s. The Third Republic, which was set up in 1870 and survived until 1940, may be perceived as placing France at the forefront of liberalism, as Thiers, the Prime Minister, confronted and crushed the Paris Commune and the resurgent royalists. Despite its problems and the criticism attracted by scandal, the Third Republic, with its essentially liberal ethos, saw off the neo-Bonapartist Boulanger, the Panama Scandal, the divisive and dangerous Dreyfus Affair, and the syndicalist strikes of the immediate pre-war period. An important factor in the continuation of the largely liberal values of the Republic was the steel, not always detectable in previous liberal leaders, which enabled them to utilise ruthless force (the Paris Commune) and the threat of draconian action (the syndicalist strikers).

(b) Other Countries
The progress of liberalism in other countries may be seen as less successful. Limited though the constitutions of 1814 and 1848 may have been, France did boast proper constitutions and elected Chambers. With the exceptions of Baden and Württemberg, this was not the case in the German Confederation, the Italian states or the Habsburg Empire. Metternich's influence, all-powerful in Central Europe, stopped short of France (although he did influence Louis XVIII to restore a conservative government in Spain in 1823, a low point for French liberalism). In the period 1814–1848 a number of demonstrations and revolts sought liberal reform in Italy and Germany, but all were thwarted, by repressive legislation in the German Confederation and by military intervention in Italy. Politically liberalism may have been unsuccessful during this period, but its economic aspect was more fruitful, with the growth of the *Zollverein* creating wealth and providing a shop window for the essentially liberal doctrine of free trade.

1848 and its events saw spectacular but short-lived success for liberal ideas across much of Europe. Briefly liberals found themselves wielding power or winning concessions from frightened rulers, but they lacked experience of power politics and lost most of what they had

6826.01

briefly won. Where constitutions had been granted they were withdrawn or, as in Prussia, watered down. (Despite the Second French Republic becoming the Second Empire, the important principle of a parliament elected by universal suffrage remained.) Yet for all its failure in 1848 liberalism had come to the attention of many who had disregarded it before – no longer was it simply a minority taste. For those rulers who regained their power, 1848 had been a near thing, and many decided that rather than have reform or worse forced on them they ought to take the initiative in liberalising their regimes in a controlled fashion.

Thus in the decades after 1850 press freedom, the franchise and other individual rights were cautiously extended. The Prussian liberals became the largest party in the Reichstag, although they were unable to do more than protest when Bismarck defied them over the Army budget. In Italy the liberal politician Cavour built up his own state of Piedmont until it was in a position to unify Italy, extending the liberal Piedmontese constitution (the only major remnant of liberal success in 1848) to the rest of the newly united country. In Austria the 1849 constitution centralised the government of the Empire, but made significant concessions in the field of individual freedoms. After 1866 the Prussian National Liberals formed a government in alliance with Bismarck, and continued their political dominance into the era of the German Empire.

Late in the period liberalism's success was more problematical. Almost everywhere individual liberties increased, but legislatures tended to be subordinated to the executive in Germany and especially in the Habsburg Empire. The German liberals supported the illiberal *Kulturkampf*, while in the Kingdom of Italy parliamentary institutions fell into disrepute under the trasformismo system, and the liberal state did not long survive the Great War. In economic terms classical liberalism was on the retreat. From 1850 the success of the *Zollverein* and the theories of the Manchester School persuaded many that free trade was the way of the future, and it was adopted across much of Europe, its high point being the Anglo-French Cobden Treaty of 1860. But the Great Depression which began around 1875 led Bismarck to reintroduce protection, a blow to his liberal partners, and other countries hastened to follow suit. It was Bismarck again who, in an effort to steal the thunder of the Social Democrats, introduced the beginnings of a Welfare State in Germany. Such state intervention ran counter to the essentially middle class, laissez-faire beliefs which had been the hallmark of liberalism for much of the nineteenth century. By 1914 it may be argued that the liberal age of individualism was rapidly giving way to a new age of collectivism.

Any other relevant and accurate material should be rewarded appropriately.

22

AVAILABLE MARKS

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

Examples of contemporary interpretations could include:
- Metternich's attitude towards liberalism
- Louis Philippe's government and its opinions on extension of the franchise
- Bismarck's justification for working with, then ditching the liberals
- the liberal attitude to the rise of socialism.

Examples of later interpretations could include:
- historians' definition of liberalism
- the debate as to whether liberalism was only for the middle classes
- historians on Napoleon III's beliefs
- the historical debate on how liberal/illiberal the Second Reich really was.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately [50]

50

2 To what extent would you agree that nationalism in Europe was a failure in the period 1815–1849 but a success from 1850 to 1914?

This question requires an assessment of the creation of nation-states in the two halves of the period, noting the apparent increase after 1850, and the corresponding growth of popularity of nationalism.

Top level responses will reflect on the above, but will also note the many failures of nationalism even after 1850, as well as the qualitative change the ideology underwent as the period progressed.

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 those wishing to form nation-states. During Napoleon's heyday they had been encouraged by the creation of the Duchy of Warsaw, the Confederation of the Rhine and the Kingdom of Italy. These French client states gave a sense of nationhood to an educated minority who would keep the spark of nationalism glowing throughout the lean years up to 1860. The Vienna Treaty restored a dynastic Europe, with Germans, Slavs, Italians and many others disunited and/or forced to accept foreign dominion. The Great Powers saw nationalism as a threat to peace and to their multi-national empires, and, led by the Austrian Metternich, they reacted vigorously whenever nationalist threats appeared. Thus Austrian troops were sent to Naples and Piedmont in 1820, and to the duchies in 1831 to put down revolts that, although predominantly liberal, were tinged with

23

nationalism. After protests and demonstrations Austria alarmed the German Diet into stifling free speech via the Carlsbad Decrees and the Six Articles. In 1831 a Polish revolt against Russian rule was crushed, and for the next two decades Mazzini's persistent efforts to rid Italy of foreign influence achieved little success. 1848 witnessed a large number of revolutions across Europe, many driven by nationalist desires. Almost universally the revolutionaries' early success became eventual failure. Among the reasons for this were the lack of political experience among those who had a brief chance to seize the initiative, their failure to win over the existing armed forces, in Germany in particular indecision and selfishness (their unwillingness to give up the "Polish" parts of their new Germany), and, in the end, the superior firepower and general canniness of the old regime. Nor were there enough nationalists to carry the day. Nationalism, predominantly an enthusiasm of the middle class and the intelligentsia, was not yet a majority belief.

(b) For the most part nationalism before 1850 may, therefore, be viewed as a failure. But amid the encircling gloom there were some shafts of light, notably the emergence of Greece and Belgium as new states. Both countries were born partly as a result of their own endeavours, but mainly because the Great Powers abandoned their habitual defence of the status quo to approve or even actively to assist their birth. The sinking of the Turkish fleet by the combined Anglo-Russian-French fleet ended Ottoman resistance to Greek rebellion, while in Belgium's case a recognition that with certain guarantees Belgium would not be a soft target for a resurgent France paved the way for the new state. In economic terms the *Zollverein* may only have been a free trade area, but it gave a sense of unity to a host of Germans, and helped pave the way for an economically strengthened Prussia to exert dominance in Germany.

(c) Despite the lack of concrete success, the growth of nationalism among the reading classes should not be overlooked. The Grimm brothers encouraged German nationalists thanks to their linguistic and folklorist studies. In addition, Palacky played a prominent part in the revival of interest in Czech history, and the works of the poet Mickiewicz helped inspire Polish patriotism.

(d) Although the various nationalist outbreaks were convincingly defeated in 1848–1849, the movement had at least raised its profile, and would prosper as the Austrian Empire began to show the cracks and waste its good relations with Russia, while the continuing decline of Turkey would give fresh energy to Balkan nationalism. Further catalysts were a flurry of wars in the 1860s and the accession to power of Napoleon III, a revisionist who actively sought to dismantle the 1815 settlement in the interests of France. Cavour, the Piedmontese Prime Minister, believed that previous attempts to rid Italy of the foreigner had failed because of the lack of outside help. Accordingly, he turned to Napoleon III, and between them they dislodged the Austrians from Lombardy. Although

6826.01

24

AVAILABLE MARKS

the Emperor got cold feet, the work of uniting the North was completed due to the work of the National Society, with which Cavour probably had secret links. Cavour went on to capitalise on Garibaldi's swift progress from Sicily up to the borders of the Papal States, and most of Italy was now free and united. But even when the work was completed in 1870 it could be argued that this was not a victory for nationalism, rather for Piedmont alone.

(e) The most spectacular success of the period was the creation of the German Empire. As in Italy, one particular state and one man drove the project to completion. Bismarck was determined to reduce Austrian influence in Germany and increase that of Prussia. Capitalising on the industrial wealth of Prussia (much of it built by the policies of Manteuffel), and by von Roon's remodelled army, he followed a policy of confronting the Austrians, first luring them into joining the Prussian war against Denmark, then deliberately provoking them over the fate of Schleswig and Holstein. In the resultant war Prussia had Italy as an ally and had secured a promise of French neutrality. The spectacular Prussian victory paved the way for the establishment of the North German Confederation, followed rapidly by self-government for Hungary. This was something the Magyars had long striven for, but which only appeared now, when Austria was on the back foot and needed the assurance of a Hungary loyal to the Habsburg Empire. The German Empire was proclaimed after the Southern German states were seized on the outbreak of war with France. On this occasion Bismarck used the issue of the Spanish marriages to infuriate French public opinion, secured the neutrality of first Austria through his not ungenerous terms after the 1866 war, and secondly Britain, through a leak of secret French claims on territory in Luxembourg and/or Belgium.

(f) Good answers may query whether the unification of Germany was a success for the nationalist movement or merely for Prussian aggrandisement. It may also be argued that the new Empire acquired an authoritarian outlook and militarised values that would play a major part in the coming of war in 1914. This was a trend that applied not only in Germany, but across Europe, as governments tried to exploit nationalism, something they had previously opposed, to the service of the state. Patriotic and militaristic values were instilled into the populace as nationalism became a widespread phenomenon, merging at its nastier end into xenophobia and anti-semitism. Cultural activity was included into this drive for absolute loyalty to the state. Many of the artists thus used were quite innocent, of course, of anything other than a love of country. The second half of the period saw an upsurge in patriotic music, with composers such as the Czechs Smetana and Dvorak, the Norwegian Grieg and the Hungarian Lizst prominent. Perhaps the most famous examples are Verdi, whose operas appealed to all classes, partly as coded cries for Italian freedom, and Wagner, whose ultra-Germanic Ring Cycle proved a powerful rallying cry for nationalists.

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:
- Metternich's anti-nationalist rationale
- Cavour's attitude to Garibaldi invading the papal territories
- contemporaries' opinions as to whether Bismarck was a German or a Prussian nationalist
- contemporary criticism or defence of "state nationalism" in the later part of the period.

Examples of later interpretations could include:
- historians' explanations of the growth of support for nationalism
- the historical debate as to whether the nineteenth century really was the "century of nationalism"
- historians' views as to what were the essential criteria for nationalist success.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately [50]

50

Option 3 | **50**

Option 4: Unionism and Nationalism in Ireland 1800–1900

Answer **one** question.

1   "While constitutional nationalists were successful, revolutionary and cultural nationalists were of little relevance." To what extent would you accept this assessment of constitutional, revolutionary and cultural nationalism in Ireland in the period 1800–1900?

This question requires candidates to assess the significance of three strands of Irish nationalism: constitutional, revolutionary and cultural.

Top level responses will examine all the possibilities raised by the proposition in the question. Regarding constitutional nationalism, it can be argued that it enjoyed mixed fortunes, the degree of which can be debated. While those involved in physical force nationalism ultimately failed to achieve their objective of breaking the Union, good responses will identify the extent of their relevance in the nineteenth century and even beyond. Good answers will debate the impact of cultural nationalism, and the nature of the material available makes an unbalanced response on this theme acceptable.

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 many ways constitutional nationalists such as O'Connell and Parnell were quite successful in achieving their objectives.

O'Connell succeeded in his campaign to achieve Catholic Emancipation by 1829, and in the process created many of the characteristics of the modern day pressure group. There was mass mobilisation, a central organising body in the form of the Catholic Association, and widespread support and unity concentrated on a single purpose. Funds were raised, literature produced, and the profile of the movement highlighted by the participation in the electoral process, especially in high profile by-elections. The use of rhetoric made an uncertain government more inclined to acquiesce. This marked the high point of constitutionalism in the first part of this period. More limited success came in the form of the **Lichfield House Compact,** with partial reform of the tithe question and a more tolerant regime at Dublin Castle inspired by Drummond.

Parnell was successful in his "New Departure", whereby he embraced physical force nationalists and those with an agenda for radical reform of the land question. This liaison yielded the Land Act of 1881 and the Arrears Act the following year. Parnell placed home rule at the forefront of British politics by moulding the Irish Party along modern lines: tightly disciplined, united, salaried and efficiently organised through the Irish National League. Parnell's party was a force to be reckoned with by both Liberals and Conservatives, and it was his legacy that the

experience in the democratic process at Westminster was to create the circumstances for another attempt at home rule in the next century.

(b) Constitutional nationalists, however, were not entirely successful in this period. Frequent disappointment was evident. For example:

O'Connell despaired of many aspects of the Lichfield House Compact. He believed that tithe reform did not go far enough, while the Poor Law was an inappropriate application of an English-style solution to Irish problems. Drummond's initiatives were of short duration. O'Connell experienced mostly failure in the final years of his political carer in the 1840s. His campaign for the repeal of the Union was thwarted by the firm response of Peel, as well as his failure to realise that the duplication of the tactics for emancipation would no longer suffice. Repeal was a different issue, and political opinion at Westminster was in unison against him.

Parnell, was not entirely successful either. He failed to deliver home rule, while the circumstances of his political demise (the divorce scandal) crippled constitutional nationalists for the remainder of the period.

(c) Revolutionary nationalists failed in their objective of breaking the Union, *so in this sense may be regarded as being of "little relevance".*

Emmet's revolt in 1803 was ill conceived, badly planned and unrealistic in its expectations.

The Young Irelanders who rebelled in 1848 were subdued without difficulty by the authorities.

The Fenians revolted in 1867, only to have their aspirations undermined at practically every possible level. A hostile Catholic Church denounced them. Government spies betrayed all of their plans. A mixture of legislation and military actions facilitated a firm but appropriate response by government. Hostility and indifference from virtually every section of the population rendered their political agenda impossible to achieve.

(d) Answers are expected to debate the degree of "relevance" which should be bestowed upon physical force nationalists in this period. For example:

Legacy provides a source of relevance for all of the aforementioned. Emmet's speech at his trial – "Let no man write my epitaph; for as no man who knows motives dare now vindicate them, let not prejudice nor ignorance asperse them" – provided inspiration for later revolutionaries. The writings of Thomas Davis and the Young Ireland movement in their newspaper *The Nation* were resurrected in the Gaelic revival of the later part of this period. The Fenians lent their support to the New Departure, thereby enhancing the potency of Parnell, and their revolution in 1867 contributed to Gladstone's determination to deal with the Irish question. Answers may remark that the descendants of the Fenians planned the Easter Rising of 1916.

AVAILABLE MARKS

(e) **Answers should discuss in some form the relevance of cultural nationalism in this period.**

It may be pointed out that there was little opportunity for those involved in cultural activity to bring about the kind of legislative achievement by which constitutional nationalism can be assessed. The relevance of cultural nationalism may be examined through the specific actions of groups such as Young Ireland, the GAA and the Gaelic League. The Young Ireland movement played a political role in the Repeal Association led by Daniel O'Connell. The poetry and writings of Thomas Davis inspired members of the Gaelic League and the National Literary Society at the end of the century. The Gaelic League, led by Douglas Hyde, inspired nationalists to seek a separate cultural identity. In 1892 Hyde delivered a manifesto entitled *The Necessity for De-anglicising Ireland*, in which he urged Irishmen to assert those aspects of their culture which highlighted their distinct sense of Irishness. The Gaelic League was infiltrated by poets and writers who later became involved in the Easter Rising of 1916.

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:
- comments made by O'Connell or Parnell about the successes or disappointments they experienced
- views from those who were identified with revolutionary nationalism, such as Emmet.

Examples of later interpretations could include:
- historians' views on the achievements and failures of O'Connell and Parnell
- opinions about the legacy/relevance of physical force nationalists such as the Fenians. [50]

50

2 "They shared identical motives yet differed greatly in the methods by which they tried to achieve them". 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 candidates to examine both the motives and the methods of the supporters of the Union in the north and south of Ireland.

Top level responses are expected to make clear and consistent comparisons and contrasts throughout. Such answers should address the extent to which **motives** were **identical**, commenting on the traditional attitudes towards the empire, the economy and religion. As for **methods,** an assessment of how far they compare is required, with the best answers

6826.01

focusing on the role and functions of some of the organising bodies which represented unionism.

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 supporters of the Union in the north and south of Ireland shared many similar motives. However, it is a matter of debate as to whether or not they were "identical". For example:

Economic motives were prominent in the literature and speeches of all supporters of the Union. In the north, unionists argued that their industrial prosperity owed itself to the Union and would be irreparably damaged if the Union was broken. Many comments drew attention to the industrial prowess of shipbuilding, linen and ropemaking, and the fact that the northern part of the country had a proud and worldwide reputation. Fears for their agricultural prosperity figured highly in the attitudes of southern unionists as they reflected on the impact of a Dublin Parliament dominated by nationalists. The widening of the franchise both in 1867 and 1884, along with the Secret Ballot Act of 1872 and reform of Local Government in 1898, made the landlowning leadership apprehensive about their security. The activities of the Land League and the violence of the Land War of 1879–1882 indicated that such apprehensions were not misplaced. *There was no distinction in the economic motives of northern and southern unionists. Answers may link these economic views to the social structure of unionism.*

Religious fears impacted on both groups, *with a clear difference in emphasis in the north.* Competition for jobs in Belfast added to sectarian tension, which exploded into violence at moments of perceived crisis in the period. The city experienced rioting in 1872 and later in 1886, on the occasion of the introduction of the first home rule bill. Sporadic violence over a five-month period, resulted in 32 killed and 371 injured. There were riots in Derry in 1870 and 1883. Prompted by O'Connell's repeal movement in 1834, the Rev. Henry Cooke addressed a meeting of over 40,000 at Hillsborough, promising to lead his audience against what he believed was the onslaught of Roman Catholicism. The Protestant Colonisation Society was formed in 1830 when emigration was threatening the Protestant ascendancy in Ulster. The society sought to ensure that lands vacated through emigration would continue to be occupied by Protestants. Occupiers of such lands were also forbidden to marry Catholics, or risk forfeiture of their holdings.

There was a clear contrast in attitudes towards religion among southern unionists. A scattered minority, who depended upon the goodwill of the Catholic neighbours, unionists in the south highlighted

the fact that the Union was beneficial to all. Moreover, Catholics were made welcome into southern unionist organisations as well as being embraced by sentiments of conciliation whenever opinion was mobilised in the south to safeguard the Union. For example, the founders of the Cork Defence Union in 1885 proclaimed the Union *"to be non-sectarian and non-political",* and they aspired to unite together *"all friends of law and order of all classes".* William Kenny, who became a leading Catholic Q.C. in 1885, won the St. Stephen's Green seat in Dublin in 1892, an example of Catholics who supported the Union in the south. In contrast, Denis Henry's success in 1916 in South Derry became the first occasion on which the unionist interest in the north was represented by a Catholic, and his retention of the seat in 1918 was to be the last. *Candidates may link these religious contrasts to the geographical distribution of unionism.*

Empire and the imperial ideal was a motivation which was *more prominent among unionists in the south* than in the north. It was argued that Ireland was part of a greater union, namely the British Empire, and enjoyed the benefits it brought. A logical corollary was that any loosening of the ties with Westminster would lead to the ultimate demise of the empire. *Good responses may examine the social background of the leaders of southern unionism to explain this strong affection for Empire. Midleton and Dunraven served the Empire in administrative capacities, while most were educated outside Ireland, travelled widely, and thus perceived Ireland's place in the world in a wider context.*

(b) **While there were similarities in methods, there were notable contrasts, thereby disproving the proposition that they were "identical". For example:**

In the south supporters of the Union devoted themselves to the use of producing propaganda, publication of literature, contesting elections and utilising their formidable influence at Westminster. In 1885 the **ILPU** financed 48 election contests in Ireland and Britain. The **Irish Unionist Alliance** managed meetings, distributed manifestoes and petitions, and organised tours of Ireland for British electors. In a similar vein, northern unionists organised grand rallies such as the Belfast Convention in 1892. Good answers will comment on the titles and methods of northern unionists to highlight contrasts. Their very titles indicate a more narrow regard for self-interest, with a hint of force if the Union was impaired: **Young Ulster, Ulster Defence Union, Ulster Loyalist and Anti-Repeal Union.** Members of Young Ulster possessed firearms. Saunderson established **the Ulster Defence Union** in 1894 for the purpose of collecting funds and organising resistance to home rule. *Geographical considerations partly determined methods. While Ulster unionists comprised a population of 800,000 out of 1.2 million, their southern counterparts represented only 250,000 out of a population of 2.2 million in the three remaining southern provinces.*

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:
- comments by supporters of the Union about their economic motives and fear for home rule
- opinions expressed about the role of the Empire
- contrasting attitudes towards the question of religion and the Union.

Examples of later interpretations could include:
- historians' views on the motives of those who supported the Union
- later opinions regarding the similarities and differences in their methods
- comments indicating reasons why geography and social structure were so important in assessing methods and motives. [50]

50

Option 4 | **50**

Option 5: Clash of Ideologies in Europe 1900–2000

Answer **one** question.

1 "The search for security was the primary motivation behind Soviet foreign policy in Europe in the twentieth century." To what extent would you agree with this statement?

Candidates should select appropriate evidence from Soviet foreign policy in Europe after 1917 to illustrate their responses. Different perspectives influence Soviet policy at different times such as economic, ideological, strategic and/or pragmatic considerations.

Most candidates will probably argue that, while security considerations were important in the formation of Soviet foreign policy, other factors were also important at other times. In such a broad topic, candidates have to be selective with their historical evidence. The following evidence from each phase is therefore only a suggestion as to what could be included.

Answers may deploy some of the following knowledge:

(a) 1917–1924
The significance of security considerations is very clear in the early years of Soviet foreign policy, both in the form of withdrawal from the war and the civil war itself and the immediate threat to the revolution. Answers could also argue that the Soviet Union was aggressive from its creation with Lenin's establishment of the Comintern. Although answers may point out that there was a dual strategy in operation, that was to vary depending on its leaders and circumstances throughout the period. Survival rather than any economic priorities or a desire to expand communism was the main priority in this phase and in 1922 with 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, believing that Trotsky's hopes of international revolution were hopelessly naïve, continued the more inward-looking policies of the early 1920s. Stalin concentrated on the economic reconstruction of the USSR. The policy of "Socialism in One Country" focused partly on industrialisation to develop the Soviet Union's ability to increase its levels of rearmament to protect it from potential attacks by capitalist states. In this sense security was the primary focus of foreign policy. There was nowhere to search for it as such – it was to be found at home. 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 and one could say that the search for security was at the heart of Soviet decision making.

The USSR's 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 the gain of Spanish Gold (economic) or the
opportunity to wipe out Trotskyist opponents (ideological). However,
answers may argue that here was an example of opportunism that was
typical of Soviet actions throughout the period.

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 from the pact, it could be more readily
argued that it was essentially a measure to forestall a Nazi attack. In
other words, this was an attempt to maintain Soviet security. This may
offer an opportunity for responses to explore historiographical debates
concerning the motives of Soviet foreign policy and suggest that it was
not about survival but rather expansion.

(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 at
some point 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. What had been done for
survival led Stalin to determine a course of action that security was to
be at the heart of Soviet foreign policy.

(d) 1945–1964
In the immediate post-war period Soviet actions could be analysed
through the prism of the search for security or a range of other factors.
These possibilities are reflected in the range of historical viewpoints.
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.
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
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 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 their
belief that it was necessary to blockade Berlin to try and undermine US
attempts to create an independent Federal 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 1956 Hungarian uprising was crushed to prevent states in
Eastern Europe from leaving the alliance. Once again this could be

34

AVAILABLE
MARKS

presented as an example of Soviet determination to maintain its own security and a fear that any break in the Eastern Bloc would endanger Soviet security. Alternatively this could be presented as a determination on behalf of the Soviet leadership to maintain its empire.

(e) 1964–1982

One could equally interpret events in Czechoslovakia in 1968 and the Brezhnev Doctrine as a desire to maintain that security that had been so elusive in the pre-war years. 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 1975 Helsinki Accords were signed by the Soviets to get recognition from the West of the Soviet Bloc for security reasons.

The 1979 Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, which led to the end of détente and was justified by the Soviets on the ideological grounds of the 1968 Brezhnev Doctrine, could be presented as a determined effort to maintain Soviet security, given the US backed Islamisist threat. However, it could equally be presented as a further example of Soviet aggression and a desire to impose communist governments against the democratic wishes of the Afghani people to have a theocratic state.

(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 1917 Bolshevik Revolution on trying to export communist doctrine abroad and the 1968 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. From this perspective it could be suggested that he believed the means used to attain Soviet security had effectively undermined it and thus brought about the need to change policies.

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:
- different attitudes of individual leaders or leading figures within the Soviet Union concerning the foreign policy needs at the time
- contemporary comments from opponents of Soviet foreign policy at various points from across the period, be it British or German in the pre-war period or more likely American in the post war period
- comment may also be attributed to either Soviet or non-Soviet papers, journals or other forms of contemporary material.

Examples of later interpretations could include:
- historians' comments on the early motivation of Soviet foreign policy, a particular focus on one motivation at the expense of other factors
- equally attention could be given to the sources of historical debate – such as Soviet engagement with Nazi Germany and the commencement of the Cold War.   [50]

50

2 "The aims and methods of the opponents of communism in Europe in the period 1917–1991 were characterised by continuity rather than change." How far would you accept this verdict?

Answers should discuss both types of opposition to Communism in Europe over the whole period from 1917 to 1991. Answers should be fully aware of the aims and methods of the opponents of Communism and whether these were characterised by continuity rather than change. The top level responses will be aware of the distinct periods of opposition to Communism before and after the Second World War.

Answers may deploy some of the following knowledge:

(a) 1917–1945
During this period there was hostility from both the democratic states and Fascist/Nazi states towards Communism in Europe. The western states at first refused to recognise the legitimacy of the Bolshevik states and supported the Whites during the Civil War. This initial use of force was to mark a recurrent method from the opponents of communism. Throughout this period Russia was left diplomatically and economically isolated until the 1930s, with the exception of Germany, e.g. Rapallo (1922). Even after 1934, when the USSR joined the League of Nations, states like Britain and France distrusted Stalin, which led indirectly to the Nazi-Soviet pact of 1939. By the 1930s there was growing opposition to Communism from Hitler's Germany, supported by its allies Italy and Japan by 1937. In 1941 Germany invaded the USSR which forced Britain and France to join forces with Stalin's Russia, which they had refused to do in the 1930s. However, the leaders of the western powers continued to be suspicious of communist Russia and its aims and motives, as they had been since Lenin took power in Russia.

Throughout this period, methods of opposition changed from military intervention, diplomatic isolation and political agreements to becoming partners with their ideological enemy during the Second World War. However, it could be argued that the Soviet Union suspected the West of stalling on launching a second front as the Nazis continued to wreak devastation on the Soviet Union. At times during this period both types of western states employed similar aims and methods to oppose the spread of Communism.

(b) 1945–1991
After 1945 there were major changes in how the western democratic states opposed the growth of Communism, whilst their aims and methods showed some aspects of continuity. Initially the use of nuclear diplomacy by the new superpower, the USA, as the former imperial western powers had been reduced to second rate powers, did suggest that the methods used would involve the threat of force if not its actual use. However, Stalin, at least from a western perspective, refused to uphold promises made to the western allies in 1945 and by 1947/1948 an "Iron Curtain" divided Europe between democratic states and those states who had become communist under Soviet control. The Western Allies, especially the USA, now led the opposition to Communism in Europe with the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan. In this regard answers could argue there was now a militaristic, financial and diplomatic set of methods working in concert, something that had not been apparent before the war. This led after the Berlin Crisis to the formation of a formal military alliance. NATO was formed in 1949 and this was a major change by the western powers. This increased Soviet fears and led to the establishment of the Warsaw Pact of 1955. The western powers showed continuity in their fears of communist expansion and tried to economically and politically isolate the Soviet Bloc. The western powers did not intervene over Hungary (1956) or Czechoslovakia (1968). During the 1970s the economic burden of the arms race led to the period of détente as western attitudes to Communism started to change until the invasion of Afghanistan in 1979.

In the 1980s stronger opposition to Communism led by Reagan and Thatcher forced Gorbachev to change Soviet foreign policy aims radically and improve relations with the western powers. This led to the collapse of the Soviet Bloc between 1989 and 1991 and the disintegration of the USSR in 1991. Opposition to Communism in this period often shared similar aims and methods thanks to the role of NATO and the United Nations. However, top level candidates will be aware that the methods used by the western powers, such as the USA, also changed from military alliances, arms races, nuclear threat to diplomatic agreements in the 1970s and 1980s. This also contributed to the demise of Communism in Europe by 1991.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately

6826.01   **37**

	AVAILABLE MARKS

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

Examples of contemporary interpretations could include:
- leading political figures within Britain or later Germany and their attitudes to the Soviet Union and how this shaped their policies towards them
- most contemporary comment after World War Two would focus on the United States and leading political and public figures and particular attitudes to what they regarded as the expansionist tendencies of the Soviet Union
- comment may also be attributed to national newspapers, editorials, journals or other forms of contemporary material.

Examples of later interpretations could include:
- historians' comments on the motivation of Western states, whether it be individually or collectively;
- equally attention could be given to key areas of historical debate – such as what shaped the policies of the opponents of communism in the pre-war years and equally in the years immediately after World War Two. [50]

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