Rewarding Learning

ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education
2017

History

Assessment Unit A2 1

[AH211]

TUESDAY 6 JUNE, MORNING

MARK SCHEME

Level of response mark grid

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

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

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

AO2 In relation to historical context:

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

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

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

Synoptic Assessment

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

Generic Levels of Response for Synoptic Assessment

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

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

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

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

AVAILABLE MARKS

Answer **one** question.

1 "Economic considerations had the greatest impact on Anglo-Spanish relations in the period 1509–1609." To what extent would you agree with this statement?

This question requires an assessment of a number of factors which had an impact on Anglo-Spanish relations in the period 1509–1609. Responses should focus on how Anglo-Spanish relations were influenced by economic considerations and how this changed across the period. Answers should also consider the impact of political, dynastic and religious factors on Anglo-Spanish relations.

Top level responses will reflect on the complicated nature of the period. Answers should consider how the four factors overlapped. When considering the economic embargoes of the 1530s, responses might suggest that this was not just economic but also dynastic, due to Henry VIII's divorce, and political factors due to England's break from Rome. The economic clashes in the New World were clearly economic but answers might point to England's challenge being related to its different religion and its refusal to accept the Papal declaration granting the Americas to Spain.

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

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

(a) Economic considerations

Answers should consider the economic ties between England and Spain which were established by the Treaty of Medina del Campo in 1489. The importance of these connections was reinforced in 1516 when the Netherlands was linked with the Spanish crown. Responses should show the importance of economic links with the Netherlands, the main recipient of English wool, and the Dutch cloth trade producing a huge income for the Spanish exchequer. The weakness of England's economy in the early part of the period could be supported by comments from the Privy Council urging Henry VIII to avoid war due to its economic impact. Answers could consider how trade embargoes were used as a lever by each nation to influence the leadership of their rivals during the late 1520s and early 1530s. Responses could suggest that it was political and religious factors which had the greatest impact and that economic power was only used to achieve other aims such as the divorce or the break with Rome. Answers might suggest that good Anglo-Spanish relations in the period were supported by economic links and that the growth of England's economy was slow and had little impact on Anglo-Spanish relations.

Answers should consider the changing nature of economic considerations with regard to Anglo-Spanish relations. The decline of the Antwerp money market and the cloth trade in the 1550s did influence relations, not because of English economic power but rather a declining Spanish economic position. This could be supported by evidence of weakness in the Spanish economy

AVAILABLE MARKS

in the 1550s. Responses might use the comments of Kamen, who points to complaints among Spanish merchants about English merchants dominating trade. Answers might focus on the impact on England's economy of the loss of Calais. Titler claims that this was an economic disaster for England and again this shows that economics did impact on Anglo-Spanish relations in this period but they were determined by Spain rather than by increased English economic activity.

The importance of economic considerations on Anglo-Spanish relations is most obvious in the Elizabethan era. Elizabeth's failure to conclude a marriage alliance led to more unstable relations with Europe in general and in particular Spain. The outbreak of the Dutch Revolt in 1566 threatened England's wool trade and led to a change of direction for England's economy. Answers might point to William Cecil's directions to look for diversity in trade with the creation of the Moscovo Company, the Levant Company and explorations for the North West passage. Responses might consider the actions of men like Drake and Hawkins in the New World where their interference in Spanish trade led to clashes, particularly at San Juan del Ulna. Answers could show how this growth in English economic power threatened Spain's most important possessions, and came at a time when Spain's own economy was in decline. England was not prepared to follow Papal direction on the New World and this clearly damaged Anglo-Spanish relations.

(b) Political/Dynastic factors

The changing nature of Anglo-Spanish relations can also be attributed to political and dynastic factors and answers might suggest that this, rather than economic considerations, had the greatest impact on relations. Answers might suggest that strong dynastic links were established by the Treaty of Medina del Campo and this led to Henry VIII's marriage to Catherine of Aragon. This marriage reinforced good relations and aided the alliance of Spain and England against France in 1513. Responses might show how Catherine of Aragon was encouraged by her father, Ferdinand of Spain, to maintain good relations. Ferdinand's manipulation of the inexperienced Henry VIII could be said to have had more influence on Anglo-Spanish relations than economic considerations. Answers might suggest that the existence of France as a natural enemy of both nations had the greatest impact on Anglo-Spanish relations. This was evident in the Treaty of Bruges, which drew England into the Habsburg-Valois wars. Responses could suggest that Anglo-Spanish relations were damaged by the divorce and, as the Imperial Ambassador, Chapuys, stated, Charles V felt that this was an insult to the Habsburg family. Answers could refer to Dickens, who suggests that, despite this offence, a rapprochement was sought to renew conflict with the French in 1542.

Responses could consider the mid-Tudor period to show that good Anglo-Spanish relations were maintained through the political and military needs of England and Spain. The Duke of Somerset points to his strong desire to maintain good Anglo-Spanish relations. These good relations reached a peak in the reign of Mary I with her marriage to Philip II of Spain in 1554. Despite the strength of these relations, they were influenced by English xenophobia. Answers might point to the harsh terms placed on Philip by the English Parliament, yet his father's need for an ally in the war with France allowed him to overlook the offence. Parliament's fear of being sucked in to

war with France again proved correct, with Anglo-Spanish relations being damaged by the loss of Calais and, as Bindoff states, becoming a pawn of Spain. Responses could show that it was political actions such as these that had the greatest impact on Anglo-Spanish relations.

The reign of Elizabeth I could be used to reinforce the political and dynastic impact on Anglo-Spanish relations. Initially, good relations were maintained due to the French threat but these declined after the outbreak of the French Wars of Religion. Answers could use a range of events to demonstrate how Anglo-Spanish relations were influenced by the increasingly personal conflict between Philip II and Elizabeth I. Elizabeth's interference in the Dutch Revolt and Philip's in Irish rebellions both had an impact on Anglo-Spanish relations. Candidates might use Mervyn's comments that both monarchs sought to cause each other trouble, to support this position. Elizabeth's support for Don Antonio in Portugal, and Philip's for Mary Queen of Scots, further damaged relations. Responses should consider the impact of the Treaties of Joinville (1584) and Nonsuch (1585) and show that they drove Anglo-Spanish relations into a state of war. Answers might show that, after the defeat of the Armada in 1588, both nations should have sought peace, yet it took the death of both monarchs before the Treaty of London could be signed. The Duke of Lerma's comment regarding this treaty, that Spain needed peace to deal with the Dutch Revolt, could be used to support the impact of political factors on Anglo-Spanish relations.

(c) Religious factors

Responses could suggest that religious factors had very little impact on Anglo-Spanish relations in the early part of this period. The granting of the title "Defender of the Faith" to Henry VIII by the Pope shows common ground between England and Spain on religious issues. Henry's need for a divorce greatly influenced Anglo-Spanish relations. Dickens says that Cromwell's solution to the divorce marked the turning point in Anglo-Spanish relations. Answers might suggest that the break with Rome had the greatest impact on Anglo-Spanish relations because it established a religious difference between the two nations. It might be suggested that renewed alliance against France, in 1542, undermines this argument. This could be further emphasised with the continued alliance of England with Spain during the reign of the Protestant Edward VI.

Answers might use the reign of Mary I to show that, despite both monarchs being of the same faith, Anglo-Spanish relations were still influenced by religion. Wyatt's rebellion of 1554 was led by Protestants fearing Catholic persecution. Wyatt's view that the Queen was surrounded by priests could be used to support this position. Spanish influence in the period was connected with a period of religious persecution, which Protestants never forgot.

Answers might suggest that Philip II's proposal to Elizabeth in 1559 shows that religion did not have a major impact on Anglo-Spanish relations. On the other hand, his comment of "better a heretic than a French woman" could be used to show that religion was important. Philip's view of himself as the "sword of Catholicism" certainly supports the importance of religion. Neale suggests that Elizabeth was a religious crusader and her intervention in the Netherlands and in France certainly influenced Philip's view of her. Philip II's support for the Catholic Mary of Scots and his signing of the Treaty of

AVAILABLE MARKS

Joinville, with the French Catholic League, certainly made Elizabeth fear a Catholic crusade against her. Papal support for the Armada and the number of priests on board could be used to support this position. Many Englishmen of the period were vehemently anti-Catholic and anti-Spanish. Responses could use Drake's desire to "rid the seas of the Spanish and spread the true faith" to support the importance of religious extremists on Anglo-Spanish relations. Answers could argue that religion had the greatest impact on Anglo-Spanish relations but the Treaty of London (1604), and the peace it brought, could be used to counteract this argument.

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

2 "The divorce of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon was the most important turning point in Anglo-Spanish relations in the period 1509–1609." How far would you agree with this verdict?

This question requires an assessment of a variety of different events and how they influenced Anglo-Spanish relations. Responses will focus on the divorce issue and consider how big an impact it had on Anglo-Spanish relations. A range of other important turning points need to be considered and these should include some of the following: the split from Rome, the Habsburg-Valois dynastic war, the death of Mary Tudor, Elizabeth I's accession to the throne, her religious settlement and rejection of Philip II's marriage proposal, the French threat and Wars of Religion, the Dutch Revolt and Treaties of Joinville and Nonsuch.

Top level responses will reflect on the motivations behind the actions of each nation. There should be an attempt to establish the nature of Anglo-Spanish relations in the period prior to the divorce and to consider both the nature of change and how constant any change in relations actually was. Other events could be considered to see if they represent more important turning points than the divorce issue.

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 and contemporary and later interpretations:

(a) The Divorce

Answers could begin by establishing the nature of relations between England and Spain in the period prior to the divorce. The good relations established in the Treaty of Medina del Campo were reinforced by the marriage of Henry VIII to Catherine of Aragon. Responses might show how strong this marriage was and how Henry created Catherine as Regent while he went to war against the French. Catherine's letter to her father, Ferdinand, states that she was able to persuade Henry into a pro-Spanish policy. Despite Ferdinand's manipulation of Henry, good relations were still maintained after peace was declared. Answers should show that these good relations were maintained with the accession of Charles V and this could be supported by the signing of the Treaty of Bruges in 1521. Responses should show how the marriage declined throughout the 1520s and how Henry sought divorce by 1528. Catherine appealed to both Rome and her

nephew, Charles V, and this made an internal issue into an international crisis. Charles' defence of his aunt could be explained by his belief that the divorce gave an insult to the Habsburg family. With Charles V's victory at the Battle of Pavia in 1525 giving him a dominant position, responses might suggest that this allowed the divorce to become an issue and so Pavia might be a more important turning point. Answers could show how Anglo-Spanish relations were damaged by Charles V's actions to prevent the divorce. With the Pope a prisoner of Charles there was no possibility of the divorce being granted. Responses could show how desperate Henry was to have a male heir and this drove him to take rash steps. This might be supported by Smith's comment that "he barely looked before he leapt." Responses might counter the importance of the divorce as a turning point by showing how relations improved after the execution of Anne Boleyn and the death of Catherine of Aragon. The alliance against France in the 1540s could be used to suggest that Anglo-Spanish relations had been restored and the divorce was not a major turning point.

Answers might suggest that the divorce was the most important turning point because of the means which were used to achieve it. Sheils commented that it could only be achieved by denying Papal authority, so making the divorce a religious issue. The English Reformation which followed provided the change that would damage Anglo-Spanish relations in the future. Answers might suggest that it was this change, brought about by the divorce, which was the greatest turning point.

(b) France

Responses could argue that France provided a number of factors which could be seen to be the most important turning points. Henry VIII's desire to be King of France and a "warrior Prince" led him into alliance with the Spanish on three occasions. Ferdinand and Charles V both continued to seek an alliance with England against their most dangerous enemy, France, and so good Anglo-Spanish relations were maintained by France. Answers might suggest that the peace between France and Spain in 1558 was the greatest turning point in Anglo-Spanish relations because the factor which drew the two nations together had been removed. This might be countered by showing that a similar position existed after Spanish success at the Battle of Pavia, yet war was renewed and good Anglo-Spanish relations were maintained. In 1559 Philip II stated "better a heretic than a French woman" and this could be used to show that France was still a major focus of Anglo-Spanish relations. Responses could suggest that it was the French decline after the beginning of the French Wars of Religion which allowed England and France to drift apart. Answers could point to how Philip II's support for Mary Stuart in the Rebellion of the Northern Earls marked a deterioration in relations. Although the decline in relations was slow, it might be argued that there was a constant worsening in Anglo-Spanish relations after 1562.

(c) Mary Tudor

Answers could show how Anglo-Spanish relations were at their best during Mary's reign. Her marriage to Philip II of Spain brought the two nations very close together. Mary restored Roman Catholicism and was aided in this by Spanish advisers. Responses could suggest that Mary's death broke these strong links and allowed a decline in Anglo-Spanish relations to begin, the alliance to be broken and Calais to be lost. This turning point could be

AVAILABLE MARKS

argued against by showing that anti-Spanish feeling existed in 1554 with Wyatt's Rebellion. Wyatt commented that "England abhors the Queen surrounded by Spaniards." Parliament's restrictions on the marriage might be used to further support this.

(d) Elizabeth I

Answers might point to a number of factors related to Elizabeth I and Philip II of Spain which could be viewed as major turning points. It might be suggested that Elizabeth's accession was the main turning point, as her religious faith would bring her into conflict with Philip II, the "Sword of Catholicism". Responses might point to Philip's marriage proposal of 1559 as a contradiction, as he saw her as a heretic. It might be suggested that it was the completion of Elizabeth's Church settlement in 1571 which finally persuaded Philip that Elizabeth was not to be persuaded back to the true faith and that coercion was needed. Answers might use Neale's comments on the influence of "the Puritan Choir" to support Philip II's view of Elizabeth I as a Protestant crusader and her religion as the most important turning point.

Responses could also suggest that it was Elizabeth's refusal of Philip II's proposal which was the most important turning point. It could be suggested that a man spurned was always likely to hold a grudge and that Anglo-Spanish relations would be damaged. Certainly, events show how each monarch grew to despise the other and Mervyn's views could be used to support this. Answers might use Philip's attempts to dissuade the Pope from excommunicating Elizabeth I in the 1560s to counter this point.

(e) Dutch Revolt

Answers could point to the economic importance of the Netherlands to both England and Spain. With the outbreak of revolt in 1566 and Philip II's mishandling of it, a point of conflict was created. Responses might point to a series of events which damaged Anglo-Spanish relations and were all related to the Dutch Revolt. These might include: the seizure of the silver ships, the sacking of Antwerp, the expulsion of the Sea Beggars, the presence of a Spanish army in the Netherlands, only a day's sail from England, and English assistance for their "co-religionists."

Responses could argue that, if the Netherlands was such an important factor, England would have supported the Dutch openly before the Treaty of Nonsuch in 1585.

(f) Treaties of Joinville and Nonsuch

Answers could suggest that Philip II's signing of the Treaty of Joinville in 1584 was the most important turning point in Anglo-Spanish relations. Philip II signed this treaty to support the French Catholic League in its struggle against Henry of Navarre. Responses could suggest that Elizabeth I misinterpreted Philip's motives, fearing a Catholic crusade against her, and reacted by signing the Treaty of Nonsuch in 1585. These two events led to the outbreak of war between the two nations and so this could be the most important turning point in Anglo-Spanish relations. Answers might counter this point by using the Treaty of London of 1604 to show that Anglo-Spanish relations were restored but only after the death of both Philip II and Elizabeth. The continuation of the conflict after the Armada showed that it was not about a threat as such but more a personal dislike between the

monarchs. Responses might use Robert Cecil's comments that James I needed to focus on establishing his reign to support this position.

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

Option 1

AVAILABLE MARKS
50
50

Option 2: Crown and Parliament in England 1603–1702

AVAILABLE MARKS

Answer **one** question.

1 'The execution of Charles I in 1649 marked the most important turning point in the relationship between Crown and Parliament in the period 1603–1702' To what extent would you accept this statement?

This question requires an assessment of whether the execution of Charles I represented the most important turning point in the relationship between Crown and Parliament in this period.

Top level responses will fully address the short-term and long-term significance of the execution as a key turning point and make a comparative analysis with the other pivotal events in this period. The Glorious Revolution, Constitutional Revolution and the final decade of the century will be assessed for their impact on 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 are the requirements for creditable marks.

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

(a) The execution of Charles I, 1649

The relationship between Charles I and his parliament had fractured in the early part of his reign and the two civil wars are clear evidence of the extent of this breakdown. The position of monarchy collapsed completely with the execution in 1649 and the creation of the English Republic. However, the decision to execute Charles was primarily driven by the army leaders and it was only a Rump parliament that had agreed to the King's trial in the first place. Furthermore, although 1649 saw the death of Charles I, it was not to be the death of the monarchy; in fact, the restoration of his son in 1660 suggests that, while the blow to the Crown had been significant, it had not been fatal. The Whig school of thought interprets the execution as a stepping stone on the road to parliamentary democracy and part of a gradual erosion of the position and status of the monarchy, rather than the most important turning point.

(b) James I, 1603–1625

Candidates may use the events of the reign of James I to illustrate the positive aspects of the relationship between Crown and Parliament at the outset of the Stuart period. Despite clashes over finance, religion and foreign policy, James I's reign was characterised by co-operation rather than conflict. Certainly, no event in James I's reign was as significant a turning point in the relationship as the execution of Charles I would prove to be. The views of leading historians such as Gardiner may be employed.

(c) The Constitutional Revolution, 1640–1642

Although the execution, which prematurely ended Charles I's reign, represented the most dramatic blow to Crown/Parliament relations, the Constitutional Revolution of 1640–1642 arguably had more long-term significance. Parliament directly attacked the King's prerogative powers

limiting the royal right to call, prorogue and dissolve Parliament by passing the Triennial Act. The Crown was also weakened by the ending of prerogative taxation and courts. However, many of Parliament's proposals never made the statute books and the Crown retained the majority of its most important prerogative powers. The contemporary opinion of Strafford and the views of historians such as Schama may be employed to assess the extent to which it represented a turning point.

(d) The Restoration Settlement, 1660–c.1665

The clearest evidence that the execution was not the most important turning point in the relationship between Crown and Parliament is in the restoration of Charles II in 1660 and the political settlement that followed. After the chaos of the Interregnum, Charles, and the institution of monarchy, had been recalled at the request of Parliament. The Restoration Settlement, while confirming the bills passed by the Long Parliament, set about strengthening the position of the monarchy. For example, the Triennial Act was weakened. The co-operation between Charles II and his Cavalier Parliament suggests that the relationship between Crown and Parliament had not been permanently damaged by the execution of his father. However, candidates may note that the relationship between the two broke down again during the Exclusion Crisis and Charles pursued personal rule in the final years of his reign. The views of historians such as Jones and Fellows may be employed to explain the impact of the Restoration Settlement on the relationship between Crown and Parliament.

(e) James II, the Glorious Revolution and the Revolution Settlement, 1685–1689

James II's pro-Catholic and absolutist policies had resulted in a complete breakdown in his relationship with Parliament. Despite inheriting a loyal, Tory Parliament, he failed to recall it after 1685. The extent of the deterioration in their relationship is evidenced by Parliament's willingness to agree to the joint monarchy of William and Mary and force James into exile. The Revolution Settlement that followed displayed a willingness of both sides to compromise in pursuit of a working relationship: the new Coronation Oath, Bill of Rights, Mutiny Act, Toleration Act and revised financial arrangements may be viewed as a significant turning point. The contemporary opinion of William of Orange may be included.

(f) The reign of William III and Mary, 1689–1702

William's desire to lead the European Grand Alliance against Louis XIV meant that he was willing to enter into a partnership with his Parliament to ensure a steady supply of revenue. The Civil List and Bank of England strengthened the Crown's position. The cost for the monarchy was an acceptance of more regular Parliaments and allowing MPs a more direct say in how the Crown's money was spent. The contemporary opinion of the Earl of Sunderland may be employed to illustrate the changing nature of Parliament in this period. Clearly the prerogative powers and position of both Crown and Parliament had been transformed, although arguably the relationship between the two had become more clearly defined as a co-dependency had emerged. The reign of William and Mary may be viewed as the most significant turning point in the period.

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

AVAILABLE MARKS

50

2 'The most significant changes to the power and position of Parliament in the period 1603–1702 came about as result of clashes with the Crown over finance.' How far would you agree with this verdict?

AVAILABLE MARKS

This question requires an assessment of whether the most significant changes to the power and position of Parliament in this period were caused by clashes over finance.

Top level responses will also analyse the importance of other factors such as religion and foreign policy. The main changes to the prerogative powers of Parliament came in the Constitutional Revolution, the execution of Charles I, the Restoration Settlement, the Glorious Revolution and during William's reign as a direct result of his foreign policy.

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 and contemporary and later interpretations:

(a) The position of Parliament before 1640

James I's reign (1603–1625) saw some significant clashes between King and Parliament, notably over monopolies and foreign policy; however, there was little significant or long-term change to the power and position of the monarchy. James I's financial policies, pro-Spanish foreign policies and religious policy had also provoked criticism within Parliament. While the relationship had at times been strained under the rule of James I, the prerogative power of Parliament had not been significantly strengthened. The contemporary opinion of Cranfield and Buckingham may be employed. By 1629 the contentious financial and foreign policy of Charles I had resulted in the total breakdown in his relationship with Parliament and the commencement of a lengthy period of Personal Rule. By 1640, when he was forced to recall Parliament because of conflict in Scotland, Charles I's religious and financial policies had created the conditions conducive to a clash with his Parliament over his power and position.

(b) The 'Constitutional Revolution' of 1640–1642

Charles I's financial policies during Personal Rule certainly contributed to the extent of the opposition he faced in the Long Parliament and shaped the demands of his opponents. In the Constitutional Revolution, Parliament succeeded in abolishing the Crown's prerogative financial devices, although the King did retain his right to collect customs duties. While this represented a blow to the financial power of the Crown, Parliament was more concerned with preventing the King ruling without calling it and reversing his controversial Laudian changes to the church. Parliament feared that a financially independent monarch could rule without it and pursue the establishment of a pro-Catholic absolutist state. The Triennial Act and the Act Against Own Dissolution sought to prevent the King ruling for a sustained period of time without calling parliament. The removal of the prerogative courts and financial devices further lessened the likelihood of a restoration of personal rule. However, there were limits to the success of Parliament in this period and it is debatable whether there was any real 'revolution' in Crown-Parliament relations. Parliament had tried and failed to gain the

AVAILABLE MARKS

right to choose the King's advisers or establish its control over the Anglican church and the army. Financial issues had played a part in the Constitutional Revolution but other factors were arguably more significant. The opinions of leading historians such as Hirst and Ferguson may be employed.

(c) The execution of Charles I, 1649

Although financial issues played some part in the execution of the King, they were not central to this, the most significant clash between Crown and Parliament in this period. It was disagreements over religion and liberties of the subject that caused the most severe divisions. After his defeat in two civil wars, Charles I's prevarication and unwillingness to compromise suggests that he contributed directly to his own downfall. The emergence of religious and political radicals and a politicised army were central to the decision to remove the monarchy. However, the failure of the republic and the Crown's restoration in 1660 suggest that the execution had not mortally wounded the relationship between the monarchy and parliament. Contemporary opinion from Cromwell may be employed, while historians such as Williams and Barnard could be utilised.

(d) The Restoration Settlement and the reign of Charles II, 1660–1685

The Restoration was a remarkable comeback for the monarchy and the settlement which followed only served to secure its position even more firmly. The decision to recall Charles II was, to some degree, caused by the economic problems of the interregnum, although the growing political and social disorder was a crucial factor. Charles inherited virtually the same position his father held after the Constitutional Revolution and was able to secure his position as the loyal Cavalier Parliament passed bills to censor the press and make it treason to imprison or restrain the king. The new Triennial Act and improved financial position through trade expansion enabled Charles to enjoy a short period of personal rule before his death, thus providing clear evidence of the extent of the weakening of Parliament's position. It was the desire for political stability which enabled the monarchy to re-establish its position rather than any financial or economic concerns. The contemporary opinion of Clarendon may be used to explain the change in this period. The clashes which did occur during his reign tended to be over religion and the potential succession of his Catholic brother. Foreign policy failures, to a lesser extent, also put strain on the relationship.

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

James II inherited a strong financial position and a loyal Tory Parliament from his brother. Parliament was concerned by James II's financial strength but it was to be his religious policies which would provoke most controversy in his reign. After the Monmouth Rebellion, he retained the standing army and began promoting Catholic officers in contravention of the Test Act. By the end of 1685 he had closed down Parliament and his attempts to achieve political and religious equality for Catholics ultimately resulted in a complete breakdown in his relationship with the gentry. The birth of a potential Catholic heir hastened his removal in the Glorious Revolution. The Revolution Settlement resulted in significant changes in the relationship between King and Parliament as a result of the new Coronation Oath, the Bill of Rights, the Mutiny Act, the Toleration Act and the revised financial arrangements. Parliament's concerns about the Catholic threat, the liberties of the subject and its own position in government rather than financial concerns were the basis of these changes. The views of historians such as Ogg and Pincus may be utilised.

		AVAILABLE MARKS
(f)	**Changes to the role and status of Parliament during the reign of William III** William's involvement of England in the Nine Years' War against Louis XIV led to him making concessions to Parliament in order to fund his military effort. As a result, foreign policy was the most important factor in changing the relationship between Crown and Parliament in this period. The Commission of Accounts and Civil List allowed Parliament a direct influence over the king by controlling the purse strings and the revised Triennial Act secured their regular sitting. The Act of Settlement helped to secure the Protestant succession and also created a judiciary independent of the monarch. Parliament had gained a permanency enabling it to become more efficient and effective. William's need for finance had been central to all these changes, although it was his foreign policy objectives which determined his willingness to concede power to his Parliament. Ironically the period when the most significant changes to the relationship occurred had been marked by financial agreement rather than conflict between the King and his Parliament. The views of historians such as Claydon may be employed. The relationship between Parliament and the King had changed considerably during this period. The monarchy had surrendered some degree of financial independence, although the actual amount of supply from Parliament had increased. In return, Parliament had become a permanent, integral part of central government with the power to shape the succession and religion of future monarchs. Parliament even had the right to discuss and shape the country's foreign policy. Undoubtedly, clashes over finance had provoked many of these changes, although religion and conflicts over the liberties of the subjects had also been hugely significant. The character, beliefs and actions of individual monarchs had also been central to the major constitutional clashes of the period. *Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.* [50]	50
	Option 2	**50**

Option 3: Liberalism and Nationalism in Europe 1815–1914

AVAILABLE MARKS

Answer **one** question.

1 "Both in political and economic terms liberalism in Europe achieved only limited success in the period 1815–1914." To what extent would you agree with this statement?

This question requires a consideration of the successes and failures of liberalism between 1815 and 1914. Answers will probably identify liberalism's failure to attract widespread support or make many inroads into the predominantly authoritarian regimes of Europe between 1815 and 1850, but will note increasing success after that date, with wider powers for elected assemblies and the growth of individual rights. Economically, the gradual growth of free trade should be noted, with its eventual collapse in the last part of the period. Top level responses, however, will refer to isolated successes in the early part of the period, as well as signs of returning authoritarianism as the twentieth century approached.

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 and contemporary and later interpretations:

(a) The Treaty of Vienna, an attempt to eradicate the dangerous ideas which existed in Europe during Revolutionary and Napoleonic times, was largely successful in its aim. Despotic monarchies were restored, with consequent loss of political involvement and individual rights for the middle classes, who had probably benefited most from the previous regimes. It was this bourgeois class which would be the bedrock of liberalism for the next century, its actions governed by a mixture of self-interest and idealism. There were few enough successes before 1848. In France, Louis XVIII "granted" a Charter, rather than seeing it as a right, but at least it made France the most liberal major power on the continent. All the members of the German Confederation were supposed to grant constitutions. Most did not, but in Baden and Württemberg liberal constitutions not only existed, but flourished over time. In the 1840s Pius IX and Frederick William IV in Prussia raised the hopes of liberals on their accession, but those hopes were dashed. Beyond these examples of liberal success, reaction largely triumphed. In the Italian peninsula all of the restored rulers were in one form or another under the power of the Habsburgs, and showed themselves in complete sympathy with Metternich's fierce enmity to all things liberal. The Austrian Foreign Minister's remarks about the"destructive forces" of liberal values would be useful as an interpretation here. In the Empire itself an elaborate system of spies, informers and censorship was established to suppress liberal ideas. The well-meaning Louis XVIII did his best to uphold the moderate liberalism of the Charter, but his Ultra brother Charles X appeared to espouse the values of the ançien regime during his reign (1824–1830) and lost his throne as a result. In the German Confederation, after student demonstrations, the Diet passed harsh laws curbing academic freedom, student organisations and the press. In Italy Carbonari-led revolutions in Piedmont and Naples in 1820 and in the duchies in 1832 were quashed by Austrian forces, while in 1823 French troops crossed the Pyrenees to defeat liberals and restore the

AVAILABLE MARKS

despotic Ferdinand VII. In France, after Charles' overthrow, Louis Philippe headed what became known as the "Bourgeois Monarchy". The franchise was slightly extended and the resurgent Church reined back, but Louis Philippe was not really very liberal, and his reluctance to further extend the right to vote, when it coincided with an economic crisis, brought an end to monarchy in France. Useful interpretations of Louis Philippe's reign and liberal reluctance to share power may be found in the work of Alfred Cobban.

Economically, there were some green shoots for liberalism. After 1820 Prussia and Saxony, in particular, began to industrialise, which meant a growth in an entrepreneurial middle class who were natural liberals. In 1819 Prussia began its Customs Union that would grow into the *Zollverein*, a free trading area eventually including almost all of Germany. Adam Smith or other proponents of the free market might be cited as examples of contemporary interpretations of this development.

(b) In 1848 revolutions occurred all over Europe. In that year liberalism appeared strong enough to secure major constitutional concessions from the rulers, but opportunities for consolidation were frittered away, and the old, reactionary regimes were eventually restored. In France a republic was established, but survived a mere four years until Napoleon III had himself crowned Emperor of France. Italy saw republics in Venice and Rome, constitutions granted elsewhere, and an optimistic declaration of war on Austria by Charles Albert, King of Piedmont, but all these ventures would end in defeat, almost invariably at the hands of the Austrians. The restored despotism in Naples was a little later described as "the negation of God" by the English statesman Gladstone. Austria itself saw the fall of the arch-conservative Metternich and major, if temporary, concessions by the government, notably the March Laws, but in time the governing classes regrouped and the liberal gains of 1848 were lost. In Germany the Frankfurt Assembly, an impeccably liberal body, met to draw up a liberal constitution for a united Germany, but lacked leadership, decisiveness and an army. In Prussia Frederick William IV appeared, at various times, to offer liberal concessions, but these were always later withdrawn or watered down, as in the addition of three-tier voting into the king's own constitution.

Liberals had very few successes in 1848: in Piedmont the retention of the *Statuto* would prove significant, France kept universal male suffrage, while the end of Metternich's career saw the disappearance from public life of their most doughty opponent. Some liberals absorbed the lesson that they needed more worldly, tough-minded leaders if they were to succeed in the future, although this was little consolation as they surveyed the wreckage of the 1848 revolutions. There was an economic dimension too. The predominantly bourgeois liberals, believers in the free market, were horrified by events in both Paris and Vienna, where National Workshops were set up at public expense to deal with the problems of the unemployed. In both cases liberals were as a result less reluctant about seeing a return to more reactionary regimes. Cowie and Wolfson point to the liberal "refusal to share the fruits of victory" with the working class as a fatal weakness.

(c) In the wake of 1848 there were few liberal successes. In Prussia Manteuffel introduced social reforms to produce an alliance between the lower classes and the Junkers, specifically to sideline the liberals. His scathing views on middle class liberals would be useful as an interpretation. In France Louis Napoleon appealed to peasants and the bourgeoisie who feared radicalism

AVAILABLE MARKS

and desired strong government, and he established the Second Empire, initially acting severely against his opponents. In Austria there was a series of experimental constitutions, of which the Sylvester Patent, the most conservative, ushered in a decade of illiberalism during the Bach era. Italy, and more specifically Piedmont, supplied the main political success during the 1850s, when Cavour modernised and liberalised his country to the extent that it became a beacon of hope for liberals across the country. When Italy was largely united by 1860, the Piedmontese constitution was extended across the whole of the country, even though it did not necessarily fit well in the impoverished, backward south.

The 1860s were, arguably, the high point of liberal success. Free trade made advances almost everywhere, spurred on by the examples of Britain and Germany. Napoleon III was one of those rulers who promoted it, only one facet of the liberalisation of his regime after the earlier "authoritarian Empire." He had always promised "order first, liberty later", and by the latter stages of his reign he had introduced many freedoms that liberals had long sought. Keith Randell could be quoted as an historian on the contradictions inherent in his liberalisation. In 1867 the traumatic defeat of the Seven Weeks' War forced Austria into a series of reforms, with greatly increased powers for the *Reichsrat* and a weakening of Church influence. Germany saw significant advances for liberalism. In Prussia the Progressives became the biggest party by 1861. Opposed to von Roon's army reforms, they blocked the parliamentary legislation, but Bismarck showed that their power was not as great as they might have hoped when he curbed the press and collected the required taxes illegally. After the defeat of Austria in 1866 the National Liberals were formed, representing business interests and seeking to work with their former enemy, Bismarck.

(d) After 1870 liberalism had limited success: individual freedoms continued their growth, but the rights of parliaments were often restricted, as in Germany after 1900. France does represent success for liberalism. The Third Republic proved more permanent than its predecessors, with Thiers seeing off threats from the Commune and the resurgent royalists in the 1870s. The republic had its problems: the Panama Scandal was one of a number which undermined faith in a liberal state, and the Dreyfus Affair caused deep divisions in France, but these crises, as well as the attempt by Boulanger to establish some sort of dictatorship and the pre-war revolutionary syndicalism threat, were successfully seen off. Elsewhere the picture was more clouded. In Germany the National Liberals collaborated in the illiberal anti-clerical Falk Laws and were eventually jettisoned by Bismarck as he sought to reverse free trade in 1879. The Iron Chancellor's own opinions about liberals might be alluded to as contemporary interpretation. As their supporters drifted away, the party sank into relative obscurity. Italy was not a good advertisement for liberalism, with corrupt elections, bribery in parliament and unstable governments. Anti-clerical laws were hugely unpopular in the South: Shreeves' remark that the new country was merely "a Piedmontese political and economic conquest of the rest of Italy" is an interesting interpretation. In Austria the liberals fell from power in 1878 and the country reverted more and more to authoritarianism as Franz Josef took greater control and parliament fell into disrepute as it degenerated into a forum for numerous small, squabbling parties.

Economic liberalism suffered also, as other countries rushed to follow

AVAILABLE MARKS

Germany's lead in restoring protective tariffs, with only Britain left as a free trading country in 1914. Bismarck also paved the way in introducing welfare payments for the elderly and the injured, reforms which, with their collectivist basis, ran counter to the individualism of liberal philosophy. Socialism was growing and by 1914 the SPD was the largest party in the German *Reichstag*, and Austria had nationalised its railways as early as 1873.

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

2 "The unification of Italy was the greatest triumph of nationalism in Europe between 1815 and 1914." How far would you agree with this verdict?

This question requires an assessment of the process of Italian unification, setting it in the context of its background, as well as considering its results. There will be a comparison with other nation-state creations, particularly Germany, to judge whether this was nationalism's "greatest triumph", but the context of the period 1815–1914 also requires mention of less spectacular examples, such as Belgium or Hungary. Better answers may consider the part played by writers and musicians in the formation of national consciousness across many countries as a "triumph", while others may remark on the way in which nationalism, previously an enemy of the status quo, was adapted by many governments to suit their own purposes.

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 and contemporary and later interpretations:

(a) The Italian "triumph" should be placed in the context of earlier setbacks for nationalism. 1815 represented a low point for those whose hopes had been raised by developments before 1815, as Italy was repartitioned into a series of states, all to a greater or lesser degree under Habsburg control. Revolutions, liberal but with nationalist undertones, organised by secret societies in 1820 and 1831, were uniformly crushed. In the 1830s Guiseppe Mazzini, an inspirational but impractical patriot, vainly attempted further revolution with his "Young Italy" movement. In 1848 nationalism suffered a crushing blow when Piedmont's war against the colonial power, Austria, did not succeed, and short-lived revolutionary successes across the peninsula were eventually crushed by Austrian and French intervention. The Austrian determination, masterminded by Metternich, to keep Italy disunited, might provide some contemporary interpretative material, while Peter Jones could be quoted for his more modern views on the specific failures of 1848.

(b) The intellectual and cultural encouragement of Italian nationalism was perhaps a necessary pre-condition for the events of the post-1848 period. Verdi's opera "Nabucco", ostensibly about the Israelites in Egypt, was a coded plea for Italian freedom. Various ideas were circulated regarding Italy's future: Gioberti wanted a confederation headed by the Pope, whereas Balbo, also writing in the 1840s, favoured moderation over revolution, and felt that Piedmont should take the lead in pushing for liberation. Either of these writers might be cited as contemporary interpreters. Count Camillo

AVAILABLE MARKS

Cavour, a leading Piedmontese politician, impressed patriots across the peninsula with his promotion of free trade, railway expansion and anti-clerical reforms, these achievements attracting sympathy for the idea of Piedmont as the future leader of Italy. Cavour attracted wider European sympathy when Piedmont fought against Russia in the Crimean War, and Napoleon III, who wished to undermine the Treaty of Vienna, agreed at Plombières to assist in driving the Austrians out of Northern Italy. But he proved an irresolute ally, only an attempt on his life and Austrian diplomatic blundering finally bringing him into the war, which he abandoned with the task only half completed, Venetia remaining part of the Habsburg Empire. A despairing Cavour resigned, but the day was saved when the National Society, a body with which he had shadowy links, promoted both revolution and a campaign to join Tuscany, Parma, Modena and the Romagna with the new Piedmont, now joined with Lombardy. The impetus towards full union continued with Garibaldi's epic campaign of the Thousand, through Sicily and Naples, ousting the old regime and threatening the Papal territories. It was to stop Garibaldi, who despite fighting in the name of Victor Emmanuel of Piedmont, had radical and republican leanings, that the returning Cavour marched his army south to overawe Garibaldi, who handed his conquests over to the Kingdom of Italy in 1860. Venetia was added to the new Kingdom in 1866, when Italy fought with Prussia against Austria, and Rome finally became part of the new Italy in 1870, when French troops abandoned their garrisoning of the city on the outbreak of war with Prussia. Arguments for the proposition should note the contrast between the constant failures of the 1815–1848 period and the apparent triumph of 1859–1870. During the earlier period, nationalism in Italy was thwarted by its limited appeal, its lack of strong leadership, absence of focus, and its insistence on *Italia fara da se*, a belief that Italy would "make herself." But, despite the failures of 1848 the events of that year had contributed to a growing awareness of nationalism: Cavour and Garibaldi both dwarfed their nationalist predecessors, even former republicans and papalists were prepared to rally round Piedmont as a realistic focus for unity, and help was readily obtained from France, Prussia and Britain. This turnaround in attitudes, as well as in deeds, makes a strong case for the proposition. Herder could be used to interpret the use of foreign aid, while Cavour's letters and reported conversations illustrate his own attitude to calling on the French to spark off the process of unification.

(c) Better answers may question the "greatest triumph" claim more closely. Italy was fortunate that after the Crimean War Austria found itself isolated, while neither France nor Britain had any interest in Habsburg retention of power in Italy. The formerly orthodox view among Italians such as Croce was that of a *Risorgimento* where liberal Italians took control of their own destiny to create a unified nation-state. More recent revisionists such as Dennis Mack Smith cast doubt on this, pointing not to an Italy uniting itself but a Piedmont extending its own power. A further interpretation of this comes from the historian Luraghi, who suggests that rather than unification, the backward and agrarian South of Italy was defeated and taken over by the capitalist, industrial North. The new Kingdom was not a happy marriage: the politician d'Azeglio remarked: "We have made Italy; now we must make Italians", and it was not long before brigandage bordering on civil war raged across the South.

(d) German unification will usually be seen as another candidate for the title of "greatest triumph". Like Italy, it was redivided in 1815 and placed firmly

under Austrian supervision. Liberalism and nationalism briefly sparked into life in 1817 and 1832, only to be crushed under repressive legislation passed by the German Diet under Metternich's instructions. Like Italy, German national consciousness was expanded by cultural figures: Herder's writings gave Germans pride in their race and culture, while Jahn was the founding father of the idealistic *Burschenschaften*. Yet their success may have been limited, and the modern historians Catterall and Vinen note the difficulty of spreading the nationalist message beyond a young, educated elite. 1848 saw great hopes and greater disappointment in Germany as a whole and in Prussia in particular, and by 1849 the political situation had reverted to the pre-revolutionary norm. It was not until the appearance of Bismarck that this changed. Taking over in Prussia when the liberals were blocking military expansion, he ignored political convention to raise the necessary taxes without parliamentary consent, and went on to fight a series of three wars to unite Germany under Prussian control, defeating first Denmark, then the hitherto dominant Austria, and finally France, which would not have timidly accepted a new Great Power across the Rhine. Bismarck's diplomacy was cunning, Prussian armies shocked Europe by their success, and Prussian industry supplied the materials for the country's conquests. German unification, accomplished in a mere seven years after decades of stagnation, may be argued to be an even greater triumph than that of Italy. But other points should be made. It is doubtful if Bismarck was any sort of German nationalist, rather he was a Prussian through and through. His own comments on this could be used as an interpretation, as could the remarks of historians such as Carr, who observed that "the Empire did not emanate from the will of the people." Bismarck undoubtedly benefited from a helpful diplomatic situation, where Austria remained isolated, and France, by its own blunders, had forfeited international support.

(e) Other nationalist successes may be mentioned. Belgian independence from Holland would have been seen as remarkable and worrying in 1815, but by 1831, so long as France was excluded from the new country, it was more readily accepted by the Powers. Greece would not have become independent of its own volition: it was only at the end of a long military stalemate with Turkey that Britain, France and Russia intervened decisively enough to drive the Ottomans out in 1829. Hungary achieved self-government and a half share in the running of the Habsburg Empire in 1867. This had been a long struggle, but the Magyars had received only limited concessions until, in the wake of defeat in the Seven Weeks War, Austria could deny them no longer. Bulgaria (1878 and 1885) and Albania (1913) both escaped from the clutches of the Ottoman Empire, in each case after other powers (first Russia and then the Balkan League) defeated Turkey. Also late in the period most, if not all, European nation-states began to play the nationalist card, stressing patriotism, military virtues and the glories of overseas empire as a means of weaning the working classes away from the lures of socialism. This was indeed clever, but was not always successful in either achieving its aims or adding nobility to the national character. Historians such as Waller might be quoted on this where he wrote "the later history of nationalism is a much more sombre and sinister affair."

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately [50]

Option 3

AVAILABLE MARKS
50
50

Option 4: Unionism and Nationalism in Ireland 1800–1900

AVAILABLE MARKS

Answer **one** question.

1 "Irish nationalism only succeeded when it had the backing of the Catholic Church." How far would you accept this assessment of constitutional and revolutionary nationalism in Ireland in the period 1800–1900?

This question requires an assessment of the importance of the support of the Catholic Church in the success of constitutional and revolutionary nationalism.

Top level responses will reflect on the extent to which the support of the Catholic Church led to nationalism experiencing either success or failure and link the question of success or failure to other factors as well, such as the relative strength of successive British Governments, the role of key leadership figures or the building up of mass support. Regarding the proposition and constitutional nationalism, answers may reflect on the response of the Church towards key figures such as O'Connell and Parnell and regarding revolutionary nationalists, some specific indication of the Church's reaction towards Emmet, Young Ireland and the Fenians will be required. Top marks will be awarded to those candidates who debate all the relevant factors, including the proposition, before arriving at a valid and substantiated conclusion.

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 and contemporary and later interpretations:

(a) Constitutional nationalists did indeed benefit from the support of the Catholic Church at different times during the century. O'Connell received the backing of the Church quite early in his career, specifically regarding his quest for Catholic Emancipation. The clergy openly endorsed him, collected the 'penny rent' and were key in persuading O'Connell to utilise the latent strength of the 40 shilling freeholders to affect the outcome of by-elections. Bishop Doyle was a high profile supporter who lent his name and therefore legitimacy to the campaign. Candidates could refer to contemporary comment from Catholic clergy, as well as from historians such as McCartney regarding the key role the Church played in O'Connell's campaign. Adelman also commented that O'Connell rightly realised that the role of the parish priests was of crucial importance in spreading the message of the Association. Parnell was also fortunate to have the backing of the Catholic Church, although it did not come so quickly for him. Larkin described the relationship as 'symbiotic', with the Church attaching itself to Parnell out of a desire to remain relevant. Archbishop Croke was Parnell's key supporter and the Church even went so far as to entrust the care of the Irish Catholic educational interests to the Home Rule party and to Parnell, a Protestant. Lyons could be referred to here to illustrate the support given to Parnell and the Home Rule party by the Catholic Church in this period. Top level answers could also discuss the support of the Catholic Church in terms of how O'Connell had it firmly on his side in 1829, as did Parnell in the1880s, and this undoubtedly helped their causes in these respective eras. By contrast, the Church was lukewarm in its support for repeal and then

AVAILABLE MARKS

ultimately cost Parnell his support base after the O'Shea scandal, thereby helping to determine both success and failure. The contrast could be traced between the Church building support for O'Connell and removing support from Parnell. This had a huge impact on his support.

(b) There were, however, other factors which helped constitutional nationalists. In the Emancipation era, O'Connell's own personal charisma and keen political intelligence were vital. O'Connell's recognition of the crisis at Westminster and within the Tory party also contributed to his success. The weakness of the Westminster government and the splits in the Tory party between Wellington and Peel led to a situation where Emancipation was likely to be passed. Peel conceded over Emancipation that, "I yield therefore to a moral necessity which I cannot control, unwilling to push resistance to a point which might endanger the establishments that I wish to defend." The way in which O'Connell pressured the government after his election in County Clare could also be discussed. Other factors such as the precedent set by Wellington having to pass the Test and Corporations Act and the overall support and mobilisation of the Catholic Church in support of both O'Connell and Emancipation could also be included as reasons for success. O'Connell's successes with his reforms of the 1830s, such as the Education Reform of 1832 and the Irish Church Act of 1833, could also be discussed along with his alliance with the Whigs in the Lichfield House Compact of 1835. This was success but not due directly to mass popular support. The theory of MacDonagh could be advanced here, that O'Connell was always more committed to reform rather than Repeal, despite his later stance.

(c) The campaign for the Repeal of the Union was very different. The Church was less committed to repeal than it had been to Emancipation, seeing it as a more radical and therefore dangerous political issue. There was also the fact that Church leaders wanted to wait and see what benefits Emancipation would bring and arguably never saw the need to support Repeal in the same way as Emancipation. Although candidates could argue that O'Connell still managed to attract mass popular support to his cause, it was not as effective this time. The support of Presbyterians was lukewarm and the masses arguably did not buy into the idea of Repeal with the same conviction. O'Connell's decision to ally with Young Ireland backfired since he could not control the movement as he had hoped, leading to a split. The failure of Repeal, however, was not only caused by a lack of mass popular support but also by factors such as the relative strength of Peel's government at this time in contrast to the situation in 1829. In addition, O'Connell was arguably not the political force or leader he had once been. This is evident from the gradual reduction in the O'Connell tribute during his later years. Peel's campaign of reforms for Ireland also damaged the Repeal campaign.

(d) Isaac Butt was another leader who enjoyed some limited success in the formative years of the Home Rule campaign. The Catholic Church was indifferent to Butt's campaign in all probability because it was nowhere near the force Home Rule would later become and therefore other reasons must be looked at to explain his relative lack of success. Butt arguably never enjoyed mass popular support and his Home Rule movement was characterised by loyalty to the British establishment in the hope that concessions would be given. Although this brought some success in that Home Rule became an issue at Westminster, Butt's subservience eventually cost him his leadership and his support. It can nonetheless be claimed, that Butt prepared the way for what Parnell would later do.

AVAILABLE MARKS

(e) In addition to the support he received from the Church, Parnell's ability to mobilise mass popular support was a key factor in his success. Parnell's association with the Land League and ex-Fenians such as Davitt led to the creation of the "New Departure" which brought together mass popular support, the endorsement of the Catholic Church and co-operation for a time with some of the more radical elements of Irish nationalism. According to Larkin, "the Church had taken this step and allied with Parnell, out of necessity and a need to remain relevant." Tangible successes were soon apparent such as the Land Act of 1881 and the Arrears Act of 1882. Parnell's transformation of the Irish Parliamentary Party (IPP) into a unified, focused and pledge-bound party at Westminster also made the Irish presence so dominant in the House of Commons that it helped prompt the Home Rule debate. The success of Parnell and the IPP in the 1885 general election, taking 86 seats, could also be discussed to show how widespread mass support contributed to success. The fact that both the 1886 and 1893 Home Rule Bills failed did not change the fact that Parnell's real legacy had been that he had made Home Rule a dominant and recurring political issue at Westminster for the next thirty years. Parnell's failure, downfall and death can be explained by a combination of factors. The O'Shea scandal alienated the Church, which denounced Parnell. The scandal also caused division in his own party. Gladstone was also forced to distance himself from Parnell due to the backlash. In some ways, then, Parnell could be described as the architect of his own downfall. Candidates could also debate the extent to which Tory and unionist hostility to Home Rule led to its failure. This shows that even with mass popular support, Irish nationalism could still suffer devastating defeats and losses.

(f) Candidates should present a discussion of other significant factors that led to the success of constitutional nationalism apart from support from the Catholic Church. Those worthy of note would include the relative strength of successive British governments. Wellington's government was weak in 1829 and this helped O'Connell immensely in his campaign for emancipation. The opposite was true in the 1840s when Peel headed a united party and government and was able to resist Repeal with relative ease. The role of leadership could also be discussed in that O'Connell's dynamic leadership helped emancipation but he was arguably not so dynamic with Repeal. The same was true in the Home Rule era as, although Butt was capable, he lacked Parnell's charisma and discipline. The oratorical skills of certain leaders could also be discussed, such as those of Parnell when he claimed: "But no man has the right to fix the boundary to the march of a nation. No man has the right to say to his country, this far shalt thou go and no farther."

(g) The role of the Catholic Church in not supporting revolutionary nationalism should also be discussed. The Church offered no real support to revolutionary groups which did arguably contribute to their overall failure but it was by no means the main reason behind their failure.

Emmet in 1803 received no Church backing but his failure was due to poor planning, a lack of support and a lack of resources. The Church was also suspicious of the Young Irelanders long before their rebellion in 1848, due to their views on Catholic education, and so gave no support to the group but again other reasons were more important in leading to their failure. The Fenian rebellion of 1867 faced the additional problem of not only no clerical support, but rather almost total condemnation from the Catholic Church and

establishment, largely because of the views and overwhelming presence of Cardinal Cullen. As Bishop Moriarty claimed at the time: "Hell is not hot enough nor eternity long enough to roast the Fenians." This depleted any support they had.

(h) Answers should however reflect on the other factors which contributed to the failure of revolutionary nationalists in this period. The failure of revolutionary nationalists to build up mass popular support did contribute to their failure in this period. There was little public support for either Emmet's rebellion of 1803 or the Young Ireland rebellion of 1848 and both were relatively easily suppressed. In none of the three rebellions of the nineteenth century did there appear any significant spontaneous support for any of the rebels. However, the point could also be made that revolutionary nationalists, by their very nature, did not ever seek or set out to achieve mass popular support. Inadequate planning and preparation was a common feature in all three rebellions. The Fenians were also hamstrung by the divisions in their leadership, both in Ireland and the USA. The role of government was also a key determinant as each prospective rebellion was easily crushed by a combination of firm leadership, strong military response and infiltration. In the case of the Fenians, the fear they inspired in Gladstone led to a frenetic campaign of Irish reforms which denied them support. The unrealistic aspirations of some of the revolutionaries could also be discussed, as well as the importance of external factors, such as the hardships being endured during the Young Ireland rebellion of 1848 due to the famine, making any chance of success disappear.

(i) It is valid for answers to comment on the success of physical force movements. Each movement contributed to the legacy of Irish revolutionary nationalism and provided inspiration for future Irish generations. Emmet's views and rhetoric can be linked clearly to Pearse in 1916, as can the cultural ideas of Young Ireland. Some members of Young Ireland later joined the Fenians, continuing their struggle. As also stated above, the activities of the Fenians convinced Gladstone of the need to legislate for Ireland leading to a programme of social, economic and political reforms. The reform of the Tithe question could then be attributed indirectly to the Fenians. The romanticised idea and legacy of the 'triumph of failure' and the ever-growing list of Irish martyrs did contribute to the wider nationalist struggle, providing inspiration for successive revolutionary groups, most notably in 1916.

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

AVAILABLE MARKS

2 "The supporters of the Union in the north and south of Ireland were motivated mainly by their fears over the Empire and shared the belief that violent methods would be necessary to protect the Union." How far would you accept this verdict on the motives and methods of unionists in the north and south of Ireland in the period 1800–1900?

This question requires an assessment of the motives and methods of those who supported the Union in the north and the south of Ireland, making sustained and substantiated comparisons and contrasts.
The question requires candidates to examine the attitudes towards the Union held by its supporters in the north and south of Ireland. Imperial concerns were arguably more keenly felt by those unionists in the south. Religious fears and

AVAILABLE MARKS

motives were more influential in shaping unionist opinion towards the Union in the north rather than the south. Economic considerations were relevant to both groups but not equally so. Top level responses will reflect on the wide range of motives which prompted Ulster and southern unionists to uphold the status quo. Similarities and differences should also be pointed out in the methods employed by both groups of unionists with particular mention being made of their attitudes to the use of physical force.

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 and contemporary and later interpretations:

(a) Whilst fears regarding the Empire were prominent in the minds of both southern and northern unionists, they were not the sole motivation for their actions or beliefs. Fears for the well-being of the Empire were more prominent amongst southern unionists than their northern counterparts and the reasons for this difference should be explored. The belief was widespread that the introduction of Home Rule would weaken the Empire worldwide. A case could also be made that southern unionists were more able to see the Irish situation in a global or imperial context, as a great many of their number had served the Empire abroad and had experience of global or at least European travel; men such as Lansdowne and Midleton had gone on to serve the Empire at the highest level in diplomatic roles. Southern unionists were also keen to highlight Ireland's part within the world's greatest Empire and draw contrasts to the arguably diminished position that an independent Ireland would hold on the world stage. It could also be argued that because of their position as a minority within the rest of Ireland, southern unionists had to use fear for the Empire to appeal to others in order to build up support for their cause in the south.

(b) Fears over the Empire were also prevalent in the north, although arguably less so. The concern of Ulster unionists for the Empire was inextricably linked to the economic prosperity they felt they had enjoyed as members of the Empire. The prosperity of Ulster was in their minds, due to the benefits of global trade with Britain and the wider Empire and it could therefore be claimed that their imperial motives were really economic at their core. The possibility of a 'domino effect' across the rest of the Empire was also felt by and used by unionists. Imperial concerns undoubtedly brought many prominent English supporters to back Ulster unionism as Lord Randolph Churchill proved when he famously said: "The Orange card is the one to play." Responses may debate the relative balance of motivating factors in assessing the fears and overall motivation of northern unionists.

(c) Religious fears were undoubtedly at the forefront of Ulster unionist fears as the north of Ireland had a very different religious demography to the rest of Ireland and experienced comparably more sectarian tension. This tension was heightened during the debates over the first and second Home Rule Bills. The link with geographical distribution explains the focus on religion, especially during the Home Rule debates as those in the north arguably felt that they had more to lose from Home Rule. Responses could include public statements or speeches by leading Ulster unionists such as Saunderson or

AVAILABLE MARKS

Sinclair. There was also a belief that all Protestants had to work together to combat what was seen as a growing danger from Catholicism and, as such, the views of men like Rev. Henry Cooke could also be discussed: "Protestants have to overcome their denominational differences and learn to work together to combat the growing Catholic threat." The variety of organisations formed to uphold and defend the Union, such as the Protestant Defence Association and the Ulster Loyalist Anti-Repeal Union, also show how northern unionists perceived themselves at this time and how prominent a role religion played in both their motivation and identity. Adelman argued that Ulster unionism was born primarily due to four factors: The re-emergence of Irish Catholic nationalism, the rise of the Home Rule party in Ireland, the Home Rulers' swift capture of the Catholic vote and the introduction of Gladstone's Home Rule Bills.

(d) Religious fears were also present in the south but again due to demography, to a much lesser extent. This can be linked to the geographical distribution of southern unionists. As a small and fragmented minority, they depended on the goodwill of their Catholic neighbours. They made constant arguments as to the benefits of the Union for all religions as an attempt to spread their unionist beliefs. Catholics were made welcome into southern unionist organisations and these organisations such as the Cork Defence Union articulated in 1885 that "the Union is non-sectarian and non-political." The social make-up of southern unionism also directly affected their methods in opposing Home Rule as they were able to use their family and political ties with the House of Lords to lobby for their position and for the defeat of Home Rule. Southern unionists were also always keen to stress their importance to the wider unionist movement. As William Kenny, a Catholic Unionist MP for Dublin, stated in 1892: "We are determined to show that Unionist Ireland is not represented by Ulster alone." Top responses should debate where the balance in motivation lay with southern unionists as well.

(e) Economic motives were also clearly evident in the north of Ireland and a strong argument could be made that these motives were in fact the primary concern of northern unionists. There was a real fear that Ulster's economic prosperity and position would be threatened if the Union was broken. It was a frequently articulated argument at the time that the welfare of Ulster's industries, namely shipbuilding, linen and ropeworks, hinged on Britain's relationship with Ireland in general and on the success and continuance of the Union in particular. Ulster was also viewed as economically different from the rest of Ireland due to its global reputation and cutting edge industries, all of which depended on the continuance of the Union. Ulster unionists attributed all of the economic progress of the north directly to the Union and, as Henry Cooke said: "Look at Belfast and be a repealer if you can." Repeal and later Home Rule, regardless of the supposed safeguards built in for the unionist minority, were believed by the vast majority to symbolise the destruction of Ulster's prosperity. This belief caused many Liberals to transfer their allegiance to unionism, individuals such as Thomas Sinclair who firmly believed that Home Rule would spell economic disaster for Ulster. This was despite his support for Gladstone's other Irish reforms such as the disestablishment of the Church of Ireland. Rees and Kee have observed that the economic concerns over Home Rule were the most important motives for Ulster unionists.

		AVAILABLE MARKS
(f)	Economic motives were also important for Southern unionists. Many southern unionists had already experienced unease over their prosperity and position due to the passing of various land acts in the second half of the nineteenth century. The social structure of southern unionism also helps to account for these economic fears, as so many prominent families had their wealth bound up in landed estates and they preferred their fortunes to be controlled by an English parliament than an Irish Home Rule parliament. McDowell put forward the view that Southern unionists were fearful of the changes that an Irish Parliament would bring to land ownership in Ireland, thereby showing how economic concerns influenced their opposition to Home Rule. The social structure of Southern unionists also meant that they feared for their agricultural prosperity with any change to the Union. The reforms of the later nineteenth century, such as the Reform and Secret Ballot Acts, led to increasing unease amongst Southern unionists as their positions became threatened.	
(g)	A discussion of the methods of both Ulster and Southern unionists must also be included as these details are relevant to any discussion of their motives, the methods of resistance being the visible symbols of the motives. In particular, answers should address the physical force aspect suggested in the question, commenting on the degree to which Ulster and southern unionists felt that the use of violence would be necessary or even preferable. Geographical considerations impacted greatly on the methods of unionists. In the north, where unionism enjoyed a majority, unionists could be confident, outspoken and even radical in their defence of the Union, sometimes hinting at the use of force. The Ulster Defence Union collected funds for the organisation of resistance to Home Rule. Southern unionists could never use the same methods due to their different status as a permanent minority in the remaining three provinces, therefore making the use of violence unrealistic. It was, however, also undesirable for southern unionists as they were keen to promote their image as 'loyal' subjects of both Britain and the Empire. Southern unionists were therefore more prepared and likely to use peaceful methods compared to their northern counterparts. However, Southern unionists were able to exert their influence in the House of Lords, as well as use their considerable financial power to back their defence of the Union, advantages not possessed in the same way by their northern counterparts. The veto possessed by the Lords in this period was a constant reminder of just how powerful the political contacts of southern unionists were to the cause. Even the titles of the organisations set up to defend the union could be discussed. In the south, the word "Irish" was prominent, whilst in the north it was usually the word, "Ulster." This suggests differences in the self-perception of unionists in terms of their identities. The differences between both unionist groups became more pronounced during and after the Home Rule crises of 1886 and 1893, when the differences in methods became impossible to ignore. *Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.* [50]	50
	Option 4	**50**

Option 5: Clash of Ideologies in Europe 1900–2000

AVAILABLE MARKS

Answer **one** question.

1 "Soviet foreign policy in Europe between 1917 and 1991 was motivated primarily by economic concerns." To what extent would you agree with this assessment?

This question asks candidates to consider what influenced Soviet foreign policy and to what extent it was motivated by economic concerns.

Top level responses will directly explore the proposition with a good balance being given to the different leaders and their respective foreign policies. The strongest responses will consider other motivations such as ideology and security and weigh up the significance of these motivations in relation to economic concerns. Equally, top level candidates will highlight that the forces shaping foreign policy at any one given time may be multiple rather than singular.

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 and contemporary and later interpretations:

(a) 1917–1924

The significance of economic concerns is obvious in the immediate aftermath of the seizure of power in October 1917. Candidates could argue that withdrawal from the war and the renunciation of Tsarist loans were economically motivated actions designed to protect the nascent state, although it could be pointed out such actions were equally ideological. Candidates might also observe that Lenin set up the Comintern in 1919 with the goal of trying to spread communism internationally. It could be pointed out, as Kennan was to subsequently claim, that communism was an inherently aggressive and expansionist ideology and there is some evidence for that claim, particularly with regard to the Russo-Polish War of 1919–1921. Interpreted as an attempt to create a "red bridge into Europe", this could be presented as evidence of Soviet foreign policy being motivated by factors other than economics.

However, candidates could argue that the Russo-Polish War and the previous Civil War were evidence of the defensive nature of Soviet foreign policy. This is further supported by treaties in 1921 and 1922 with both Britain and Germany which had economic considerations at their heart and as such would reinforce the proposition at the centre of the question.

Candidates can find opportunities to challenge or support the proposition, and the strongest responses will highlight the many strains of motivation, show that they overlap and support these points with relevant interpretations.

(b) 1924–1941

Stalin adopted more inward-looking policies than Lenin and concentrated on the economic reconstruction of the USSR. The policy of "Socialism in One Country" focused partly on industrialisation, allowing the USSR to increase its levels of rearmament to protect itself from potential attacks by capitalist

AVAILABLE MARKS

states. Equally, diplomatic ties that were strengthened with Germany also highlighted the significance of economic considerations in Soviet foreign policy. As Stalin was to comment: "One Soviet tractor is worth ten foreign communists", thereby highlighting his priorities.

However, with the rise to power of Hitler in 1933, the USSR was forced to recognise the threat of Nazism. As a result, Stalin turned his back on previous policies and in 1934 the USSR joined the League of Nations, which Lenin had once termed "a den of robbers." The Soviet Union pursued a policy of collective security with previously ideologically hostile states. Candidates could argue that foreign policy at this point was not overly influenced by economic concerns but rather security and external threats dominated diplomatic relations throughout these years.

The involvement with the Spanish Civil War in 1936 was limited in character and may indeed be viewed as a piece of opportunism by Stalin, both economic and ideological, with the capture of Spanish gold reserves and the attack on Trotskyists. After the Munich Conference in 1938 the USSR clearly realised that the West could not be relied on and in 1939 an "ideological somersault" (Ward) was performed and the Nazi-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact was signed. Although there were economic gains to be made from the Pact, it could also be argued that the agreement was essentially a measure to forestall Nazi attack and thus was motivated by security concerns. Candidates have an excellent opportunity to consider how different interpretations have emerged regarding the motivations of Soviet foreign policy at this point.

(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. Thus, although there was no economic motivation at this point, the legacy of the war was certainly going to create one. Since the Soviet Union had lost an estimated 28 million people and 80% of all casualties had occurred on the Eastern front, reparations and security would be seen as indivisible.

(d) 1945–1953

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 creation of Cominform in 1947 and Comecon in 1949, but he also wanted to prevent a united capitalist Germany rising up again to threaten the USSR. One can make a strong claim that economic considerations were the driving force at this point – be it in terms of reparations with regard to Germany or the belief that it was necessary to blockade Berlin in 1948 to try to undermine US attempts to create an independent Federal Germany that would undermine the workings of the Soviet occupied zone. As McCauley has noted, Stalin's two main concerns were "security and money."

AVAILABLE MARKS

(e) 1953–1964

The Khrushchev era allows candidates to weigh up to what extent economic matters took priority over security and ideological concerns. Initially, candidates could argue that Khrushchev sought improved relationships from a pragmatic point of view to avoid, as he put it, "the most destructive war in history" and the denunciation of Stalin and Stalinist policies, as well as the withdrawal of troops from Austria, appear positive in this light. Candidates could suggest that it was the cost of the arms race and the vast military spending that shaped Khrushchev's diplomatic polices and thus economics strongly motivated policy. However, candidates could argue that beneath this, security remained the primary motivation, no more so than with the brutal suppression of the Hungarian uprising of 1956. The possibility of a break in the "Iron Curtain" could not be countenanced and thus security dominated not just thinking, but actions. As Evans and Jenkins noted: "In many ways the foreign policy aims of Khrushchev differed little from those of Stalin."

The building of the Berlin Wall once again allows candidates to consider the relationship between security and economics when it comes to understanding the motivation behind Soviet foreign policy. It can be argued that the economic impact of the "brain drain" from East Germany forced Khrushchev into building the totemic symbol of the Cold War. Equally, in contrast candidates could suggest that it was mainly a matter of security. The collapse of East Germany was first and foremost a security concern given the impact it would have on the Eastern Bloc as a whole. Candidates could also suggest that it was the interplay between economic and security matters that was to be the determining force in Soviet thinking at this time.

(f) 1964–1982

In many ways the Brezhnev era was to have distinct similarities to the period that preceded it. The suppression of the Prague Spring in 1968 could be understood in a similar manner to arguments concerning Hungary in 1956. Indeed, the creation of the Brezhnev Doctrine in the wake of the Czechoslovakian uprising would offer support for the view that the maintenance of the eastern bloc was crucial in shaping the foreign policy of the USSR. While Czechoslovakia was to grow as an economy by the late 1980s, it was at this point relatively weak and was stagnating economically.

However, détente and the diplomatic treaties such as SALT 1 and the Helsinki Final Act offer the opportunity for candidates to highlight the economic benefits to be gained from both treaties. Answers should evaluate these benefits rather than merely state them. The costly nature of complex defence systems was placing a severe strain on the Soviet economy and, although, as Barston among others has written, the Soviet Union did not want to undermine "those areas where the Soviets had a strategic advantage", there was a desire to reduce spending. Equally, while the Helsinki Final Act had beneficial security aspects, such as the recognition of post-war borders, there were also economic gains to be made through trade, as well as scientific and economic co-operation which formed part of what was termed the second "basket."

AVAILABLE MARKS

(g) 1982–1985

Candidates could note that the years in between Brezhnev and Gorbachev witnessed the short-term rule of Andropov and subsequently Chernenko and little was achieved internationally.

(h) 1985–1991

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.

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

2. "Throughout the period 1917–1991 the opponents of communism remained consistently hostile to the Soviet Union, regardless of nationality or ideology." To what extent would you accept this verdict?

This question requires an assessment of the motivations of the opponents of communism in Europe between 1917 and 1991. At the heart of this discussion should be the question of how hostile the various opponents of communism throughout the whole period were and what variations or contrasts there might have been.

Top level responses will reflect on how hostility to the Soviet Union did in fact depend on the historical period but also the opponent. Contrasts will be drawn between states and the degrees of hostility and also periods of co-operation, both diplomatically and militarily.

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 and contemporary and later interpretations:

(a) 1917–1941

In the immediate aftermath of the October Revolution the deep hostility to the Soviet Union was reflected in the intervention in the Civil War on behalf of the Whites. Despite the limited nature of the intervention, the intent was clear. Churchill's wish to see the Soviet Union "strangled in the crib" reflected the general hostility to the nascent state. At this point Europe's capitalist

AVAILABLE MARKS

states appeared to be of one mind. No doubt candidates will point out that there is some variation in action or motivation. Whether it was the fact that the Soviet Union had cancelled Tsarist debts that particularly antagonised the French, or Lenin seeking to use Poland as "a red bridge into Europe" to export the revolution or the role of the Comintern in promoting revolution in Germany or Hungary, many of Europe's nations were motivated by more than just class hatred.

However, many European powers were to replace their outrage with a return to more traditional diplomatic methods that would lead to a series of treaties between former foes. It would appear that treaties such as the Anglo-Soviet Trade Agreement and the Treaty of Rapallo of 1922 with Germany demonstrated that hostility was temporary and national interest permanent. Certainly, relations with Germany reflected the fact that both states were effectively "pariah nations" and, as such, mutual benefit trumped hostility.

In this regard, different strategies were adopted by different opponents of the Soviet Union as needs dictated and candidates would do well to draw this point out with appropriate examples.

The rise of fascism in Italy, Germany and Spain was to lead to a range of complex treaties as fascist states pursued belligerent aims, not just towards the USSR but other non-communist states. The complicated forces of ideology and pragmatism were to lead to a series of conflicting diplomatic treaties and military actions, in what was to be a most tumultuous period in Europe's "short twentieth century."

The democratic states appeared keen to cultivate diplomatic ties to provide a bulwark against fascism and as such the Soviet Union was re-integrated into the world, or at least the European Community, most notably with regard to the League of Nations in 1934, an organisation Lenin had previously described as "a den of robbers." This would suggest that the hostility had lessened and was replaced by a wary pragmatism.

On the other hand, fascist countries – particularly Nazi Germany – made explicit their outright hostility to the Soviet Union, most notably through diplomatic pacts such as the Anti-Comintern Pact. In the case of fascism, there was undoubtedly a deep ideological hatred of the Soviet Union, as reflected in Hitler's writings in *Mein Kampf*. Candidates could note the various motivations of fascist powers; whilst Hitler was motivated by an anti-semitism connected to Marx, this was not so evident with Mussolini. This would allow for a more sophisticated differentiation of motivation amongst the opponents of the Soviet Union.

Equally, the willingness of the democratic powers to entertain the possibility of some form of alliance with the Soviet Union suggests that hostility was not as significant as it had been in the early days of its existence. However, France and Britain were not exactly motivated to stand up for democracy at any price, most notably when the coalition of Italian and German fascist forces overthrew the republican government in Spain. Here we can see outright fascist hostility to communism. As Collier commented: "Italy became heavily involved in the Spanish Civil War because it could not permit a communist government in the Mediterranean."

AVAILABLE MARKS

The dealings of democratic countries with the Nazis in Munich led to a collapse in their relations with the Soviet Union, which then turned to the Nazis which provided them with the opportunity to launch their assault on Western Europe. Hitler's "ideological somersault" (Ward) speaks for itself but candidates could consider the way in which the motivations of foreign policy are rarely straightforward to comprehend and this is reflected in the historiographical debate focused on the period.

(b) 1941–1945

The Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union is a clear illustration of the culmination of Hitler's attitude towards it. The fact that 80% of Nazi forces were concentrated on the Eastern front lays stark the level of Nazi hostility to the Soviet Union. In contrast, candidates may suggest that the Grand Alliance formed to defeat the forces of fascism reflected the laying aside of old animosities to find common cause. However, candidates may highlight the limitations and tensions that existed in what was termed "a marriage of convenience." The Soviet suspicion that the capitalist powers were withholding the opening of a "second front" to deliberately weaken the communist state reflects the mistrust that was to dominate the post-war years and the war-time conferences and could be indicative of a deep-seated hostility to the Soviet Union that had persisted since its inception.

(c) 1945–1953

The emergence of the Cold War provides an excellent opportunity for candidates to consider how hostile the opponents of communism were towards the USSR in the post-war period. Candidates can utilise the historiographical debate to both illustrate and enhance their exploration of the premise at the heart of the question. The orthodox school argues that it was the inherent aggressiveness of the Soviet Union that produced a defensive reaction from the opponents of the USSR. Key examples include the Marshall Plan and the Berlin airlift, as well the creation of NATO in 1949. Candidates can, of course, challenge this line of argument and adopt the revisionist line that draws attention to the role of the United States and the use of "dollar diplomacy" to pursue interests that were hostile to the Soviet Union. Candidates could also highlight the development of the Truman Doctrine and American involvement in Greece after the Second World War to reinforce this point.

(d) 1953–1964

Candidates could argue that the post-Stalin years were characterised by intermittent efforts at improved diplomatic relations, punctuated by breakdowns in relations, usually due to aggressive Soviet actions. The United States and its allies were strongly committed to promoting and protecting democracy in the non-communist states of Western Europe. This was further reflected in the integration of West Germany into NATO in 1955. Efforts were made to improve relations in the Geneva Summit of 1955, Khrushchev's visit to the United States in 1959 and subsequent summits in Paris (1960) and Vienna (1961).

However, with the Soviet invasion of Hungary in 1956 and the building of the Berlin Wall in 1961 relations were to illustrate the inherent instability and tension that existed. Candidates may wish to draw out the fact that at no point were the opponents of the Soviet Union prepared to engage in military action to roll back communism if it would lead to the possibility of a

direct confrontation between the superpowers. Kennedy may have displayed his ideological commitment to democracy when he declared in June 1963: "Today, in the world of freedom, the proudest boast is 'Ich bin ein Berliner'", but this was clearly limited to the rhetorical rather than the physical and, as such, although relations were less than cordial, it might be overstating it to say that they were hostile.

Indeed, the legacy of the Cuban missile crisis was to highlight this point with the establishment of the "hotline" between the White House and the Kremlin in August 1963 and the subsequent Nuclear Test Ban Treaty in October of the same year. In this regard it is reasonable to point out that the opponents of communism, while remaining hostile, were completely different to those of previous eras.

(e) 1964–1979

The years in which Brezhnev was at the helm of the Soviet Union coincided with the period known as détente. On the face of it a thawing in relations would reflect the willingness of both superpowers to reduce geopolitical tension through summits and diplomatic overtures such as SALT I and the Helsinki Final Act of 1975. It could be argued that détente was primarily motivated not by ideology but by finance. The crippling costs of the arms race and the dangers of imperial overstretch as the US embarked on costly wars in south east Asia led to a willingness to see improved relations. In this context Todd has suggested: "Détente appealed to the USA as they felt it might help to resolve problems elsewhere – such as Vietnam." However, candidates would be right to argue that statesmen like Nixon and Kissinger remained implacably hostile to communism.

(f) 1979–1991

A much more hostile and belligerent approach came to the fore with the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan and the election of Ronald Reagan in 1980. Reagan's predecessor, Jimmy Carter, was to declare the invasion of Afghanistan "the greatest threat to world peace since World War Two", while Reagan was to claim that the Soviet Union was the "evil Empire". This renewed hostility, in what Halliday was to term the "Second Cold War", was reflected in increased military adventurism beyond European shores but also in the form of the stationing of new ranges of missiles (Pershing and Cruise) across Western Europe. Equally, there was a strong ideological drive to assert the supremacy of free market economics and its symbiotic relationship with both democracy and individual liberty.

The best answers will focus closely on the wording of the question, and discuss the entire period.

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

Option 5

AVAILABLE MARKS
50
50