Rewarding Learning

ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education
2012

History

Assessment Unit A2 1

[AH211]

TUESDAY 15 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 "Henry VIII's break with Rome (1533–1534) was the most important turning point in Anglo-Spanish relations in the period 1509–1609." How far would you agree with this statement?

This question requires an assessment of the complex relationship between England and Spain throughout the period. Answers might consider the range of major events that could be considered to be turning points and attempt to compare these. Responses should consider the nature of relations in each period of the century and assess if change did in fact occur.

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) **1509–1534.** Candidates might consider if rivalry existed at all between England and Spain. The marriage of Henry VIII to Catherine of Aragon in 1509 confirmed long-standing dynastic links. Henry's wars with France drew him into an alliance with Ferdinand of Spain and later Charles I (V). Most of this period was characterised by good Anglo-Spanish relations. Henry VIII's failure to persuade Charles I (V) to support English advancement in France led Henry to seek an alliance with his old enemy, Francis I of France. Strong responses might suggest that Charles I (V)'s success at the Battle of Pavia was a turning point in Anglo-Spanish relations. Henry VIII's desire for divorce was to become the critical issue of the late 1520s and 1530s. Henry was driven by the need for a son, whereas Charles I (V) saw the divorce of his aunt, Catherine of Aragon, as an affront to the Habsburg dynasty. Such clashes were not uncommon in the sixteenth century but Catherine's appeal to the Pope, in conjunction with Charles I (V)'s sacking of Rome and subsequent control of the Papacy, transformed the situation. With Wolsey's failure to deliver the divorce, political change began in England which saw the rise of reformers such as Cromwell and Cranmer. Unable to achieve divorce through Rome, Henry's split from the mother church was to create a schism with all Roman Catholic states and their rulers. Charles I (V) saw himself as the defender of the Church and so Anglo-Spanish relations were seriously damaged. Answers might argue that it was this difference that continued to damage Anglo-Spanish relations for the rest of the period and hence 1533–1534 was the most important turning point.

(b) **1534–1562.** Initially Anglo-Spanish relations were poor and this would seem to support the break with Rome as the major turning point. However, the 1540s were to see Anglo-Spanish relations revived by an alliance against their common enemy, France. Answers might suggest that France was of greatest concern to both nations and that, although

6

religious differences were important, it was dynastic considerations which dominated relations.

This is supported with the continuation of the alliance between Charles I (V) and the openly Protestant Edward VI. The Protestant legislation of Somerset and Northumberland was disliked by Charles but relations remained good.

The accession of Mary Tudor to the English throne in 1553 was to see an even greater revival of the Anglo-Spanish relationship. The marriage of Mary to her cousin Philip (later Philip II of Spain) and the restoration of Catholicism in England suggest that the break with Rome was not the most important turning point.

The death of Mary I in 1558, leaving her Protestant sister as heir to the English throne, is another possible turning point. Strong responses might relate the crowning of Elizabeth and her restoration of a religious settlement close to the position of the 1530s as a direct result of the break with Rome. These events might suggest a worsening of Anglo-Spanish relations, yet this was not the case. Philip II stated in 1558, "rather a heretic on the English throne than a French woman." Answers will show that the religious differences of this period were not the deciding factor in Anglo-Spanish relations. Responses might suggest that the quote highlights the deciding factor in Anglo-Spanish relations, France.

(c) **1562**–**1609.** Answers should consider the beginnings of the French Wars of Religion as the major turning point of this period. Anglo-Spanish relations in the first half of the century were generally good but the second half was to see a slow decline which eventually led to war. The death of Henry II of France in 1559 led to a weakening of the French monarchy and the beginnings of a period of unrest. The growth of Calvinism in France (Huguenots) and the inability of the monarchy to control the situation led to growing instability. 1562 was to see the outbreak of violence in France which was to continue sporadically for over thirty years. The decline of France during this period removed a major factor which had encouraged good Anglo-Spanish relations. On her coronation Elizabeth had been most worried about the threat of Mary, Queen of Scots to the throne. Mary was married to the French Dauphin, Francis, and her mother Mary of Guise had strong French connections and provided military help in running Scotland. Philip II's opposition to this French/Scottish Catholic shows that France was the key element in Anglo-Spanish relations. By the 1580s Philip was openly supporting Mary, Queen of Scots as a replacement for Elizabeth because he was no longer constrained by a fear of France.

A series of events might be mentioned to demonstrate declining relations such as: the seizing of silver ships and other shipping, Drake's attacks on Spanish shipping, clashes in the New World and a series of events related to the Netherlands.

AVAILABLE MARKS

Response might suggest the outbreak of the Dutch revolt as a turning point in Anglo-Spanish relations. The arrival of Spanish troops in the Netherlands in 1567 represented a threat to Elizabeth I as they were only a short distance from England. Many Englishmen felt a need to support their co-religionists in the Netherlands and this informal assistance led Philip to believe in an orchestrated campaign in support of rebellion in his lands. Elizabeth feared a Catholic Crusade against her and Philip's signing of the Treaty of Joinville in 1584 supported this idea. Elizabeth's reaction in signing of the Treaty of Nonsuch in 1585, in support of the Dutch, led Philip to declare war. Answers might consider if the Dutch revolt was the most important turning point or the result of the change in the international environment brought about by the French Wars of Religion or the religious differences in England brought about by the break with Rome.

Strong responses might suggest a turning point to be the late-1550s and the accession of both Philip II and Elizabeth I. The conflicts of the 1580s and 1590s clearly had a personal clash between these two monarchs. The signing of the Treaty of London in 1604 was only achieved after the death of both monarchs and this supports the idea of a personality struggle.

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 attitudes of those with strong religious beliefs such as Cromwell or Cranmer;
- the influence of advisors like Wolsey, Somerset or Cecil;
- the views of factions in each country, led by Alva or Dudley, and how they viewed international affairs;
- the impact of a variety of Popes on Anglo-Spanish relations.

Examples of later interpretations could include:
- the debate on the successes of English policy under Wolsey in maintaining good relations with Spain;
- the debate on the aims, or existence, of Elizabethan foreign policy;
- Elizabeth I's success in the Netherlands and her motivation for involvement;
- the views of historians on the nature of the monarchs of Henry VIII, Elizabeth I and Philip II.

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

AVAILABLE
MARKS

2 "Women had a far greater influence than men on Anglo-Spanish relations in the period 1509–1609." To what extent would you accept this verdict?

This question requires an assessment of the impact of individuals across the period. Candidates should consider how far women could have an impact in a man's world. Much of the focus will be on monarchs and their working relationships with the opposite sex.

Top level responses will reflect on the subtle influences that women may have had on relations. Candidates may directly compare and contrast the influences of a female ruler in one nation to a male in the other.

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) Spanish women. As no females ruled Spain in this period, candidates might argue that women had little influence. Isabella of Castile's death in 1504 did not end her influence on the period. As one of those who helped to create a unified Spain and who completed the "Reconquista" from the Moors, Isabella must be said to have had a great influence on Spain. Isabella's example was to influence her daughter, Catherine of Aragon, in her determination to oppose Henry VIII's desired divorce. Catherine felt that her daughter, Mary, was a suitable successor to Henry, while he was driven by a need for a male heir. Catherine's opposition to the divorce was to have a major impact on Anglo-Spanish relations and lead to a declining international position. Clearly women had an impact on Anglo-Spanish relations and Catherine of Aragon's influence in the 1530s differed greatly from her support for an Anglo-Spanish alliance in the 1510s and 1520s. Margaret of Parma's mismanagement of the Netherlands and exaggeration of revolt intensified Spain's reaction, so creating an issue that damaged Anglo-Spanish relations.

(b) English women. Candidates have a much wider selection of women who influenced Anglo-Spanish relations. Anne Boleyn could be blamed for England's split from Rome, an issue which had a major influence on Anglo-Spanish relations. Certainly Anne could be held responsible for the declining relations in the 1530s due to Henry VIII's desire to marry her and divorce the Spanish King's aunt. Catherine Parr's strong reforming faith could have influenced Henry VIII's religious reforms which had an impact on Anglo-Spanish relations.

Mary Tudor's reign could be said to have had a major impact on relations. Her marriage to Philip II brought Anglo-Spanish relations to their closest point of the period. Candidates may argue that Mary's reliance on Philip created difficulties inside England that encouraged anti-Spanish sentiments which continued throughout the century.

7150.01

9

The growth of English power during the reign of Elizabeth I shows the strength of a female monarch. Candidates might suggest that Elizabeth's strength was the direct cause of the war with Spain in 1585. Elizabeth's stubbornness could be said to be responsible for continued conflict with Spain which did not end until after her death.

(c) French/Scottish women. Candidates could argue that Catherine de Medici had a huge impact on Anglo-Spanish relations. As regent for two of her sons, she dictated French policy at a time of internal division. Her possible involvement in the massacre of French Protestants worried Elizabeth about a Catholic crusade against England, which seemed likely after the Treaty of Joinville in 1584. Mary Stuart's claim to the English throne initially improved Anglo-Spanish relations. French support for the Dauphin's wife forced Elizabeth to seek Spanish assistance and for Philip II to offer it. Mary's escape from Scotland in 1568 and long residence in England further changed relations. Mary became the focus for a Spanish-backed Catholic revolt in England. While Mary lived, Philip II saw an opportunity to restore England to the true faith and remove the troublesome Elizabeth from the throne.

(d) Men. Candidates should consider the range of men who influenced Anglo-Spanish relations. There is clear evidence of the influence of monarchs from both countries. Henry VIII's desire for glory against France led to a close alliance with Spain, yet his divorce in the 1530s caused conflict. Charles I's involvement in the Habsburg-Valois dynastic war forced the maintenance of good Anglo-Spanish relations, yet his support for Catherine of Aragon led to a decline in relations. Philip II's mismanagement of events in the Netherlands and his signing of the Treaty of Joinville increased conflict with England and eventually led to war. Philip's hostility towards England and his inability to seek compromise led to a conflict which lasted until after his death.

Candidates might also consider a range of men who influenced their monarchs' and countries' policies. The Duke of Alva's aggressive stance over the Netherlands might be used to explain revolt in this region, which eventually drew England into conflict with its former ally. The Duke of Parma sought, unsuccessfully, to dissuade Philip from conflict with France and England. Wolsey attempted to rebuild England's international position by maintaining a balance between France and Spain, although he generally favoured Spain. Cromwell's religious reforms created conflict with Charles I and his attempts at alliance with the Protestant German Princes damaged relations further. The Duke of Norfolk's involvement in plots, supported by Spain, infuriated Elizabeth I and created tensions which damaged Anglo-Spanish relations. Walsingham and Robert Dudley both encouraged an aggressively pro-Dutch foreign policy which was eventually supported by William Cecil. It was the signing of the Treaty of Nonsuch in 1585 which sparked the Anglo-Spanish war. The actions of the "Sea Dogs" in the Americas can also be seen as a factor in declining relations and men like Drake and Hawkins had some influence in directing Elizabeth's policies.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Few women, outside of monarchs, had an influence on relations and this is not surprising in a world dominated by men. Monarchs, both male and female, were open to the influence of important figures in society who were inevitably men.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately

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

Examples of contemporary interpretations could include:
• the views of individuals like Alva and Parma;
• political influence of William and Robert Cecil and Walsingham;
• the manly influences of Philip II or Robert Dudley and the womanly influences of Anne Boleyn or the determination of Mary or Elizabeth Tudor.

Examples of later interpretations could include:
• the debate on the ability of Mary I's government;
• whether Elizabeth I had an international policy;
• interpretations on the abilities of various monarchs;
• the ineffectiveness of male monarchs.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately [50]

50

Option 1 | **50**

Option 2: Crown and Parliament in England 1603–1702

Answer **one** question.

1 "It was during the reign of Charles II that Parliament in England made the most significant gains in its power and influence." How far would you agree with this verdict on the relationship between Crown and Parliament in the period 1603–1702?

This question requires an assessment of the relative importance of the reign of Charles II in improving the power and position of Parliament.

Top level responses will reflect on the extent to which the importance and influence of Parliament actually changed during the reign of Charles II. While the period 1660–1685 was significant for Parliament, more extensive and long-term changes were seen in the reigns of Charles I, James II and especially, William and Mary.

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 power and influence of Parliament in 1603
In 1603 Parliament was responsible for providing the King with advice and supply, passing bills and providing a point of contact between the King and his subjects. As Parliament met infrequently, it had limited status and influence in early Stuart England. The Crown retained the right to summon, prorogue and dissolve Parliament and the monarch appointed his own ministers. The predominance of factions weakened Parliament further. Parliament's main strength was in its power to help the monarch change the law and the fact that it was the Crown's major source of income.

(b) Charles II (1660–1685)
The restoration of Charles II in 1660 is more remarkable for the lack of restrictions that were placed upon the Crown than any significant increase in the power and influence of Parliament. Charles inherited virtually the same powers as his father, although the reforms of the "Constitutional Revolution" remained in place. He was still able to call, prorogue and dissolve Parliament, chose his own ministers and retained sole responsibility for foreign policy. Charles II's Cavalier Parliament passed a series of reforms to improve his position and he created a strong alliance with his Church and gentry increasing the importance of Parliament. The Clarendon Code and later Test Acts reasserted the supremacy of Parliament over the Church. Parliament attempted to restrict the Crown's independence by challenging divine right during the Exclusion Crisis. However, Charles was able to stand firm and he used his period of personal rule to crush his Whig opponents and create a strong alliance with the Tories. The emergence and importance of political parties may be explored.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

(c) James I (1603–1625)

The Thirty Years' War in Europe strained relations between King and gentry and James I faced criticism from Puritan MPs for his failure to lead the Protestant Alliance. Parliament's impeachment of Cranfield marked a significant challenge to the King's power to choose his own ministers. He also clashed with his later parliaments over his financial policies, notably monopolies, and it is valid to argue that, while prerogative powers had not been weakened during his reign, the relationship with parliament had.

(d) Charles I (1625–1649)

In the early years of Charles I's reign, relations with Parliament were damaged by Buckingham's disastrous foreign policy and the methods used to finance it. Charles I's refusal to call Parliament for eleven years under Personal Rule was to have a damaging impact upon their relationship. The Constitutional Revolution (1640–1642) saw a number of successful attempts to secure an increased and more permanent role for Parliament. The Triennial Act protected Parliament against personal rule and the Crown's prerogative financial devices and courts were abolished. However, Parliament did not gain the right to choose the King's ministers and Charles refused to allow them to lessen his control of the Church. The King retained his right to collect customs duties and control the armed forces. 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". Responses may analyse the significance of the defeat of the monarchy on the battlefield in two civil wars. 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, the execution was driven by a small army faction and it never gained the full support of Parliament or the people. The restoration of Charles II suggests it was an attack upon the person of Charles I rather than the institution of monarchy.

(e) James II (1685–1688/9)

While the prerogative powers of Parliament were not directly changed by the events of James II's reign, it was his abuse of these powers that led to the Glorious Revolution and the creation of a new settlement between King and Parliament. At the outset of his reign, James enjoyed a good relationship with his loyal, Tory Parliament but his attitude and actions were to destroy this. His desire to achieve political and religious equality for Catholics, and his attempts to pack Parliament in order to do so, created a complete breakdown in his relationship with the gentry. Good responses may question the extent to which Parliament was united in the desire to replace James with William and Mary.

(f) William and Mary (1689–1702)

William and Mary becoming joint monarchs of England challenged the
very concept of the divine right of kings. The Coronation Oath and Bill
of Rights signalled a new relationship between Crown and Parliament.
However, the Bill of Rights was designed to fix the abuses of the reign
of James II and restated Parliament's existing rights rather than
changing its actual power.

The most significant changes to the power and influence of Parliament
came in the final decade of the century, as a result of William's foreign
policy. The Triennial Act of 1694 ensured the regular calling of
Parliament and the establishment of a Commission of Accounts and a
Civil List allowed Parliament a degree of control over the King's
spending. In the Act of Settlement, Parliament secured the
independence of the judiciary and determined the religion of future
monarchs. Parliament took responsibility for the National Debt, giving it
a permanency that improved its efficiency and effectiveness. Good
responses may note the increasing importance of political parties and
how this affected the workings of Parliament.

The reign of William and Mary saw the creation of a partnership
between King and Parliament. Good responses may note that James I
had enjoyed a similar working relationship with his Parliament and that,
although the prerogative position of the monarchy had changed, it was
arguably not substantially different. The Crown retained the right to
choose ministers and judges, to determine foreign policy and to call,
dissolve and prorogue Parliament. It could even be argued that the
increased financial strength of the monarchy, allowed by the Civil List
and Bank of England, actually meant that the Crown was stronger than
ever before.

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 views of MPs during the Constitutional Revolution;
• the views of parliamentarians on their position and power at the end of
  the century.

AVAILABLE MARKS

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 "Of all the monarchs in the period 1603–1702, James I was most responsible for damaging the relationship between Crown and Parliament in England." To what extent would you accept this statement?

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

Top level responses will reflect on the Whig argument that the causes of the Civil Wars, execution and even Glorious Revolution are evident as early as the reign of James I. Serious problems in finance, foreign policy, religion and the very nature of monarchy existed from the outset of the Stuart dynasty. The reigns of Charles I and James II are arguably much more significant for damaging the relationship between Crown and Parliament.

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

Answers may deploy some of the following knowledge:

(a) James I (1603–1625)
Although James I clashed with Parliament, usually over his financial and foreign policies, his reign did not see irreparable damage in the relationship between Crown and Parliament. James initially faced some opposition towards his use of impositions, overspending and rewarding of favourites. His religious policies were generally successful, although the outbreak of war in Europe and his favouring of a Spanish marriage for his son provoked some criticism. By the end of his reign relations with Parliament were certainly strained. The clashes over monopolies, the impeachment of Cranfield and the Protestation reveal a Parliament prepared to challenge its monarch.

7150.01

15

(b) Charles I (1625–1649)

Two civil wars and the eventual execution of the monarch give evidence about the extent of the breakdown in the relationship between the King and his Parliament. In the early years of his reign the Petition of Right demonstrates the extent to which the relationship was strained. During Personal Rule, Charles I's abuse of his prerogative financial devices, Laudian changes to the church and the closed nature of his court all contributed to damaging relations when he eventually recalled Parliament.

On the surface the Constitutional Revolution (1640–1642) appeared to be repairing some of this damage. However, Charles I's refusal to accept many of the reforms requested by Parliament resulted in the outbreak of war. The defeat of the monarchy on the battlefield and the eventual execution of Charles was undoubtedly the time when the relationship was most damaged. England entered a period of Interregnum, although the failure to achieve a settlement without a King resulted in the restoration of Charles II in 1660.

(c) Charles II (1660–1685)

Since his father had been executed and he had spent his formative years in exile, the restoration of Charles II was a remarkable comeback. Charles regained all of his father's prerogative powers, except those lost during the Constitutional Revolution. Charles enjoyed a good working relationship with his loyal, Cavalier Parliament, using it to increase the security of his own position and re-establish a strong Anglican Church. Charles II's strong position was undermined by his own pursuit of religious indulgence, his links with absolutist France and particularly the open Catholicism of James, his brother and heir. The Exclusion Crisis undoubtedly weakened the relationship between Charles II and his Parliament and resulted in a period of Personal Rule. While Charles survived the crisis and took steps to create a loyal Tory support base for his brother, the same issues were to re-emerge in the reign of James II.

(d) James II (1685–1688/9)

James II's desire to secure religious and political toleration for Catholics was misinterpreted as an attempt to forcibly convert England and create an absolutist monarchy comparable to the one in France. His dispensing of Catholics from the Test Act to allow their promotion to positions of influence, particularly in the Standing Army, alarmed his opponents.

James II's suspension of the Test and Corporation Acts was perceived by his loyal Tory supporters to be an attack on the Anglican Church. His subsequent support for Dissenters, in a misguided attempt to secure toleration for Catholics, only succeeded in uniting his opponents against him. The establishment of the Court of Ecclesiastical Commission and Declarations of Indulgence ensured that Parliament would take steps to ensure a Protestant monarchy and strong Church of England. James II damaged the relationship between Crown and Parliament to such an extent that, when he fled England in 1688,

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Parliament declared that he had abdicated the throne and took the unprecedented step of creating a joint, and crucially Protestant, monarchy, to replace him.

(e) William and Mary (1689–1702)
While the Glorious Revolution represented a revolution in the personnel of monarchy, it was not a revolution in its powers and prerogatives. What it did create was the circumstances for a new working relationship to develop between King and Parliament. The "King's War" in Europe resulted in William being willing to establish a partnership in government with his Parliament. It was in his interests to have a regular, almost annual, meeting of Parliament. William may have retained many of his most important prerogative powers but his need for regular subsidies to finance his escapades in Europe ensured a need to work with his gentry. For example, while he retained the right to choose his own ministers, it was in his interests to ensure they were men who worked well with Parliament.

Interestingly, despite the final decade of the century representing the time when the relationship was at its most stable, there were few tears shed by Parliament when the unpopular William died. Nonetheless, his actions had created a permanency and interdependence which were to characterise future relations.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately

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

Examples of contemporary interpretations could include:
• views of MPs and royalists on the relationship between Crown and Parliament under James I;
• the views of James I on his leading opponents during his reign;
• the views of MPs such as John Pym during the Constitutional Revolution;
• William III's views on relations with Parliament.

Examples of later interpretations could include:
• Whig historians' analysis of the long-term weaknesses in the relationship;
• historians' opinions on the importance of Charles I's reign for damaging relations;
• historians' opinions on the importance of James II's reign for damaging relations;
• historians' opinions on the relative importance of finance, foreign policy and religion.

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

Option 2   **50**

Option 3: Liberalism and Nationalism in Europe 1815–1914

Answer **one** question.

1   "1848 was the great turning point in the fortunes of liberalism in Europe in the period 1815–1914." To what extent would you agree with this statement?

This question requires an assessment of the apparently sluggish progress made by liberalism up to 1848, and its eventual failure in the year of revolutions. This can be contrasted with the growth of individual freedoms, the gradual widening of the franchise and the greater prevalence of responsible government after 1848. The gradual acceptance of economic liberalism, and its later decline, should also be discussed.

Top level responses will reflect on the lessons learned after 1848, resulting in the greater political nous shown by liberals, coupled with the concessions made by worried rulers. Answers may also note the contrast between the growth of individual liberties and the problems of maintaining parliamentary government as the period drew to a close.

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 was a low point for liberalism, with the restoration of ancien regime rulers and the reimposition of Austrian hegemony over much of central Europe. In the years after 1815 liberalism suffered a further series of rebuffs: in Germany student protests were met with crackdowns on academic freedom in the Carlsbad Decrees and the Six Articles, while in a series of Italian states the liberal revolutions of 1820 and 1831 were crushed after Austrian intervention. The Austrian Foreign Chancellor, Metternich, was behind the suppression of these liberal protests, and he utilised a system of espionage and censorship to clamp down on freedom of expression in the Empire. In France Charles X, while acting within the letter of the law, rejected the wishes of the (limited) electorate and appeared to be turning the clock back to ancien regime days. His successor, Louis Philippe, for a time stifled press freedom, and his government's refusal to acknowledge a growing middle class by extending the franchise helped to dent its liberal credentials.

(b)   Yet to see 1815–1848 as bereft of all liberal progress would be too harsh. Liberal ideas were kept alive, particularly by intellectuals, the South German states preserved more liberal constitutions, and for all the failings of French monarchs, at least France possessed constitutions, the 1814 Charter reconstructed in a more liberal form in 1830. In the economic sphere liberalism made significant progress in the pre-1848 period. The *Zollverein*, a free trade area set up by Prussia, enthused and recruited many other North German states, and

18

its success would prove highly influential in extending the free trade concept across Europe.

(c) Initially in 1848 it appeared as if liberals might sweep all before them, as Louis Philippe was overthrown, a liberal Constituent Assembly was set up for all Germany, and constitutions were forced on or granted by nervous monarchs across the continent. But the gains were short-lived. Liberal politicians thrust into power displayed a range of failings that allowed the old rulers to regroup. In Germany liberals interminably debated the niceties of the constitution and frittered away their advantage; they made little effort to appease the majority peasant population, and fretted that "their" revolutions were in danger of being swamped by radicals who had little respect for an essentially middle class conception of liberalism. The lessons of 1848 were absorbed by many liberals, who recognised that they would have to develop a more hawkish attitude when occasion demanded, and at other times adopt a less confrontational approach, seeking to work with existing regimes to secure pragmatic goals.

(d) In the immediate aftermath of 1848, however, it seemed that liberalism would not recover. France turned back towards an Emperor, the Austrian-dominated German Confederation was restored, Italy returned to despotism everywhere except Piedmont, and the Bach era put paid to liberal hopes in the Habsburg Empire. Yet the revolutions had given a real fright to the old regimes, and wily rulers recognised the advisability of making measured concessions, particularly regarding individual freedoms. In the 1860s Napoleon III introduced liberal constitutional reforms, and the new liberal pragmatism was shown in the republican Ollivier's acceptance of the post of Prime Minister under the Empire. In Italy the tougher side of liberalism was displayed by Cavour, who first turned Piedmont into a constitutional monarchy before confronting and defeating the Austrians, facing down the republican Garibaldi and imposing Piedmont's liberal values on the whole of Italy. A new realism was also displayed in Prussia, and later in the German Empire, when the Liberals, initially bypassed and defeated by Bismarck over the issue of army reform, accepted that they would have to work with rather than against the Chancellor, becoming the National Liberals and forming a government. In much of Europe, individual rights were steadily increased and governments became more answerable to the legislature. When the Third Republic was formed in France, its Prime Minister, Thiers, displayed real steel in using ruthless force to defeat the federalist Communards, and held his nerve to overcome a monarchist majority in the Assembly. The conservatives were far from finished, but their new favourite, Boulanger, was eventually defeated, and, after a long struggle, the forces of the right which rallied behind the army during the Dreyfus affair had to bow to liberalism, and Dreyfus was exonerated. Economic liberalism spread rapidly, with free trade the new creed in Germany and Italy, while in France the Cobden Treaty reduced tariffs with the old enemy, England.

19

AVAILABLE
MARKS

(e) Better answers will point to setbacks for liberalism as the period drew to a close. When a trade depression set in after 1875 there was a retreat from free trade. The introduction of welfare state-style reforms, emanating from Germany, signalled an increase in the power of the government which was at odds with classical, laissez-faire liberalism. The rise of social democrat parties was bound to accelerate this development, and would end political domination by the middle classes, an inherent if not always explicit part of the original liberal credo. In power liberals did not always do their ideology credit. The Panama scandal revealed an unsavoury mercenary element in the French National Assembly, the Italian parliament became a byword for nepotism, and the German National Liberals' support for the *Kulturkampf* and the anti-socialist laws of a few years later showed a decidedly anti-liberal slant. As the new century approached, the principle of parliamentary government was not universally observed: in Germany, although there was universal male suffrage, the *Reichstag* had strictly limited powers, while Franz Josef governed the Empire in an increasingly authoritarian manner. Liberalism had made significant progress since 1848, but there were already signs that its heyday was over.

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 of free trade supporters;
• the National Liberals' changing attitudes towards Bismarck;
• liberal attitudes towards radicals and democrats.

Examples of later interpretations could include:
• historians on the significance of the 1814 French Charter;
• historians' opinions on the significance of 1848 for liberalism;
• the historical debate as to whether liberalism was still strong by 1914.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately [50]

50

2 "War was the main reason for the progress of nationalism in the period 1815–1914." How far would you accept this verdict?

This question requires an assessment of the varying roles played by war, revolution and the growth of national awareness in the rise of nation-states during this period.

Top level responses will observe that different nationalist successes had different causes, and reflect on the frequent interplay between these various causes.

20

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 creation of Belgium was the result of a rising by the Belgians against what they saw as their subjection in the Kingdom of the Netherlands, though they also received valuable diplomatic support from the French and the British. The Belgians had a number of political and economic grievances against the Dutch, but they also pointed to cultural differences, particularly stressing their Catholicism against Dutch Protestantism. Greek independence also began as a revolution, but there was little prospect of nationalist success in their long-running attritional revolt against the Ottoman Empire until Britain, France and Russia became involved, their military and naval might securing the creation of an independent Greece. Cultural factors were important in securing foreign help, the British ruling class attracted to the ideals of Classical Greece, and the Russians keen to help their Orthodox co-religionists against the Moslem Turks.

(b) Thirty years elapsed between these nationalist successes and the creation of the Kingdom of Italy, but in the interim period nationalist propaganda continued in a variety of ways. Hegel and Herder were among the writers who inspired German intellectuals and students who pursued nationalist ideals in societies such as the *Burschenschaften*. In Italy, secret societies such as the *Carbonari* and Adelfi conspired against Austrian domination of the peninsula, and the operas of Verdi were read as coded cries for freedom. Arguably, the most important cultural influence was Mazzini, a nationalist who preached an idealistic blend of democracy and nationalism that resonated far beyond his native Italy.

(c) 1848 may be seen as an illustration of the inability of revolutionaries acting on their own to achieve nationalist success: perhaps because of the widespread nature of the risings, none of the great powers took advantage of their rivals' difficulties to become involved in a war. Piedmont thus fought alone against Austria and lost, and Russia actually aided the Habsburgs in quelling the Magyars.

(d) A decade later Cavour, a new breed of nationalist, abandoned the "Italy can make herself" approach of his predecessors and secured French aid against the Austrians. Answers should note, however, that internal revolution, led by Garibaldi (a disciple of Mazzini), engaged in war to secure unification. Germany is the classic example of a nationalist triumph achieved through wars rather than by revolution, although unification was driven by Prussian ambition (as was the case with Italy, where Piedmontese aggrandizement was all-important) and internal revolution was not part of the equation. Indeed, most of the lesser North German states fought alongside Austria in the war of 1866 rather

7150.01

21

than join the "nationalist" cause championed by the Prussians. Bismarck would probably have preferred to employ brinkmanship to achieve his aim of extending Prussian power, but he was prepared to go beyond the brink, and was indeed obliged to do so, waging successive wars against Denmark, in order to establish his credentials as a German nationalist and to lure the Habsburg Empire into a confrontation, Austria, after which war he united the northern part of Germany, and finally France, forcing the southern states into the new German Empire. None of the states had a pro-German revolution during the period 1864–1871, the years in which these momentous events took place. Hungary presents another example of the importance of war to nationalist success. In 1848 the Magyar rising appeared to have achieved self-government, but as the Habsburgs gradually regained control of Austria proper, followed by their non-German possessions, the bid for Hungarian home rule foundered. The *Ausgleich*, which made them equal partners in the Empire, came in the immediate wake of the Austrian defeat by Prussia in the Seven Weeks' War. The Habsburgs, recognising their own military and economic weakness, felt that appeasement of their second most important racial minority was advisable, so once again nationalism had laid down its foundations through decades of nationalist propaganda, but it had taken war to provide the catalyst.

(e) Although the great surge of nationalist success was over, at least until the 1914–1918 War, after which the Czechs, the South Slavs and the Baltic states all benefited from the turmoil of war, other nation-states came into being during the latter part of the period. When Moldavia and Wallachia came together under Prince Carol in 1866, Romania achieved virtual independence from the Ottoman Empire without a war or a revolution. Full independence was recognised at the Congress of Berlin, at which Bulgaria became another nation-state. On this occasion it was the result of a war between Russia and the Ottoman Empire, but the resultant Big Bulgaria was feared by other powers as a potential Russian client state, and was reduced in size when Russia backed down in the face of German and British opposition. Nonetheless, this was the beginning of a process by which the country emerged as an independent entity, enlarged peaceably in 1885 and again as a result of the Balkan Wars. Another product of those wars was Albania, formed in 1913 as a result of the Austrian wish to block Serbian access to the sea. Answers may point to nation-states which came into being solely as a result of peaceful pressure, such as Norway, independent from Sweden in 1905, where cultural identity was important, as well as the music of Grieg and the plays of Ibsen.

(f) Other cultural examples may be offered: the Czech music of Smetana and Dvorak, for example, which did not produce a nation-state within the period under study, but which helped to create a cultural climate in which nationalism grew.

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:
- the nationalist ideas of Mazzini;
- Cavour's belief that *"Italia fara da se"* would not work;
- Bismarck's views on the necessity of war.

Examples of later interpretations could include:
- historians' views on the importance of war as a catalyst;
- historians' views on the significance of cultural nationalism;
- historical debate as to why the revolutions of 1848 failed to achieve 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 "The successes and failures of Irish nationalists depended on whether they attracted widespread support." To what extent would you agree with this assessment of constitutional and revolutionary nationalism in Ireland in the period 1800–1900?

This question requires candidates to assess two strands of Irish nationalism: constitutional and revolutionary.

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 both successes and failures, with the issue of widespread support having a different role to play in varying circumstances. While those involved in physical force nationalism ultimately failed to achieve their objective of breaking the Union, it can be argued that this was only partly attributable to their lack of popular support, as a range of other influences played a role.

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 successful because they attracted widespread support. However, the nature of this support was not the sole factor.

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. He enrolled the mass support of the Catholic peasantry; the Catholic middle class; Presbyterian and the Catholic Church. *However, the manner with which O'Connell utilised this support was crucial for his cause.* Funds were raised, literature produced, with 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. *However, other factors impacted on this successful phase of O'Connell's career, as the Tory government was seriously weakened following the departure of Lord Liverpool in 1827.*

The **Lichfield House Compact,** with partial reform of the tithe question and a more tolerant regime at Dublin Castle inspired by Drummond, produced partial success for O'Connell in the 1830s. However, he was disappointed by the limited nature of the Whig reforms regarding local

24

government and the Poor Law. *There, the nature of O'Connell's support in Ireland had no impact, as it was the nature of politics at Westminster which determined the fate of the Compact.*

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. Like O'Connell, widespread support was forthcoming for Parnell: from the peasantry, ex-Fenians, the middle classes and the Catholic Church. This liaison yielded the Land Act of 1881 and the Arrears Act the following year. Yet Parnell then placed Home Rule at the forefront of British politics by *other means than the mere mobilisation of support.* The Irish Parliamentary Party was organised along modern lines: tightly disciplined, united, salaried and efficiently organised through the Irish National League. Gladstone was willing to take risks over Irish reform. 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 also experienced failure in this period, and the issue of widespread support was significant in various ways and at certain times. 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. Political realities at Westminster impacted on how far the Whigs could go, and their liaison with O'Connell contributed to their political decline in the general elections of 1837 and 1841.

O'Connell experienced failure in his quest for the repeal of the Union in the 1840s. He enjoyed widespread support in a fashion comparable to that of emancipation. However, Protestant opinion stood firm against any tampering with the Union, while there was a lessening of enthusiasm from the Catholic middle class. O'Connell alienated part of his support base by his quarrel with Young Ireland. Other factors impacted, such as the firm response of Peel, as well as his failure to realise that the mere 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, too, was not entirely successful, and the question of widespread support had some bearing. He failed to deliver Home Rule because of the political circumstances at Westminster between the Liberals and the Conservatives, while the nature of his political demise (the divorce scandal) seriously damaged constitutional nationalism for the remainder of the period. The scandal lost Parnell the support of the Catholic Church, and divided his wider support base in Ireland.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

(c) **Revolutionary nationalists failed in their objective of breaking the Union, partly because of their lack of widespread support in Ireland, as well as the hostility of the Catholic Church, inadequate planning, divisions in their leadership and the firm response of government.**

Emmet's revolt in 1803 had no support base, and was ill conceived, badly planned and unrealistic in its expectations.

The Young Irelanders rebelled in 1848, lacking any degree of support. For example, they had no organisation to mobilise the peasantry. Yet the impact of the famine, along with farcical preparations on their part, meant that they 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. Cardinal Paul Cullen moulded the hierarchy into an effective force which presented a formidable obstacle to Catholics contemplating taking up arms against lawful authority. 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. Divisions in the Fenian leadership, both in Ireland and the USA, proved fatal to their cause.

(d) **Answers may briefly challenge the view that revolutionary nationalism was a complete "failure". 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 later resurrected in the Gaelic revival of the later part of this period. The Fenians supported the New Departure, thereby enhancing the widespread support of Parnell, and their revolution in 1867 contributed to Gladstone's determination to deal with the Irish question.

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 about the successes or disappointments of O'Connel and Parnell;
- views from those who were identified with revolutionary nationalism, such as Emmet.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Examples of later interpretations could include:
- historians' views on the impact of widespread support 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 In what ways, and for what reasons, were there similarities and differences between 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 the **economic, social and political motives** were **different** or **similar.** As for **methods,** an assessment of how far they compare is required, with the best answers focusing on the role and functions of some of the organising bodies which represented unionism.

As to **why** similarities and differences existed, answers may reflect upon themes such as **social structure, geographical distribution, religious composition and self-perception.**

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 did share many similarities.

The supporters of the Union were bound together by an inseparable belief that their interests – however measured or defined – were bound up with the maintenance of the Union. The Act of Union established a political settlement whereby all political decisions came directly from Westminster, the Parliament dominated by MPs and Peers who were overwhelmingly sympathetic to those who espoused the "unionist" cause. In these circumstances, any "tampering" of the Union was perceived as a threat to be resisted by all means available, albeit in different forms, by unionists all over Ireland.

(b) Answers should debate the extent to which there were similarities and differences in the economic, social and political outlook of unionists. They may conclude that in some cases, there were no significant contrasts; in others, marginal, and at times of great tension, material differences emerged.

Economic motives were prominent in the literature and speeches of all supporters of the Union. **Answers may reflect that in this analysis of unionism, similarities are at their most obvious.** In the north, Unionists argued that their industrial prosperity would be irreparably damaged if the Union was broken. Contemporary Unionists such as Thomas Sinclair drew attention to the industrial prestige and dynamism 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 contemplated with great unease 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 landowning 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. Many leading businessmen endorsed the Ulster Unionist cause, while landlords in the south and west of Ireland backed the Southern Unionists.*

Religious fears impacted on both groups, *with a huge 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. In response to 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 ensured 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 significant difference in attitudes towards religion among Southern Unionists. A scattered minority, who depended upon the goodwill of their Catholic neighbours, Unionists in the south highlighted the fact that the Union was beneficial to all. Moreover, Catholics were made welcome in 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 won the

7150.01

28

AVAILABLE
MARKS

St. Stephen's Green seat in Dublin in 1892, was a prominent example of a Catholic who supported the Union in the south. *Candidates may link these religious contrasts to the geographical distribution of unionism.*

Empire and the imperial ideal was a motivation *more prominent among unionists in the south* than in the north. **Answers may debate the extent to which this was a "difference".** It was argued that Ireland was part of a greater union, namely the British Empire, and enjoyed the benefits thereof. 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 the 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.*

(c) **Answers should examine the methods employed by the supporters of the Union in the north and south of Ireland, and identify where similarities and differences existed. 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. **Similarly**, 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 **"differences"**. Their 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 890 000 out of 1.25 million, their southern counterparts represented only 250 000 out of a population of 2.2 million in the three remaining southern provinces. Thus, as a scattered minority, they relied for the maintenance of their position either upon the goodwill of their fellow countrymen or upon the protection of the British government. Moreover, the social composition of Southern Unionists impacted on their methods. By 1886, of 144 peers with Irish interests, 116 had land in the south. While the threat of force lay in the background of Ulster Unionists' speeches and literature, Southern Unionists capitalised on their political contacts at Westminster to make their case.*

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 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 aims of Soviet foreign policy throughout the twentieth century were identical but the methods by which its leaders attempted to achieve them were different." To what extent would agree with this statement?

This question requires an assessment of both the aims and the methods employed by the various leaders of the Soviet Union in the given period.

Top level responses will reflect on the variations in motives and aims across leaders and within distinct reigns of leaders.

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

Answers may deploy some of the following knowledge:

(a) 1917–1924
Commencing with Lenin, candidates could argue that he employed a range of methods between 1917 and 1924. Indeed, they could maintain that the methods altered as the aims altered and that these changes can be understood in the context of events. For example, it could be suggested that withdrawing from the First World War and the battle to secure the revolution during the Civil War were basically defensive in character. Equally the creation and active guidance of the Comintern was aggressive as Lenin sought to either secure the revolution through expansion and the promotion of revolution in other states – or that ideologically he was committed to an aggressive foreign policy. The failure of Communism to take hold in central Europe and, in particular, the failure to defeat the Poles, acted as a catalyst for Lenin to develop a more moderate approach that witnessed the signing of a range of treaties which helped to secure the revolution. An opportunity exists here for candidates to demonstrate that no one leader was wholly defensive or aggressive and in fact circumstances, both domestic and international events, played a key role in shaping Soviet foreign policy – both in terms of aims and methods.

(b) 1924–1941
After Lenin it would be possible to contrast Stalin's aims, arguing that they were highly defensive. Not internationally minded like Trotsky, he scaled back the activities of the Comintern. There was very much an ideological commitment to supporting a particular ideological line: the "left turn". Candidates could argue that this reflected Stalin's conservatism or his focus on domestic matters at the expense of foreign adventurism. Yet others may point out that this was a temporary phenomenon and, with the rise of fascism and the specific threat it presented to the Soviet Union, Stalin became much more internationally minded. Whether it was promoting collective security through diplomatic methods through pacts with France and

Czechoslovakia, or the military intervention to support the Spanish Republicans, a change in aims and methods can be clearly witnessed within the leadership period of Stalin. Conversely, candidates could argue that Stalin was both an opportunist and a pragmatist who acted out of necessity and interpret the previous events in the light of this analysis. This argument could be extended to the Nazi-Soviet Pact and the subsequent Grand Alliance of 1941. However, the basic point holds that different lines of argument can be developed as the candidate sees fit as long as they are adequately supported by evidence.

(c) 1945–1953

After 1945 candidates could emphasise the opportunist in Stalin who was prepared to use both military and diplomatic means to expand Soviet control throughout eastern Europe to help secure the Soviet Union. He was also prepared to adapt his methods depending on the context. Thus, Stalin was cautious with regard to Germany, disengaged on the question of Greece, despite the pleas of Tito, and non-committal with regard to Italy. Obviously, an alternative argument could be presented that Stalin was consistent and inherently defensive. Indeed, it could be suggested that he was acting in accordance with the Yalta and Potsdam agreements of 1945 and actually found himself reacting to western aggression vis-à-vis Germany and as such, given the losses of the Second World War, the Soviet Union was in no position to do anything else. Thus, his methods may have varied but his aims remained singular: defence.

(d) 1953–1979

The Khrushchev era seems to suggest a clear break and a different set of aims being brought to the fore. With the denunciation of Stalin and Stalinism and the attempts to improve relations with the Geneva Conference in 1955, it would appear that the Soviet Union was determined to employ diplomatic methods in the pursuit of stability and peaceful co-existence. Candidates may seek to point out that this was in effect what Lenin had sought in the early twenties or they may want to distinguish between the methods and aims that were applied to Western Europe in contrast to Eastern Europe – most notably with regard to Hungary in 1956. Equally the introduction of Brezhnev would appear to see the maintenance of the Soviets' basic position with regard to Eastern Europe and indeed its reinforcement with the introduction of the Brezhnev doctrine in 1968. However, candidates may want to highlight the change in tone and tenor of relationships with the emergence of *Ostpolitik* and détente. Other candidates might like to present this as another example of a change in methods but not in aims – as détente was seen as guaranteeing or assisting Soviet security concerns.

(e) 1979–1991

Equally, the collapse of détente in 1979 in many ways left the Soviets on the back foot reacting to events rather than shaping them. The determination of Reagan and his European ally, British Prime Minister, Margaret Thatcher, was starkly contrasted with the decidedly less

dynamic later years of Brezhnev and the brief rule of both Andropov and Chernenko. Candidates could point out that basically the Soviet Union sought a return to détente and a reduction of military expenditure to facilitate socio-economic progress at home. Equally, there was a strict adherence to the Brezhnev doctrine in Eastern Europe.

The arrival of Gorbachev, originally promoted by the reform-minded Andropov, was to ultimately witness the end of the Cold War, the collapse of the Eastern Bloc and the implosion of the Soviet Union itself. Gorbachev specifically eschewed military methods in maintaining Soviet power and control and engaged in radical diplomatic moves. In this regard it is once again possible for candidates to draw parallels with previous leaders in attempting to maintain a communist state if not a buffer zone.

At the heart of the question is a discussion of how leaders varied in their aims and methods, but also in the sense of the international context(s) in which they had to formulate policy and how they were to be exercised.

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:
•   speeches from leaders, foreign ministers and other notable figures;
•   memoirs or reflections of specific individuals;
•   newspapers or articles from the time.

Examples of later interpretations could include:
•   historical debates that pertain to certain periods;
•   individual historians;
•   political figures or commentators.   [50]

50

2   "The motives and actions of the opponents of communism in the period 1917–1991 were defensive rather than aggressive." How far would you accept this verdict?

This question requires an assessment of the degree to which the opponents of communism were essentially defensive rather than aggressive in their approach to the Soviet Union and other communist states.

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

7150.01

AVAILABLE
MARKS

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

Answers may deploy some of the following knowledge:

(a) 1917–1933

Initially it would appear to be the case that the opponents of communism were aggressive during the infancy of the communist state. Most notably this is the case with regard to the Civil War and the intervention of the "White" forces. Here is a case of the aims being the destruction of communism and the methods employed being militaristic in character. However, within a relatively short period of time the motives and actions had altered. There was an emphasis on isolation through diplomatic means – this despite the treaties and trade agreements that were signed. This is also an opportunity for candidates to highlight the divisions within the opponents of communism, with Germany forming closer ties to the other "pariah" nation. Equally, the policy of isolation could be presented as defensive rather than aggressive, especially in view of the avowed aims of the Soviet Union.

(b) 1933–1945

In the 1930s a different picture emerges with the rise of fascism and candidates might distinguish between democratic and fascist countries, as well as their specific policies and the diplomatic relations that ensued. For example, answers may refer to the willingness of democratic states to sign mutual assistance pacts and allow the Soviet Union into the League of Nations in 1934. By contrast, fascist states were explicit in their avowed hostility to the Soviet Union, most notably Nazi Germany.

The events of 1939 could be presented in a number of ways. For example, it could be maintained that the Western democratic states wanted collective security but the Soviets did not. According to this argument, the West viewed the Soviet Union as untrustworthy and incapable of living up to the pacts of the mid-thirties. It could be argued with regard to Nazi Germany that here was the prime case of an opportunistic action in terms of a diplomatic treaty with the intention of subsequent military action in order to pursue specific ideological aims.

(c) 1945–1968

After 1945 it would be important to acknowledge the change in the roles of different powers and the notable emergence of the United States in taking the lead within the European theatre. It could be argued that the West adopted an essentially defensive set of polices with regard to Eastern Europe and it was the Soviets who broke the agreements. Examples could be offered including containment, the Marshall Plan and the Declaration on a Liberated Europe. This could, of course, be challenged and countered with a range of evidence to suggest that the opposite was the case and, rather than pursuing

defensive actions motivated to realise the aim of containing the spread of communism and the promotion of liberal democracy, a dual strategy was created to attack communism where feasible and maintain the status quo as necessary. More sophisticated analysis might also draw attention to the behaviour and policies of different US leaders and how they varied – for example, Truman compared to Kennedy and also the context in which they found themselves acting.

(d) 1968 –1979
The development of détente under Nixon and Carter could be characterised as a series of defensive conciliatory measures that sought to recognise the reality of a divided Europe and the desire to avoid any conflagration that would be devastating. Such an attitude could be reflected in a range of actions throughout this period, whether in terms of specific treaties with the USSR or denunciations of Soviet actions in Eastern Europe that stopped short of aggression. Mention could also be made of other western leaders such as Brandt and the development of *Ostpolitik* that sought to improve relations with the Soviet Union.

(e) 1979–1991
The period 1968–1979 could be contrasted with Reagan in the early 1980s, the end of détente and the change in language and actions with what he termed the "evil empire". Candidates might want to argue that Reagan sought the collapse of the Soviet Union through aggressive military spending and tough diplomatic stands. However, candidates would need to acknowledge the shift that emerged within relations with the arrival of Gorbachev. Indeed, candidates might want to argue that it was ultimately the actions of the Soviet Union that brought about the collapse of communism and the end of the Cold War. Equally though it could be suggested that it was, in fact, the aggressive approach adopted by Reagan in the 1980s that forced this issue.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately

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

Examples of contemporary interpretations could include:
- leading political figures from within the leadership of nation states which were opposed to the Soviet Union;
- other political or military figures from the Soviet Union or other relevant nations;
- comment may also be attributed to national newspapers, speeches and memoranda.

35

	AVAILABLE MARKS

Examples of later interpretations could include:
- historians' comments on the actions and policies of nation states which were opposed to the Soviet Union;
- equally, attention could be given to key areas of historical debate – whether prior to 1939 or debates concerning the origins and continuance of the Cold War. [50]

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