



**ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education
2017**

History

Assessment Unit A2 2

[AH221]

FRIDAY 16 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 questions 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.

Option 1: England 1570–1603

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Answer question 1 and either question 2(a) or 2(b).

- 1 (a) **Consult all the sources and your knowledge of this period.** Which of the sources would an historian value most as evidence in a study of Elizabeth I's attitude towards the Dutch Revolt?

This question targets AO2(a): the candidate's ability, as part of an historical enquiry, to analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers will paraphrase the content of each source and make assertions that are not fully supported.

Level 2 ([4]–[7])

Answers will comment on the utility of the sources, using the content more fully. Source 1 is valuable because it is from Sir Francis Walsingham, who was Elizabeth I's Principal Secretary. In it he suggests that the King of France may support Elizabeth and her policy towards the Netherlands if she marries the French Prince. He believes that, even though the Prince is Catholic, he will still support Elizabeth. Source 2 is valuable as it is evidence from one of Elizabeth I's ministers, Sir Walter Mildmay. In it he expresses his concern regarding Spanish influence in the Netherlands. He fears that this will cause trouble for England and could possibly lead to war. He fears that, if something is not done, Spain could stir up trouble in England and gain support from the Pope, Jesuits at home and abroad and Mary, Queen of Scots. Source 3 is valuable as it is a later interpretation and has the value of hindsight. It suggests that Elizabeth I wished to follow a peaceful policy regarding the Dutch Revolt but that by 1585 events dictated that she alter her policy. The assassination of William of Orange and the loss of French intervention weakened the cause of the Dutch rebels.

Level 3 ([8]–[11])

Answers will present a more sustained assessment of each source in relation to its value, and reach a credible conclusion. Source 1 is private correspondence between Walsingham and Elizabeth I in 1581. Although it does not directly discuss Elizabeth I's attitude towards the Dutch Revolt, it suggests that, if Elizabeth I marries a French suitor, they will unite in their policy towards the Netherlands. It suggests that, if this marriage does not go ahead, France will not support Elizabeth I's actions in the Netherlands. Source 2 is of value as it is evidence taken at a Privy Council meeting discussing the Netherlands. Mildmay was a loyal follower of Elizabeth but here he is urging her to take action against Spain in the Netherlands. He expresses concern about Spain and its dominance in the Netherlands. He is concerned about the religion and privileges of the Netherlands, as well as the consequences for England. He is concerned for English trade and the possibility of Spain stirring up rebellion in England. Source 3 is valuable as Elton provides an objective view of relations between the Netherlands and England and the reasons why Elizabeth I altered her attitude towards the Dutch Revolt. He suggests that, although Elizabeth I always wanted to follow a peaceful policy and not become involved in the Dutch Revolt, circumstances dictated differently. With the assassination of William of

Orange and the formation of the Catholic League, Elizabeth I was forced to take direct action.

Level 4 ([12]–[15])

Answers will use a wide range of criteria to assess utility, commenting on the significance of the information provided, authorship, motive, viewpoint, audience and date. Contextual knowledge will be introduced to enhance the answer. Source 1 is of value because it implies that in 1581 Elizabeth I was keen to use an alliance with France to help to improve the situation in the Netherlands. It suggests that a marriage between England and France would unite the two countries and help to improve relations with the Netherlands. By 1581 Elizabeth I is reluctant to become directly involved in the Dutch Revolt. She has been offering unofficial help to the Protestant rebels to protect relations with the Netherlands and allowing members of her Court to support them. Ministers have been pressing her to officially help the Protestant rebels but Elizabeth I does not want to interfere in another monarch's affairs. By 1581 she is keen to use France as a buffer in the Netherlands against Spanish domination. She is willing to discuss the prospect of marriage to the French Prince to secure this. Walsingham is keen for a French marriage to improve relations with the Netherlands and also secure the English throne. He believes that, if France becomes involved in the Netherlands, war with Spain could be averted. Source 2 is of value as it is evidence from one of Elizabeth I's ministers regarding the Dutch Revolt. By 1584 her Council and Parliament wanted direct action but Elizabeth remained reluctant. Protestant rebels in the Netherlands had been seeking help from Elizabeth as they viewed her as their "Protestant champion". This meeting was called specifically to discuss relations with the Netherlands and policy towards it. Her council fears that war with Spain is inevitable if she does not take action to help the Dutch rebels. The source implies that a positive relationship with the Netherlands is essential for trade. Mildmay and her Privy Council believe that, if Elizabeth I intervened in the Netherlands in 1584, it would prevent a war with Spain, which could have dangerous implications. Elizabeth eventually officially helped the rebels in 1585 with the Treaty of Nonsuch. Source 3 is of value as it suggests that the relationship between England and the Netherlands was greatly affected by the circumstances of 1584. With the assassination of a fellow Protestant monarch, William of Orange, and the increase of Spanish domination in the Netherlands, Elizabeth I was forced to take action. In 1585 her partnership with France had ended and a Catholic alliance between France and Spain was created. Elizabeth I, and the Netherlands, were in grave danger. The Netherlands was being dominated by Spain and its privileges and religion attacked. Elizabeth was the only powerful monarch who could help the Netherlands and she needed to help the Protestant rebels not only for their security but England's as well. At this level candidates would be expected to nominate a particular source as the most valuable. [15]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

- (b) **Use all the sources and other evidence you have studied.** How far do the sources support the view that religion was the main reason for Elizabeth I's support for the rebels in the Dutch Revolt?

AVAILABLE MARKS

This question targets AO2(a) and AO1(b): the candidate's ability, as part of an historical enquiry, to analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination **AO2(a)** and the candidate's ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[3]) AO2(a), ([0]–[3]) AO1(b)

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement **AO1(b)**. For example, the answer may give a general description of why Elizabeth I supported the rebels in the Dutch Revolt. Answers may rely on paraphrasing the sources or provide a narrative of the subject with little reference to the sources **AO2(a)**.

Level 2 ([4]–[5]) AO2(a), ([4]–[5]) AO1(b)

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement **AO1(b)**. For example, Source 1 suggests that Elizabeth I did not support the rebels but used France to help them. Source 2 suggests that she was reluctant to support them. Source 3 implies that she was forced to support the Dutch rebels due to external factors **AO2(a)**.

Level 3 ([6]–[7]) AO2(a), ([6]–[7]) AO1(b)

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgement are developed and substantiated **AO1(b)**. For example, the sources illustrate that Elizabeth I was reluctant to help the rebels but was eventually persuaded to do so. Source 1 suggests that she supported the rebels for fear of a Spanish war. It implies that religion was not that significant as she was willing to marry the Catholic French Prince. Anjou was a practising Catholic but was sympathetic towards the Protestant religion. Both countries were more concerned with Spanish domination than religion. Source 2 suggests that Elizabeth I wished to protect the religion and ancient privileges of the Dutch. They were a Protestant nation which had enjoyed freedom under Charles V. Philip II wished to dominate them and return the area back to Catholicism. In 1581 Elizabeth I was viewed as the "Protestant champion" and the rebels looked to her for support. She had been offering them unofficial help but was reluctant to take up the Protestant cause against Spain. Source 3 suggests that to save Protestantism Elizabeth I must support the Dutch rebels. By 1585 a Catholic League had formed which aimed to stamp out all Protestantism **AO2(a)**.

Level 4 ([8]–[10]) AO2(a), ([8]–[10]) AO1(b)

Answers at this level will consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are very well developed and substantiated **AO1(b)**. For example, the sources illustrate that religion was a factor which contributed to English involvement in the Dutch Revolt but was not the only factor.

Source 1 suggests that religion was not significant as Elizabeth I was prepared to marry a Catholic to prevent Spanish dominance of the Netherlands. Both England and France were concerned with Spanish dominance of this region. Source 2 is an appeal from one of Elizabeth I's ministers. He cites religion and other reasons for supporting the Dutch rebels. This source mentions shipping and trade. Elizabeth, above all else, was concerned with the security and the economy of England. In 1584 England relied heavily on trade with the Netherlands and many people were concerned that, if Elizabeth I did not support the rebels, it would affect trade. They were also concerned that, if she did not take direct action now, the situation could escalate into a war with Spain. Spain had been inciting rebellion in England, especially in regard to Mary, Queen of Scots. Many believed that, if Elizabeth I did not intervene in 1584, it would affect the security of the kingdom. Spain would grow stronger and, being in such close proximity to England, might attract support in England from Catholics and followers of Mary, Queen of Scots. The source suggests that religious reasons were important; Catholics in England could support Spain, but that was not the only reason. Source 3 suggests that religious circumstances forced Elizabeth I to support the rebels in the Dutch Revolt. The assassination of a fellow Protestant ruler, the domination of the Catholic League in France and the alliance of France and Spain forced Elizabeth I to take action **AO2(a)**. [20]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

35

- 2 (a) To what extent would you agree that Mary, Queen of Scots posed a significant threat to Elizabeth I during the period 1570–1603? Use relevant evidence you have studied including contemporary and later interpretations to support your answer.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

This question targets AO1(b) and AO2(b): the candidate's ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)** and the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways **AO2(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[5]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([0]–[3]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. Answers at this level may be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. For example, the answer may provide a narrative account of Mary, Queen of Scots and her time in England. There will be little or no awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([6]–[10]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([4]–[7]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level will select and deploy historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. The answer will have some supporting evidence. For example, it may look at the relationship between Mary, Queen of Scots and Elizabeth I. She was a threat to Elizabeth I as she was involved in various rebellions which sought to replace Elizabeth I with Mary, Queen of Scots. Eventually this led to the execution of Mary. The response will not address the significance of this threat. There will be some awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development. For example, contemporary interpretations believed that Mary posed a significant threat to Elizabeth I. Traditional historical interpretation agrees with this. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to illegibility, inaccurate spelling, punctuation or grammar; at times, the style of writing will be inappropriate. There may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([11]–[15]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([8]–[11]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. Answers may focus on a range of reasons as to why Mary was a threat to Elizabeth I. Once she arrived in England, she became a threat. She was implicated in four rebellions and many of the gentry supported these rebellions. As a Catholic she could prove popular with Elizabeth I's Catholic population and they would regard her as an alternative heir. Fellow Catholics in Europe could support Mary in her claim to the throne, which, unlike Elizabeth I, was legitimate. Answers may address the fact that this was a political and religious threat which could involve the great powers of Europe. If Mary, Queen of Scots had not been a threat, she would not have been executed. There will be a satisfactory

analysis and evaluation of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject **or** a partial evaluation of both. Contemporary interpretations could include, for example, the petition from Parliament to execute Mary, as well as the demands of Elizabeth I's Privy Council and the opinion of some of the Catholic gentry who supported Mary. Historians' interpretations could include, for example, the traditional school of thought that Mary was a significant threat to Elizabeth I. 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 with some specialist vocabulary.

Level 4 ([16]–[20]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([12]–[15]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis are very well developed and substantiated. Answers will attempt in a more definite and sustained way an assessment of the significance of the threat posed by Mary, Queen of Scots. They will assess if she was a threat, and if so, how significant this was. The response may make reference to Mary's claim to the throne and how this would be a reason for some in England to support her. This would be true of the Catholic population and Elizabeth's enemies in Europe, such as Philip of Spain, the King of France and the Pope. However, there was little support for Mary's claim. The majority of Catholics in England were happy with Elizabeth. There were a variety of plots implicating Mary but the Elizabethan government was aware of these and always one step ahead. Some gentry were involved in these plots for political rather than religious reasons. The Privy Council and Parliament were concerned with the threat Mary posed but Elizabeth I remained reluctant to execute her, which is why this did not happen until 1587. It could be argued that, if she was such a threat, she should have been executed earlier. Once she was executed, she did not become a martyr and the threat was extinguished. Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary and later interpretations of this subject. Contemporary interpretations could include, for example, the opinion of Philip of Spain, Elizabeth I, the Privy Council and Parliament. Historians' interpretations could include, for example, traditional opinion that Mary, Queen of Scots represented a threat, while revisionists believe that, although she was a threat, this was minimal. 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 use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. [35]

- (b) "Elizabeth I and her governments were unsuccessful in dealing with the economic and social problems England experienced in the period 1570–1603." How far would you accept this verdict? Use relevant evidence you have studied including contemporary and later interpretations to support your answer.

This question targets AO1(b) and AO2(b): the candidate's ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)** and the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways **AO2(b)**.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Level 1 ([0]–[5]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([0]–[3]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. Answers at this level may be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. For example, they will give a superficial account of the economic and social problems Elizabeth I faced and there will be little reference to evaluating how she dealt with them. There will be little or no awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject. Answers at this level may be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. Meaning may not always be clear because of inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([6]–[10]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([4]–[7]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level will select and deploy historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. The answer will have some supporting evidence. It will deal with either the degree of success in solving England's social or economic problems or give a limited account of both of these aspects. It may mention the legacy left by Mary I and outline the problems Elizabeth I inherited. These may include a weak financial system, inefficient administration and limited resources. There had been an over-reliance on the Netherlands and industry lacked investment. The answer may also make reference to the social problems left by Henry VIII, such as the new problem of vagrancy and loss of charity with the dissolution of the monasteries. It may look at Elizabeth I's attempts to address these problems, concluding perhaps that her governments lacked creativity and relied on the policy used by previous monarchs. There will be some awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development. For example, contemporary opinion failed to recognise the success of Elizabethan social and economic policy. Later interpretations recognise the strengths of her policy and also the restrictions placed on her. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to illegibility, inaccurate spelling and punctuation or, at times, the style of writing will be inappropriate. There may be occasional flaws, with defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([11]–[15]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([8]–[11]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. Answers may focus on a narrow range of issues, providing a more detailed yet incomplete account of the degree of success of Elizabeth I's economic and social policy. Answers may address the legacy Elizabeth I inherited, as well as the social and economic problems she faced during her reign. She inherited a tired economy which had no long-term planning. It was based on agriculture and, when there were poor harvests, the economy was greatly affected. Continual debasement of the coinage had led to a lack of confidence in the economy. Enclosures had had a negative effect on the economy and during previous reigns it had led to social discontent. Elizabeth I and her governments did attempt to improve the economy but often their hands were tied by sixteenth century traditions and expectations. Some improvements were made to agriculture.

Up and down husbandry, mixed arable and pasture together removed the need for fallow fields and placed less pressure on the land. New fertilisers and the drainage of fens and marshes helped agriculture. Some farms switched to market gardening and introduced new breeds of livestock. During her reign Elizabeth I exploited New World discoveries and attempted to search for new trade markets which would benefit the economy. Crown revenue did increase, though not as much as inflation. With a growing population, many of Elizabeth's policies had little effect. She remained dependent on parliamentary subsidies and forced loans. The expense of war affected the economy. There had been significant social changes and with a growing population Elizabeth I and her governments had to address this. She attempted to do so and displayed some innovation. Under the new Poor Law, relief became the responsibility of local government. Elizabeth I's government introduced legislation in an attempt to stabilise society and, although problems remained, it must be noted that no social rebellion occurred during Elizabeth I's reign. There will be a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject or a partial evaluation of **both**. Contemporary interpretations could include, for example, the opinion of Elizabeth and her Privy Council. Historians' interpretations could include, for example, the revisionist view that much was achieved in difficult circumstances. 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 with some specialist vocabulary.

Level 4 ([16]–[20]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([12]–[15]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis are very well developed and substantiated. Answers will attempt in a more definite and sustained way an assessment of how successfully Elizabeth I dealt with the economic and social problems of her reign. Faced with a rising population of four million, Elizabeth I did all she could to improve England. However, the population increase put pressure on agriculture and landlords were hesitant to make improvements. More people migrated to the towns, which also faced pressure. The emerging middle class was keen to invest in and advance commerce. Improvements were made to the economy, with the regulation of wages and employment. New industries began to emerge and the development of new trade routes was to prove beneficial to England. New companies were set up in the New World. With the age of discovery and the pirates on the sea, England was beginning its journey to becoming an Empire. There were greater opportunities for individuals and companies. However, most of the gains from these were not evident during Elizabeth I's reign. The "labouring poor" drifted in and out of employment. Crime was on the increase. Elizabeth I tried to address this with the Poor Law but this merely transferred responsibility away from the central government onto local government. Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of this subject. Contemporary interpretations could include, for example, references to ordinary people and how little actually changed for them. Conditions and life remained harsh. Historians' interpretations could include, for example, the traditional view that Elizabeth I remains the great Queen in all aspects of her reign and her economic policy reflects this. Traditional opinion offers the opinion that her Poor Law was successful. Revisionists argue that benefits were not present until much later. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised

AVAILABLE
MARKS

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 use of specialist vocabulary.

[35]

Option 1

AVAILABLE MARKS
35
70

Option 2: Ireland 1607–1691

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Answer question 1 and either question 2(a) or 2(b).

- 1 (a) **Consult all the sources and your knowledge of this period.** Which of the sources would an historian value most as evidence in a study of the Battle of Aughrim?

This question targets AO2(a): the candidate's ability, as part of an historical enquiry, to analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers will paraphrase the content of each source and make assertions that are not fully supported.

Level 2 ([4]–[7])

Answers will comment on the utility of the sources, using the content more fully. Sources 1 and 2 are valuable because they are eyewitness accounts of the Battle of Aughrim. Source 3 is also of value because it is written by an historian from an objective perspective.

Level 3 ([8]–[11])

Answers will present a more sustained assessment of each source in relation to its value, and reach a credible conclusion. Answers at this level will note that all three sources provide an insight into the Battle of Aughrim from differing perspectives. In Source 1 we have an eyewitness description of an advance by Williamite regiments and the resistance put up by Jacobite forces. In contrast, Captain Robert Parker in Source 2 focuses on the impact on the battle of the death of the French Jacobite commander St Ruth. J. C. Beckett, in Source 3, puts the battle in the wider perspective of the war since the defeat of James II at the Boyne, observing that the steady progress of the Williamites seemed to be putting increased strain on the Jacobite high command.

Level 4 ([12]–[15])

Answers will use a wide range of criteria to assess utility, commenting on the significance of the information provided, authorship, motive, viewpoint, audience and date. Contextual knowledge will be introduced to enhance the answer. Answers may note that a significant strength of Sources 1 and 2 is that they are both eyewitness accounts of the battle. Source 1 is by George Story, a chaplain in the Williamite army, who observes the dogged resistance the Jacobites are putting up to a Williamite attack. Captain Robert Parker, a serving officer in the Williamite army, in Source 2 presents an assessment of how the death of St Ruth seemed to be critical to the outcome of the battle. Contextual knowledge might be used to point out that the confrontation at Aughrim on 12 July 1691 was indeed, as the Duke of Wellington was reputed to have said of the Battle of Waterloo, "a damn close run thing". Both armies were about 20 000 men strong. The turning point in the battle itself was the death of St Ruth, decapitated by a cannon ball. At this point, the Jacobite position collapsed very quickly. Their horsemen, demoralised by the death of their commander, fled the battlefield, leaving the left flank open for the Williamites to funnel more troops into and envelop the Jacobite line. The

Jacobites on the right, seeing the situation was hopeless, also began to melt away, although Sarsfield did try to organise a rearguard action. This left the Jacobite infantry on Kilcommadan Hill completely exposed and surrounded. They were slaughtered by the Williamite cavalry as they tried to get away, many of them having thrown away their weapons in order to run faster. At this level, candidates would be expected to nominate a particular source as the most valuable, and there is much scope for candidates to make a strong case for any one of the sources. Source 1 provides evidence of the evenness of the contest and notes the discipline of the Jacobites when facing an offensive move by four Williamite regiments, remarking that they “did not retreat far”. This assessment can be cross-referenced with Source 2, which suggests that had St Ruth survived, the result of the battle might have been different. Source 3, by J. C. Beckett, in contrast, argues that since the Boyne, the Jacobites had been fighting – and losing – a rearguard action and that “defeat could hardly have been avoided”. Beckett’s assessment, therefore, reduces the significance of the battle, and arguably provides a more nuanced and objective analysis than either of the other sources. However, candidates may well observe that all the sources are limited in failing to provide a detailed account of the overall battle. [15]

- (b) **Use all the sources and other evidence you have studied.** How far do the sources support the view that the outcome of the Battle of Aughrim was a foregone conclusion?

This question targets AO2(a) and AO1(b): the candidate’s ability, as part of an historical enquiry, to analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination **AO2(a)** and the candidate’s ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[3]) AO2(a), ([0]–[3]) AO1(b)

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement **AO1(b)**. For example, there may be a general reference to Aughrim being the bloodiest battle of the Williamite Wars. Answers may rely on paraphrasing the sources or provide a narrative of the subject with little reference to the sources **AO2(a)**.

Level 2 ([4]–[5]) AO2(a), ([4]–[5]) AO1(b)

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement relating to the outcome of the Battle of Aughrim being a foregone conclusion **AO1(b)**. Sources 1 and 2 can be seen as challenging the proposition, as the Jacobites appear well organised and highly disciplined – until they lost their French commander. Source 3 puts more emphasis on the events preceding the battle, suggesting that a Williamite victory was already more or less assured **AO2(a)**.

Level 3 ([6]–[7]) AO2(a), ([6]–[7]) AO1(b)

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgement are developed and substantiated **AO1(b)**. For example, it could be argued

that this engagement at Aughrim was both the costliest in terms of the loss of life (an estimated 7000 dead) and that it secured a final victory for the Williamites in Ireland. The Jacobite position in the summer of 1691 was a defensive one, having retreated behind the River Shannon, from where they hoped to receive military aid from Louis XIV of France via the port towns and eventually be in a position to re-take the rest of Ireland. Ginkel, the Williamites' Dutch general, had breached this line of defence by crossing the Shannon at Athlone. The Marquis de St Ruth, the French Jacobite general, moved too slowly to save Athlone. Ginkel marched through Ballinasloe, on the main road towards Limerick and Galway, before he found his way blocked by St Ruth's army. Answers will address the sources, noting that, despite the divisions in the Jacobite command which J. C. Beckett emphasises (Source 3), their performance in the battle itself was disciplined and their manoeuvres were conducted effectively, as recounted by the Reverend George Story (Source 1). Using Source 2 as evidence, some candidates might argue that the stiff resistance put up by the Jacobites at the Battle of Aughrim was due to the inspirational leadership of the Marquis of St Ruth, whose death, in the view of Captain Robert Parker, was the decisive moment in a battle whose outcome up to that point could not have been predicted with any degree of confidence. This source in particular, but backed up implicitly by Source 1, clearly challenges the idea that the Jacobite defeat at Aughrim was a foregone conclusion **AO2(a)**.

Level 4 ([8]–[10]) AO2(a), ([8]–[10]) AO1(b)

Answers at this level will consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are very well developed and substantiated in relation to the proposition that the outcome of the Battle of Aughrim was a foregone conclusion **AO1(b)**. For example, candidates might argue that Aughrim was in fact a battle that need never have been fought. That it happened was due to the Frenchman Charles Chalmont, Marquis of St Ruth, who assumed the post of Marshal-General of Ireland in May 1691. While it could be argued that since William's victory at the Boyne, the Jacobites had been in terminal decline, or at least retreat, a counterargument would place emphasis on the fact that the campaign of 1690 had failed to end the war. St Ruth's command was confined behind the Shannon to Connacht, and the Williamites were now commanded by another Dutchman, Godard de Ginkel. Although it is tempting to view the course of the war between July 1690 and July 1691 as a simple narrative of impending Williamite victory, candidates might well conclude that victory did not necessarily have to come at Aughrim. The picture is in fact a complicated one. Jacobite morale remained high, especially after Patrick Sarsfield's raid on the Williamite artillery train at Ballyneety. Sarsfield continued to inspire the Irish throughout the winter of 1690–1691 and ensured that the Williamites would not cross the Shannon. Pivotal to the Shannon defence was Athlone town, which had withstood siege in 1690. With strengthened defences it could do so again in 1691 but, thanks to elementary blunders by St Ruth, Athlone fell after ten days. St Ruth, suffering the agonies of a humiliated commander, considered taking Ginkel on in a decisive pitched battle. His generals were unhappy about this prospect, especially as Tyrconnell, King James's viceroy, had ordered a return to Limerick where, with strengthened defences, the Irish could hold out as in 1690, forcing the Williamites into another campaigning year in 1692. Although some generals supported St Ruth, the majority disagreed.

The Frenchman revised his strategy. He ignored warnings that giving battle in the field would be to throw away all of Ireland. Reconnoitring the area about the army's camp, St Ruth selected his ideal ground for a battle, a hill five miles away called Kilcommadan below which lay the village of Aughrim. Ginkel was uncertain about Irish intentions. The Dutchman also needed to replenish his powder and ammunition before advancing and had to protect his supply routes against interdiction by Sarsfield's cavalry. So he consolidated at Athlone and covered his lines of communication. St Ruth bolstered his army's morale, creating a personality cult around himself with bloodthirsty promises of what the army would do to its foes, and used Catholic clergy to create a crusading zeal. At daybreak on Sunday 12 July, Ginkel's army crossed the River Suck. It was misty and the Williamites moved cautiously until within sight of their foes. St Ruth indeed made good use of the terrain to overcome his soldiers' lack of experience of open manoeuvre. Although not adept at staying in line of battle, or forming a square to resist cavalry, they would fight hard from the cover of natural defences. And it would be very difficult for cavalry to approach them: horsemen would move only across the causeway through the village, or by a ford on the far side of Kilcommadan; St Ruth had cavalry covering both approaches, with infantry on the hill between. Once the Williamite attack had been repulsed, St Ruth planned to launch his cavalry across the causeway to hit the foe in the flank; in the ensuing confusion the Irish army would advance, rolling up its enemy. But it would be as difficult for the Irish to counter-attack effectively as it would be for the Williamites to break the Irish line and St Ruth could never hope to destroy Ginkel's army; arguably, he could only delay its advance. Answers will interpret and evaluate the sources fully in relation to their historical context. Source 3 is the source that is most supportive of the proposition, emphasising the divisions between St Ruth, Tyrconnell and Sarsfield and suggesting that this was a fatal flaw in the Jacobite cause. In contrast, Source 1 describes the good order of the Irish troops, which can be linked to St Ruth's leadership and the focus on this particular aspect of the battle in Source 2. Here, Captain Robert Parker, while arguing that St Ruth's death was pivotal to the outcome of the battle, acknowledges that the French general was not without flaws, as seen in the loss of Athlone. Candidates might well argue that Aughrim was therefore a desperate attempt by St Ruth to get revenge and restore his military reputation. A possible verdict on this subject might be that, as Beckett suggests in Source 3, ultimate Jacobite defeat in the war could not be averted – but it does not necessarily follow that the Battle of Aughrim would signal the end **AO2(a)**. [20]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

35

- 2 (a) “The Plantation of Ulster was mainly concerned with British security in Ireland and England.” How far do you agree with this assessment of the Plantation of Ulster in the period up to 1636? Use relevant evidence you have studied including contemporary and later interpretations to support your answer.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

This question targets AO1(b) and AO2(b): the candidate’s ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)** and the candidate’s ability to analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways **AO2(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[5]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([0]–[3]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. Answers at this level may be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. For example, there may be a general reference to the building of castles and bawns in the Plantation of Ulster. There will be little or no awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([6]–[10]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([4]–[7]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level will select and deploy historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. The answer will have some supporting evidence. For example, it may be noted that Ulster was considered the most problematic area of Ireland and that England had just concluded a long and costly war to reassert control (the Nine Years’ War). There will be some awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development. For example, a view from one of the planters might be deployed, while in terms of later interpretations, Jonathon Bardon’s detailed study of the Ulster Plantation may be used. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to illegibility, inaccurate spelling, punctuation or grammar; at times, the style of writing will be inappropriate. There may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([11]–[15]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([8]–[11]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. Answers may focus on the fact that the British concern with security in the wake of the Nine Years’ War was if anything intensified by the events of 1607–1608. The Flight of the Earls, such as Tyrone and Tyrconnell, to the continent in 1607 suggested not only that another rising was possibly being planned, but that the Gaelic lords may well attempt to regain control of Ulster by returning with foreign allies, most likely the Spanish, who had sent a military expedition to Ireland to support the native Irish as recently as 1601. The rebellion by Sir Cahir O’Doherty in the north-west in 1608, in which he captured and burned the town of Derry, confirmed that the issue of security would arguably be paramount in the planning of the Plantation of Ulster. The emphasis on security – specifically

the fortification of Londonderry and Coleraine – is not only a key feature of the Plantation in the north-west of Ulster, but is indicative of the fact that this was where the British authorities felt an invasion to restore Gaelic control of Ulster (possibly backed by the Spanish) was most likely. Londonderry and Donegal were the only official Plantation counties with a coastline, but the rugged nature of much of the Donegal coast made County Londonderry the most likely target for an attack. Arguably, therefore – and certainly in the opinion of James I's government – the fate of the whole plantation hinged on the fate of the plantation in County Londonderry, marking it out as critical to the success of the whole project. The new county was indeed enlarged at the expense of the neighbouring counties of Tyrone, Donegal and Antrim, and the London companies made their mark not only by the building of the walls of Londonderry but by the establishment within those walls of the first purpose-built Protestant cathedral in Europe, which suggests that there was also a religious motivation behind the Plantation. There will be a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject **or** a partial evaluation of **both**. Contemporary opinion might include the views of James I or key Crown officials such as Lord Deputy Chichester, while later interpretations might be provided by Gillespie or Canny. Candidates will also begin to consider other factors that had a bearing on the Plantation of Ulster. For example, while candidates may acknowledge that British security may have been uppermost in the minds of government planners, they were also alert to the commercial possibilities that were opened up by the defeat of the Irish rebellions and the availability of vast tracts of land, much of it of high agricultural potential. 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 with some specialist vocabulary.

Level 4 ([16]–[20]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([12]–[15]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis are very well developed and substantiated. Answers will attempt in a more definite and sustained way an assessment of whether the Plantation of Ulster was mainly concerned with British security. The Flight of the Earls in 1607 not only gave the Crown the opportunity to seize the abandoned lands of the Gaelic Earls of Tyrone and Tyrconnell, and make them available for British settlement, but also made plantation an imperative in order to fill the power vacuum that now existed in Ulster. Planning for the Plantation got underway shortly after the Flight of the Earls in September 1607. As the Earls of Tyrone and Tyrconnell were expected to seek to return to their lands, bringing foreign military assistance, time was of the essence. The planning and implementation of the Ulster Plantation was carried out as a matter of military urgency. Sir Arthur Chichester, the Lord Deputy of Ireland, only intended a fairly limited scale of Protestant settlement, but Sir Cahir O'Doherty's rebellion in 1608 convinced James I to opt for a much more radical project, supported by Sir John Davies, the Irish Attorney General, and Sir Francis Bacon. In addition to defence considerations, there were also clear economic and commercial motives behind the Crown Plantation, namely to develop the economic infrastructure of Ulster in order to stimulate trade and thereby increase royal revenue, as evidenced by the role of the London companies in the project. Politically, the Ulster Plantation was intended to increase Protestant representation in the Irish Parliament, and establish both the Reformed faith and British culture in Ulster. Arguably,

AVAILABLE
MARKS

these objectives might have pertained in any event, but candidates may consider that the success of the unofficial plantation by James Hamilton and Hugh Montgomery in Antrim and Down did not go unnoticed by the Crown planners nor by James I, a Scot himself of course. Hence the Plantation of Ulster became a much more ambitious project than it might otherwise have been. Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of this subject. Contemporary opinion might include that of Sir John Davies, or of some of the principals involved in the Antrim and Down plantation. A later and perhaps wider perspective could be provided by Robinson, Perceval-Maxwell or Fitzpatrick. While candidates may conclude that the thinking behind the Plantation involved not just security concerns but also economic, commercial, religious and political goals, better answers may consider that the question of security itself involved both making provision to deal with a potential external threat – the return of the Gaelic earls backed by Spain – and an internal threat posed by the remaining native Irish, who in parts of Ulster now organised themselves as the woodkern to wage an undeclared war on isolated British settlements. The requirements of the Plantation scheme for the construction of fortifications and the provision of arms to protect the British colony reflected the fact that security was arguably the most important concern of the Plantation of Ulster. A wider perspective on the subject might suggest that the whole Plantation was designed not just to pacify Ulster but to transform it into a loyal British outpost in Ireland – perhaps the best security of all from a British point of view. 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 use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. [35]

- (b) “James II’s policies in Ireland cost him his throne in England.” How far would you agree with this statement? Use relevant evidence you have studied including contemporary and later interpretations to support your answer.

This question targets AO1(b) and AO2(b): the candidate’s ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)** and the candidate’s ability to analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways **AO2(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[5]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([0]–[3]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. Answers at this level may be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. For example, there may be a general reference to James II’s policy of Catholicisation in Ireland. There will be little or no awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([6]–[10]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([4]–[7]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level will select and deploy historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The

answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. It will have some supporting evidence. For example, there may be an appreciation that Tyrconnell's policy of Catholicising the army alarmed Irish Protestants and led to many of them fleeing to England. There will be some awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development. For example, contemporary interpretation might take the form of an observation by Tyrconnell himself, while in terms of later interpretation, reference might be made to Beckett. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to illegibility, inaccurate spelling, punctuation or grammar; at times, the style of writing will be inappropriate. There may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([11]–[15]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([8]–[11]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. In 1685, James II appointed his long-time associate Richard Talbot as Lieutenant-General in command of the Irish army. Thus began the remodelling of that army as a Catholic force, raising fears among Irish Protestants for their security, and exactly matching James's own actions in relation to the army in England. In 1687, Tyrconnell was made Lord Deputy in succession to Clarendon. He pursued four main objectives as head of the Irish administration: the disarming of the Protestant militia and the restoration of arms to Catholics from whom they had been confiscated (a policy justified by the Monmouth and Argyll rebellions in 1685); the replacement of Protestant officers and soldiers in the army by Catholics; the Catholicisation of the civil administration and municipal corporations; and ultimately a reversal or at least significant modification of the Restoration land settlement. The Catholicisation of the Irish army proceeded apace, so by September 1686, what had once been a totally Protestant force now had a very different complexion: of the 7485 soldiers, 5043 were Catholic (67%), as were 166 out of 414 officers (40%) and 251 out of 765 NCOs (33%). By the end of 1688 the army was almost 100% Catholic, and with Catholics gaining a two-thirds majority in most corporations and dominating the Irish Privy Council, Protestants had also by that point lost control of central and local government. These developments alarmed Irish Protestants, many of whom fled to England as the Catholic grip on power tightened from 1687. In Ulster, in particular, the creation of an Irish Catholic army raised the spectre of the massacres of 1641. There will be a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject **or** a partial evaluation of **both**. In terms of contemporary interpretation, reference might be made to the views of Tyrconnell himself, or others associated with him. A later interpretation might be provided by Kishlansky or Foster. Candidates will also begin to assess the importance of James II's policies in Ireland in comparison to his policies and actions in England as an explanation for his loss of the throne. For example, answers may note that at the same time that Tyrconnell was creating a Catholic army in Ireland, a similar process was underway in England. Arguably, this force, which grew to a strength of 40 000 stationed at Hounslow Heath, was what most English people were concerned about, stoking fears not just of a Catholic restoration but the creation of an absolutist monarchy. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the

AVAILABLE
MARKS

style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Level 4 ([16]–[20]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([12]–[15]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis are very well developed and substantiated. Answers will attempt in a more definite and sustained way an assessment of the extent to which James II's policies in Ireland cost him his throne in England. Candidates might argue that Tyrconnell's programme of ruthless Catholicisation – carried out, of course, in the King's name – in both the civil administration and the army helped to turn English opinion against James II, especially when Irish Protestant refugees began arriving in England after Tyrconnell became Lord Deputy in 1687. Indeed, a case can be made that Tyrconnell intended to go much further as Lord Deputy than James II had ever planned, envisaging a complete break with England. Certainly, Tyrconnell had prepared well for the meeting of the Irish Parliament that eventually assembled in 1689, in terms of his manipulation of borough charters, in that only six of its 250 members were Protestant. A strong argument can be made that it was in fact James II's policies in England that were critical in the loss of the throne to William and Mary. For example, it could be argued that James's deteriorating relationship with the Church of England was central to the failure of his policies in England, and indeed, his ultimate loss of the throne. The policy of Catholicisation that James II began to pursue before the end of 1685 – appointing Catholics to senior positions in both the army and civil administration – was an implicit if not explicit assault on the Church of England's privileged position in relation to positions of service to the state. This was exemplified by the rise of the Catholic Earl of Sunderland at court, appointed as Lord President of the Council and Secretary of State; and the related decline in influence of the Protestant Earl of Rochester, who was dismissed as Lord Treasurer in January 1687. A more blatant challenge to the Church came in July 1686, when James II created the Commission for Ecclesiastical Causes. One of the first things that the Commission did was to expel the Fellows of Magdalen College, Oxford, for refusing to accept the King's nominee for college president, the Catholic Anthony Farmer. In 1687, the College was turned into a Catholic institution. Militarily, James II had raised fears that he was preparing to introduce absolutist rule by first maintaining a standing army after the Monmouth rebellion of 1685 and then increasing its size in subsequent years. The King's handling of the rebellion itself – in particular the excessive punishment meted out by Judge Jeffreys in what was called the "Bloody Assizes" – had effectively ended James II's "honeymoon period" with his new kingdom just six months after he had succeeded to the throne. Constitutionally, the King was also perceived to have transgressed by his legally dubious application of the suspending and dispensing powers – despite winning the test case of *Godden v Hales* in 1686 – which began to alienate the Tory establishment who now saw signs of a Catholic tyranny in the making. Furthermore, James II's first, and as it turned out, only, Parliament had been prorogued as early as November 1685 and it was formally dissolved in the summer of 1687. James II now began canvassing officials across the country regarding their support for the formal repeal of the Test Acts. The information was used to begin a purge of corporations, aimed at producing a pliable Parliament which would agree to the King's wishes. Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of this subject. For example,

contemporary interpretation might be drawn from a leading representative of the Church of England, such as one of the seven bishops put on trial in 1688, or one of the leading Whig or Tory MPs. Later interpretations might include the views of Harris or Kenyon. Ultimately, James II's fate was sealed when the birth of a male heir in June 1688 encouraged the political establishment to set in motion the Glorious Revolution by their letter of invitation to William of Orange to come to England. Candidates may well conclude that it was not in the end James II's policies in Ireland that cost him his throne, but they certainly did not help. 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 use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. [35]

Option 2

AVAILABLE MARKS
35
70

Option 3: Ireland 1775–1800

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Answer question 1 and either question 2(a) or 2(b).

- 1 (a) **Consult all the sources and your knowledge of this period.** Which of the sources would an historian value most as evidence in a study of the rise of the Volunteers?

This question targets AO2(a): the candidate's ability, as part of an historical enquiry, to analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers will paraphrase the content of each source and make assertions that are not fully supported.

Level 2 ([4]–[7])

Answers will comment on the utility of the sources, using the content more fully. Source 1 is valuable because it is an eyewitness account of Volunteer activity in Strabane. Source 2 is another contemporary source from an Irish MP of the period in question. Source 3 is also of value because it is written by an historian from an objective perspective.

Level 3 ([8]–[11])

Answers will present a more sustained assessment of each source in relation to its value, and reach a credible conclusion. Answers at this level will note that both Sources 1 and 2 are concerned with the raising of local Volunteer companies – in the towns of Strabane and Armagh respectively – and both involve leading members of the local community. In the case of Source 1, this is James Hamilton, the Earl of Abercorn's estate manager; and in the case of Source 2, it is the Earl of Charlemont. Both sources also suggest that the Volunteer movement acquired a momentum of its own and that the raising of companies in one area influenced their establishment in other places. For example, the initiative referred to in Strabane (Source 1) seems to have been influenced by developments in Derry and Donegal. Candidates might argue that Source 3 has a clear advantage over the other sources in terms of its wider focus, but here too it is possible to cross-reference with the first two sources in terms of the social attraction that fed into the rise of the Volunteers. However, Source 3 makes specific reference to other factors that contributed to the rise of the Volunteers, notably the mention of the threat of French invasion.

Level 4 ([12]–[15])

Answers will use a wide range of criteria to assess utility, commenting on the significance of the information provided, authorship, motive, viewpoint, audience and date. Contextual knowledge will be introduced to enhance the answer. Answers may note that a shortcoming of the first two sources is that they are localised in content: Source 1 is focused on Strabane (but with some mention of activities in the neighbouring counties), while Source 2 is focused on Armagh. However, a counterbalancing factor that adds value to the sources is that their respective authors are both well placed to speak informatively on the subject matter. The author of Source 1 is the estate manager for the Earl of Abercorn and clearly held in high esteem by the community as he is asked to take command of the new Volunteer

company. The author of Source 2 is another contemporary, Francis Hardy, the biographer of Lord Charlemont, who is mentioned in the extract. Furthermore, better answers might note that this is of significance, as Lord Charlemont subsequently became Commander-in-Chief of the Volunteers. Hence it would be reasonable to assume that as an associate – as well as biographer – of Charlemont, Hardy would have a well informed view on the rise of the Volunteers. Source 3, by J. C. Beckett, gives a wider perspective on the rise of the Volunteers, noting their growing enthusiasm and the changing focus of their purpose. Indeed, in a remarkably short time, the Volunteers became politicised, and were effectively transformed into the extra-parliamentary wing of the Patriot movement. At this level, however, candidates would be expected to note that the initial rise of the Volunteers had nothing to do with politics, but was a response to the threat of invasion by France, an ally of the American revolutionaries, from 1778 onwards. The first Volunteer company was established in Belfast in March 1778 expressly for the purpose of defence, as the British authorities lacked both the manpower and necessary finance to secure Ireland due to the existing commitment of men and money to the fighting in America. The withdrawal of 4000 soldiers from Ireland to North America left the country vulnerable to foreign attack, with Source 2 noting the need for the Volunteers to defend “their country”, and Source 3 making reference to a “French invasion”. Additionally, the sort of policing duties normally conducted by the army and referred to in Source 1 (“established to prevent any risings or disorder”) required a substitute force to fill the role. All three sources to varying degrees, however, highlight another factor in the rise of the Volunteers: that it was fashionable and brought social status. Better answers might use contextual knowledge to elaborate on the popularity of the great Volunteer reviews, but also note that individuals such as Lord Charlemont (Source 2) already had an elevated position in society and that his involvement with the Volunteers – and that of other Ascendancy figures like him – had more to do with preserving the existing social hierarchy than defending Ireland, an observation made by Beckett in Source 3, noting that the “landlord class generally provided the officers for the Volunteers”. [15]

- (b) **Use all the sources and other evidence you have studied.** How far do the sources support the view that the main reason for the rise of the Volunteers was the desire to acquire social status in the local community?

This question targets AO2(a) and AO1(b): the candidate’s ability, as part of an historical enquiry, to analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination **AO2(a)** and the candidate’s ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[3]) AO2(a), ([0]–[3]) AO1(b)

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement **AO1(b)**. For example, there may be a general reference to the establishment of the Volunteers in 1778. Answers may rely on paraphrasing the sources or provide a narrative of the subject with little reference to the sources **AO2(a)**.

Level 2 ([4]–[5]) AO2(a), ([4]–[5]) AO1(b)

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement in relation to the desire to acquire social status in the local community being the main reason for the rise of the Volunteers **AO1(b)**. For example, both Source 2 and Source 3 make explicit reference to the “fashion” (S2) for volunteering and “the attraction of stylish uniforms and military titles” (S3). However, Source 1 places more emphasis on the preservation of “internal security” **AO2(a)**.

Level 3 ([6]–[7]) AO2(a), ([6]–[7]) AO1(b)

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgement are developed and substantiated **AO1(b)**. For example, it could be argued that the rapid growth of the organisation was very much a sign that volunteering was in fashion and that, once the initiative had been taken to establish a Volunteer company in Belfast, the example was followed quickly by surrounding areas – and so the movement spread, first across Ulster and then in the south of Ireland. It is estimated that, by the summer of 1779, Volunteer numbers stood at 45 000. Some candidates might argue that the acquisition of social status was much less important a reason for the rise of the Volunteers than the threat of French invasion – the ostensible reason for their formation in the first place. The withdrawal of 4000 British troops from Ireland to North America had left the country particularly vulnerable once Spain and France formed an alliance with the Americans in 1778. In addition to defending the island against possible foreign attack, the Volunteers also took on many of the policing activities formerly performed by the army. Answers will address the sources, noting that Source 2 and Source 3 present good evidence to support the proposition, with Source 2 referring to the moral pressure exerted by what might be called respectable society to join the Volunteers: “no gentleman could present himself to the ladies of society if he were not willing to demonstrate his patriotic spirit and manliness by serving in the Volunteers”. Source 3 refers to the appeal of the Volunteers being “widespread and infectious”. Source 1 gives much less emphasis to the social side of volunteering, but even here it is noted that the embryonic Strabane company have “decided on their uniforms” **AO2(a)**.

Level 4 ([8]–[10]) AO2(a), ([8]–[10]) AO1(b)

Answers at this level will consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are very well developed and substantiated in relation to the proposition that the main reason for the rise of the Volunteers was the desire to acquire social status in the local community **AO1(b)**. For example, it might be noted that, although officially formed to defend Ireland against foreign invasion, the great reviews and parades that had been a hallmark of the Volunteers in that first summer of 1778, became much less frequent – as did drilling and military exercises – when the harsher weather of winter set in. This would support the view that the Volunteers were not serious soldiers but enjoyed the standing and social events that came with membership. Better answers will explore other possible explanations for the rise of the Volunteers, for example arguing that the movement was at least partly a response to the depressed economic and commercial conditions in Ireland in this period, also linked to the American War, and this factor

AVAILABLE
MARKS

would ultimately manifest itself in the form of the Free Trade campaign of 1779. There will be an awareness of Molyneux, Swift and the Patriots as advocates of colonial nationalism, and in this sense they provide the rationale for the early politicisation of the Volunteer movement, which some might argue was fundamental to its rise. In this context, the impact of the American Revolution is worthy of analysis, both for the way it fostered the spirit of colonial nationalism in Ireland and the particular relevance it had for much of Presbyterian Ulster, which had sent some 175 000 emigrants to the American colonies over the previous half-century. Answers might note that the Volunteer movement was first established in Ulster and when it very soon turned to politics, it was the politics of radical Ulster Presbyterianism. Answers will interpret and evaluate the sources fully in relation to their historical context. For example, Beckett in Source 3 makes a very telling point that relates both to the proposition and the Volunteer role as a national defence force when he observes that “the fever spread, and before the middle of 1779 a volunteer army had come into existence, ready to resist a French invasion”. Cross-reference might be made here with Source 1, where Hamilton develops the point, noting that the Volunteers in Derry had not taken up commissions as officers with the government as “they might have been called on to serve elsewhere”, for example wherever the French threat was most potent. As Hamilton concludes, the Volunteers were much more interested in having “influence locally”. Just what form that “influence” might take is suggested in Source 3, where Beckett notes that Volunteer corps began to consider “the oppression of Ireland by England”, while Source 2 acknowledges that the organisation had a dual purpose almost from the outset: “the defence of their liberties and their country”. Very soon, the Volunteers would become unambiguously political, as they assumed the role of the extra-parliamentary wing of the Patriot movement in the fight for Free Trade in the autumn of 1779. The best answers may draw another important point from Source 2, aside from the more obvious content that relates to the proposition, such as the desire “to demonstrate patriotic spirit and manliness by serving in the Volunteers”. The point relates to Lord Charlemont taking command of the Armagh Volunteers (and subsequently becoming Commander-in-Chief of the national organisation). The motive on Charlemont’s part was clearly not to acquire social status in the local community – that was something he already had. More astute answers might instead argue that Charlemont – and many other Ascendancy figures like him – joined the Volunteers not to acquire social status but to preserve it, by taking up positions that would allow them to keep radical forces – such as rising middle-class Presbyterians – at bay. Here is another factor in the rise of the Volunteers **AO2(a)**. [20]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

35

- 2 (a) “The ideas of Molyneux and Swift were the most important influence on the Patriots’ campaign for reform between 1775 and 1782.” How far would you accept this verdict? Use relevant evidence you have studied including contemporary and later interpretations to support your answer.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

This question targets AO1(b) and AO2(b): the candidate’s ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)** and the candidate’s ability to analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways **AO2(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[5]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([0]–[3]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. Answers at this level may be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. For example, there may be a general reference to the writings of Swift and Molyneux. There will be little or no awareness of either contemporary or later interpretations of the subject. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([6]–[10]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([4]–[7]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level will select and deploy historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. It will have some supporting evidence. For example, there may be some reference to Jonathan Swift’s *Drapier’s Letters* and their influence on the emerging Patriot party from the mid-eighteenth century onwards. There will be some awareness of either contemporary or later interpretations of the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development. For example, a contemporary opinion might be provided by a Patriot MP such as Henry Grattan, while a later interpretation could be gleaned from J. C. Beckett. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to illegibility, inaccurate spelling, punctuation or grammar; at times, the style of writing will be inappropriate. There may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([11]–[15]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([8]–[11]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. There will be an awareness of Molyneux and Swift as advocates of colonial nationalism, and in this sense they provide the rationale for the Patriots’ campaign for reform in the period 1775–1782. Arguably, the seeds sown by these political philosophers bear fruit in the reforms that the Patriots achieve, in alliance with the Volunteers, such as the repeal of the Declaratory Act and amendment of Poyning’s Law in 1782. However, candidates may balance the influence of the ideas of Molyneux and Swift against other factors that encouraged their campaign for reform, such as the impact of the American War of Independence. For example, reference might be made to the many family ties that existed between Ireland, more particularly Ulster, and the American colonies, and how there was a sense of shared grievance against British rule between Irish Patriots and American rebels. Furthermore, the American War created the

circumstances in which the Patriots had some leverage to win concessions from the British government. This is perhaps best exemplified by the creation of the Volunteers – due to Britain having to withdraw troops stationed in Ireland to fight in America – who applied extra-parliamentary pressure in support of the Patriot campaign for free trade, which was achieved in December 1779. It was also the case that the American plea for “no taxation without representation” resonated with Irish Patriots and may have prompted them to seek further legislative reform. There will be a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject **or** a partial evaluation of **both**. Contemporary opinion might include the views of the Earl of Buckinghamshire, who was the Lord Lieutenant for most of this period, while candidates might draw on the comments of Bartlett or Bardon for later interpretations. Candidates may also begin to consider that overall, the ideas of Molyneux and Swift suited the particular circumstances of the late 1770s and early 1780s. 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 with some specialist vocabulary.

Level 4 ([16]–[20]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([12]–[15]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis are very well developed and substantiated. Answers will attempt in a more definite and sustained way an assessment of whether the ideas of Molyneux and Swift were the most important influence on the Patriots’ campaign for reform during the period 1775–1782. Candidates may refer to the key publications associated with these political philosophers, namely Molyneux’s *The Case of Ireland’s being Bound by Acts of Parliament in England* (1698), which essentially argued the case for legislative independence taken up by the Patriots in the early 1780s; and Swift’s *Drapier’s Letters* (1724–1725), which attacked English control of Ireland’s commerce and economy, foreshadowing the Patriot campaign for Free Trade. Candidates at this level will recognise that there were other factors influencing the Patriots. One of these influences was the Volunteers, who became in effect the Patriots’ extra-parliamentary pressure group. However, the Volunteers soon acquired their own identity and momentum as a political reform group, pushing the Patriots further and faster than they may have wished to go. Reference may be made here to contemporary opinion in the form of the resolutions passed at the various Volunteer conventions in this period, for example, that held at Dungannon in February 1782. Another factor that may be referred to is the economic depression in Ireland at this time – a direct consequence of the severing of trade links with North America due to the war, but a factor with its own points of reference and its own particular impact on Irish politics in this period and Patriot arguments in Parliament. Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of this subject. Later interpretations of the period could include reference to the views of historians such as McDowell and Smyth, the latter for an analysis of the Volunteer movement. A contemporary view might be provided by Henry Flood or the Earl of Charlemont, men who as Patriot MPs and also Volunteers (indeed Charlemont was the Volunteer Commander-in-Chief) had a “foot in both camps” of the reform movement. Candidates should offer a judgement as to what was the main influence on the Patriots’ campaign for reform during the period 1775–1782, but there is likely to be an acceptance that a range of factors was at play. Molyneux and

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Swift may have been the fathers of colonial nationalism – both referred to by name in Henry Grattan’s famous valedictory speech in the Irish House of Commons on the securing of legislative independence in April 1782 – but the impact of American revolutionary thought and action and Volunteer radicalism cannot be discounted. 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 use of appropriate specialist vocabulary.

[35]

- (b) “The Peep o’ Day Boys and the Orange Order were mainly responsible for the unrest in Ireland in the period 1791–1797.” To what extent would you agree with this statement? Use relevant evidence you have studied including contemporary and later interpretations to support your answer.

This question targets AO1(b) and AO2(b): the candidate’s ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)** and the candidate’s ability to analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways **AO2(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[5]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([0]–[3]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. Answers at this level may be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. For example, there may be a general reference to the establishment of the Orange Order in 1795. There will be little or no awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([6]–[10]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([4]–[7]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level will select and deploy historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. The answer will have some supporting evidence. For example, it may be noted that the Peep o’ Day Boys and the Orange Order were involved in sectarian strife in south Ulster, particularly in County Armagh. There will be some awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development. For example, a contemporary interpretation might be provided by a magistrate’s report on the civil disturbances, while a later interpretation could be drawn from Beckett. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to illegibility, inaccurate spelling, punctuation or grammar; at times, the style of writing will be inappropriate. There may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([11]–[15]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([8]–[11]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. Answers may focus on the unrest, concentrated in County Armagh, between the Protestant Peep o’ Day Boys

and the Catholic Defenders that had been ongoing since the mid-1780s. The Defenders had been established by Catholics in response to the failure of the authorities to take action against the Peep o' Day Boys, who launched night-time raids on Catholic homes under the pretence of confiscating arms which Catholics were prohibited from possessing under the terms of the Penal Laws. The most densely populated county in the country, Armagh, was a microcosm of late eighteenth-century Ireland. Each of the three major religious denominations were represented there in roughly equal proportions, with a Catholic majority in the poorer south, an Episcopalian majority in the north, and Presbyterians most numerous across the centre. That finely balanced religious demography itself helps to account for the persistent sectarian tensions. Patterns of settlement, dating back to the seventeenth-century plantation, created 'cultural frontiers', flashpoints of territorial dispute and inter-communal strife. Because of their numbers, Catholics appeared more threatening to their Protestant neighbours than in counties such as Antrim or Down, where they were in a clear minority. While candidates might conclude that the Peep o' Day Boys contributed significantly to social unrest in the period, the Defenders too are culpable – but as to political unrest, that is a much less clear-cut issue. There will be a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject **or** a partial evaluation of **both**. Contemporary opinion might include that of the Lord Lieutenant, while later interpretations could include the views of McBride or Bartlett. Candidates will also begin to weigh up whether the Peep o' Day Boys and the Orange Order were mainly responsible for the social and political unrest in Ireland in the period 1791–1797 against other factors involved, such as the emergence of the United Irishmen and the Fitzwilliam affair of 1795. 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 with some specialist vocabulary.

Level 4 ([16]–[20]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([12]–[15]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis are very well developed and substantiated. Answers will attempt in a more definite and sustained way an assessment of whether the Peep o' Day Boys and the Orange Order were mainly responsible for the unrest in Ireland in the period 1791–1797. In County Armagh an explosive religious geography reacted upon an unstable social structure and local economy. The formation of Orange Lodge No.1 followed a violent clash between armed Protestant bands and Defenders at a cross-road hamlet, named the Diamond, near the village of Loughall. Up to thirty Defenders were killed that 'running Monday', 21 September 1795, while none of the surviving accounts record any fatalities on the Protestant side. The 'Battle of the Diamond' ranks as one of the more bloody encounters in a sequence of disturbances between the Protestant Peep o' Day Boys and Defenders stretching back to the mid-1780s. That endemic unrest may be explained by land hunger. Following the repeal of penal laws restricting Catholic access to landed property in 1778 and 1782, Catholic competition for leases intensified, driving up prices and provoking Protestant resentment. Then in 1793 the Catholic Relief Act enfranchised forty-shilling freeholders in the counties, thus increasing the political value of Catholic tenants to landlords. Many witnesses to these events linked land competition to sectarian rivalry. Answers will also further explore the contribution of the Defenders to social instability in

AVAILABLE
MARKS

this period. Beginning as independent local groups, defensive in nature, the Defenders had merged by 1790 into a widespread secret oath-bound fraternal organisation consisting of lodges, associated to a head-lodge led by a Grand Master and committee. The Society of United Irishmen had identified the Defenders as potential allies and leading members, such as James Hope, had regularly travelled throughout the country, organising cells and distributing propaganda such as the *Northern Star* newspaper. Defender cells were easily transformed into United Irish cells. This combination of the Orange Order, the Defenders and the United Irishmen – the latter, by the mid-1790s, fully committed to violent revolution – was a toxic mix that kept Irish society on edge and made the politics of this period particularly sensitive. A further consideration is the role of the Irish administration and the British Government. Better answers might argue that, far from managing to defuse the situation, the actions of government – whether in the dashed hopes of Catholic Emancipation in the Fitzwilliam fiasco or the programme of repressive legislation intended to neutralise the United Irish threat – served only to make the social and political environment more tense and more volatile. Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of this subject. Tone is an obvious potential source of contemporary comment, as is his biographer Marianne Elliott in terms of later interpretation. Contemporary and later interpretation might be further supplemented by accessing the views of William Drennan and A.T.Q. Stewart respectively. Whatever balance might be struck in response to the proposition, good candidates may note that by 1797, Ireland stood on a precipice. 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 use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. [35]

Option 3

AVAILABLE
MARKS

35

70

Option 4: Partition of Ireland 1900–1925.AVAILABLE
MARKS

Answer question 1 and either question 2(a) or 2(b).

- 1 (a) **Consult all the sources and your own knowledge of this period.** Which of the sources would an historian value most as evidence in a study of the Anglo-Irish Treaty of 1921?

This question targets AO2(a): the candidate's ability, as part of an historical inquiry, to analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers will paraphrase the content of each source and make assertions that are not fully supported.

Level 2 ([4]–[7])

Answers will comment on the utility of the sources, using the content more fully. Source 1 is valuable since it indicates the basis upon which the British Government wished to negotiate a treaty with Sinn Féin. Source 2 concentrates on the response of Sinn Féin to these proposals. Source 3 provides an analysis of the outcome of the negotiations.

Level 3 ([8]–[11])

Answers will present a more sustained assessment of the value of each source and reach a credible conclusion. Answers at this level will examine the authorship and content more closely. Source 1 reflects the views of the British Government, as represented by Lloyd George, the Prime Minister. This makes the authorship indisputably valuable for a study of the Treaty negotiations. The content identifies the key issues for the British in the forthcoming talks: Dominion status, membership of the Commonwealth and Empire, security, commerce and the status of Northern Ireland. In Source 2 the Sinn Féin negotiators respond to the 20 July terms. They perceive Dominion status as restrictive, criticise the economic and security conditions and seek to deal with the position of Northern Ireland by direct negotiations themselves. Source 3 is valuable as the historian provides a wide-ranging retrospective assessment of the outcome of the Treaty negotiations, with reference to many of the issues which dominate Sources 1 and 2.

Level 4 ([12]–[15])

Answers will use a wide range of criteria to assess utility, commenting on the significance of the information provided, authorship, motive, viewpoint, audience and date. Contextual knowledge will be introduced to enhance the answer. Source 1 reflects the issues which dominated the attention of the British Government from the time of the Truce on 11 July until the final letter in the long correspondence with de Valera on 29 September. References to Dominion status ruled out the Sinn Féin demand for a republic. The requirement for defence facilities acknowledged Britain's needs following the U-boat threat in the First World War. The uncompromising tone regarding the "existing powers" of Northern Ireland acknowledges the realities of the Government of Ireland Act of 1920. Source 2 alludes to an attempt by the Sinn Féin delegates to press for a settlement closer to their agenda for a republic and failing that, some sort of compromise along the lines of de

Valera's "external association" plan. The divergence between Source 2 and Source 1 is notable regarding defence, finance and Northern Ireland. Source 3 highlights the key features of the Treaty, acknowledging the main themes indicated in Sources 1 and 2. The issue of Dominion status is dealt with in all three sources, along with defence, finance and Northern Ireland. Kee points to Ireland's new status as a "Free State", suggested by Sinn Féin in Source 2, and introduces the first reference to the Boundary Commission as a device for altering the territorial arrangements of the Government of Ireland Act of 1920. [15]

- (b) Use all the sources and other evidence you have studied.** How far do the sources support the view that the Anglo-Irish Treaty of 1921 was a victory for the British Government and a defeat for Sinn Féin?

This question targets AO2(a) and AO1(b): the candidate's ability, as part of an historical inquiry, to analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination **AO2(a)** and the candidate's ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation and analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[3]) AO2(a), ([0]–[3]) AO1(b)

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form, with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement **AO1(b)**. For example, Source 1 outlines the aspirations of the British Government in the months before the negotiations, with no indication as to its satisfaction with the outcome. Answers may rely on paraphrasing the sources or provide a narrative of the subject with little reference to the sources **AO2(a)**.

Level 2 ([4]–[5]) AO2(a), ([4]–[5]) AO1(b)

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement **AO1(b)**. For example, Source 1 could be used as evidence of the British Government establishing a satisfactory framework for negotiating with Sinn Féin, as the Sinn Féin response in Source 2 indicated that it had to react to the British agenda of 20 July 1921. Source 3 examines how far British expectations in Source 1 were met in the final Treaty **AO2(a)**.

Level 3 ([6]–[7]) AO2(a), ([6]–[7]) AO1(b)

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgement are developed and substantiated **AO1(b)**. For example, answers may confine their response to agreeing with the proposition that the Anglo-Irish Treaty of 1921 was a victory for the British Government and a defeat for Sinn Féin. The conditions outlined on 20 July in Source 1 dominate the focus of Sources 2 and 3. Lloyd George demands that Ireland will have Dominion status, which materialises in Source 3 despite Sinn Féin's reservations in Source 2. British concerns about defence, especially coastal defence, appeared to be assuaged in Source 3, whereby Britain would be allowed to "control certain ports for defence purposes" (Berehaven, Queenstown and Lough Swilly). The "existing powers" of Northern Ireland referred to in Source 1 are underpinned in Source 3. The reference to the Crown in

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Source 1 (“the association of nations over which His Majesty reigns”) is observed by the obligation of swearing allegiance in Source 3. In many ways the Treaty was a personal victory for the political skill of Lloyd George. His offer of Dominion status of 20 July formed the extent and limits of the British negotiating position. In subsequent correspondence with de Valera, Lloyd George warned on six occasions that there would be no compromise on the question of Irish allegiance to the Crown and membership of the Empire. On 13 August the government published all of the correspondence between Lloyd George and de Valera in a tactical move to win British and outside opinion behind them. The ploy worked, as Austen Chamberlain reported to the cabinet that virtually all of the British press endorsed and recognised the offer of 20 July as signalling the limits of British concessions. Lloyd George’s final letter to de Valera, inviting him to negotiate a treaty “to ascertain how the association of Ireland with the community of nations known as the British empire can best be reconciled with Ireland’s national aspirations”, created the impression among British public opinion that, whatever the outcome of the talks, Ireland would remain within the empire and Britain would emerge with certain strategic guarantees. Lloyd George chose a formidable negotiating team and used the device of sub-conferences to capitalise on his “personal touch” with Griffith and Collins and his use of the Boundary Commission plan to limit Sinn Féin’s option of breaking off the talks on the issue of Ulster.

Level 4 ([8]–[10]) AO2(a), ([8]–[10]) AO1(b)

Answers at this level will consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgement are very well developed and substantiated **AO1(b)**. Answers should additionally examine the extent to which the Treaty was not a victory for the British Government. While the votes in favour of the Treaty – 4 to 3 in the Sinn Féin Cabinet and later 64 to 57 in the Dáil – suggest that there was little for republicans to celebrate, defenders of the Treaty pointed to several merits. Griffith argued that the oath of allegiance to the Crown (Source 3), which in fact was the result of modification by the Sinn Féin negotiators, was in the first instance to one’s own country and only afterwards a declaration of faithfulness to the Crown. Collins and Griffith both believed that the Boundary Commission, Article XII of the Treaty (Source 3), would reduce the boundary of Northern Ireland and facilitate Irish unity. Ironically, this argument was submerged in a heated argument over the issues of the oath and Dominion status. Collins refuted arguments that the ideal of a republic had been compromised by claiming that the acceptance of the invitation to negotiate in itself formed a compromise. While Britain did not “renounce all claims to authority over Ireland” as demanded in Source 2, the desire to be “recognised as a Free state” (Source 2) did materialise in the final Treaty (Source 3). Rather than regarding Dominion status (Sources 1 and 3) as incompatible with freedom, Collins declared that the new Irish Free State would be weak and vulnerable in the foreseeable future, and this was the main justification for being a member of the Commonwealth with the status of a Dominion. He said that the Treaty “gave Ireland freedom, not the ultimate freedom that all nations aspire and develop to, but the freedom to achieve it”. Yet Childers drew on his vast naval experience to identify a strategic weakness in the Treaty: the cessation of ports which abdicated Ireland’s right to defend its own coasts **AO2(a)**. [20]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

35

- 2 (a) “A victory for Carson and Bonar Law.” How far would you agree with this assessment of the crisis over the Third Home Rule Bill up to September 1914? Use relevant evidence you have studied including contemporary and later interpretations to support your answer.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

This question targets AO1(b) and AO2(b): the candidate’s ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)** and the candidate’s ability to analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways **AO2(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[5]) AO1 (b) Knowledge, ([0]–[3]) AO2 (b) Interpretations

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. Answers at this level may be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. For example, there may be little focus on the outcome of the Home Rule crisis for either Carson or Bonar Law. There will be little or no awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([6]–[10]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([4]–[7]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level will select and deploy historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. It will have supporting evidence. For example, there may be some limited focus on the aspirations of Carson, who led the Ulster Unionists in order to prevent Home Rule in any form. Opposing Home Rule provided Bonar Law with a traditional cause around which his weakened party could rally and attack the Liberals. There will be some awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development. For example, there may be a contemporary comment from Bonar Law, or a later interpretation from Buckland, on Carson. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to illegibility, inaccurate spelling, punctuation or grammar; at times, the style of writing will be inappropriate. There may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([11]–[15]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([8]–[11]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. Answers may discuss the aspirations of Carson and Bonar Law in greater depth. Carson had openly declared that there was only one political cause, the maintenance of the Union, which he cared about. Carson’s “guiding star” of political life was the Union between Great Britain and Ireland. He believed that Ireland had prospered under the Union, that Irish nationalists were incapable of governing Ireland competently or fairly and that Home Rule would undermine the imperial ideal. He led the Ulster Unionists in the belief that a successful campaign of resistance by the Ulstermen would either force Asquith to drop the Bill completely, or offer Redmond some sort of partition compromise which nationalists would certainly reject. Answers should also reflect on the prominence which Bonar Law gave to the interests of the Ulster Unionists

in their opposition to Home Rule. Resisting Home Rule was a traditional Conservative stance as they saw themselves as the party of national unity and Empire. Bonar Law once told Austen Chamberlain that the only two issues he cared intensely about were tariff reform and Ulster; all the rest was only part of a game. Short-term political events prior to the introduction of the Bill in April 1912 provided additional incentives for the Conservatives to endorse Ulster Unionist resistance to Home Rule. The Conservatives experienced an overwhelming disaster in the General Election of 1906, and suffered subsequent defeats over the “People’s Budget” of 1909 and the Parliament Act of 1911. The General Elections of January and December 1910 failed to see them return to power. By 1912, Bonar Law was determined to throw the full weight of his party behind the Ulster Unionist resistance to Home Rule, but he had no inclination towards abandoning the Southern Unionists. Preserving the Union and the Empire was the overall Conservative objective. The tactics involved in what became known as the “New Style” were designed to restore the Conservatives to power by pressurising Asquith into calling a General Election, by convincing him that his Home Rule policy would result in disaster for himself, his party and the country. Candidates at this level will begin to assess the extent to which Carson and Bonar Law achieved their aims. There will be a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of either contemporary or later interpretations of this subject or a partial evaluation of **both**. Contemporary interpretations could include, for example, the public views of Carson and Bonar Law on the Home Rule crisis. Later interpretations could include, for example, the views of Rees and Lyons regarding the extent of Carson and Bonar Law’s “victory” during the Home Rule crisis. 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 with some specialist vocabulary.

Level 4 ([16]–[20]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([12]–[15]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis are very well developed and substantiated. Answers will attempt in a more definite and sustained way an examination of the proposition by assessing the extent of Carson and Bonar Law’s “victory” during this period. In June 1912 Carson supported the Agar-Robartes amendment to exclude four Ulster counties from Home Rule as a “wrecking device”, hoping that it might destroy the entire Bill. Only when Carson became convinced that exclusion was the only realistic outcome of the crisis did he seek to prioritise the interests of the Ulster Unionists. To Carson, the Dublin-born lawyer, Home Rule in any form was abhorrent. He believed that by backing the Ulster Unionists in a firm and resolute campaign, he could defeat Home Rule completely: “If Ulster succeeds Home Rule is dead”. However, providing leadership for a formidable Ulster Unionist campaign against Home Rule and forcing the Liberal Government to have doubts about the Bill was to prove the extent of Carson’s “victory” in this period, for as the crisis unfolded he was forced to abandon his strategy of preventing Home Rule for Ireland and acknowledge that the best outcome he could arrive at would be the exclusion of six Ulster counties from Home Rule. In a letter to Bonar Law on 20 September 1913, Carson conceded that excluding Ulster- an area he defined as the “six Plantation counties”- was the best outcome he could achieve. Thus, Carson’s pragmatic side was asserting itself, as he switched

AVAILABLE
MARKS

his strategy from seeking Ulster exclusion as a tactical manoeuvre in order to smash the entire Home Rule scheme to one of saving at least the greater part of Ulster from an unstoppable Home Rule Bill. Bonar Law advocated the use of force only because he knew it would never have to be used since the Liberals, whom he despised, would capitulate. It was only when it became clear in 1913 that Asquith would neither abandon the Bill nor call a General Election that the Conservatives endorsed the compromise of exclusion of six Ulster counties in order to avert a potential civil war. This partition settlement meant forsaking the Southern Unionists who enjoyed considerable support in the party. Hence Law's "victory" had mixed blessings. By September 1914 the Liberals had been weakened by the Home Rule struggle, while the Conservatives had gained political benefits from their association with the Ulster cause. Law's party, which had united on the Ulster issue following the bitter internal divisions over tariff reform and the Parliament Act, had clearly strengthened its position by 1914. Yet the abandonment of the Southern Unionists and the stridency of the "New Style" undermined public respect for the conventional rules of political conduct, and left a blemish on Law's career. Candidates may also assess the extent to which the Ulster Unionist Sir James Craig, Asquith, the Prime Minister of the Liberal Government, and Redmond, the leader of the Irish Parliamentary Party, achieved their aims. Answers will provide a good analysis of contemporary **and** later interpretations of this subject. Contemporary interpretations could include, for example, the private views of Carson and Bonar Law. Later interpretations could include, for example, the views of Stewart on the role of Carson and Mansergh on the role of Bonar Law. 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 specialist vocabulary. [35]

- (b) "The role of key individuals in the leadership of the Irish Republican Brotherhood was the most important reason for the outbreak of the Easter Rising of 1916." To what extent would you agree with this assessment? Use relevant evidence you have studied including contemporary and later interpretations to support your answer.

This question targets AO1(b) and AO2(b): the candidate's ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)** and the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways **AO2(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[5]) AO1(b) Knowledge, [[0]–[3]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. Answers at this level may be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. For example, there will be little focus on the proposition, with a limited summary of some of the reasons for the outbreak of the Easter Rising of 1916. There will be little or no awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([6]–[10]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([4]–[7]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level will select and deploy historical knowledge with greater relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. It will have some supporting evidence. For example, there may be a limited focus on the contribution of key individuals in the leadership of the Irish Republican Brotherhood to the outbreak of the Easter Rising of 1916. There may be superficial references to other causes. There will be some awareness of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject but this will be limited and in need of further development. For example, there may be a contemporary comment from Pearse about the need for a rising or a later interpretation from McGarry about the role of key individuals in the leadership of the Irish Republican Brotherhood. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to illegibility, inaccurate spelling, punctuation or grammar; at times the style of writing will be inappropriate. There may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([11]–[15]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([8]–[11]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. Answers may focus on agreeing with the proposition, and address fully the contribution of key individuals in the leadership of the Irish Republican Brotherhood to the outbreak of the Easter Rising of 1916. Answers may reflect upon the ideology of revolt articulated by men like Pearse, Clarke, McDermott, Plunkett and MacDonagh, as well as Connolly's motives in joining the revolt. Pearse, a poet and educationalist, joined the Irish Republican Brotherhood in December 1913, becoming involved at a high level in organising and drilling. He contributed the doctrine of the blood sacrifice. This was a romantic idea that someone's death would win God's favour for a cause. Originally, the Rising was planned for Easter Sunday to make clear the idea that the people who died for Ireland were engaged in a blood sacrifice for their country. Connolly involved his Irish Citizens' Army in the revolt to bring about a socialist revolution. Connolly believed that an Irish revolution would be a two-stage process in which the struggle to overthrow capitalism would be preceded by a rebellion to gain independence from Britain. In January 1916 he agreed to join the Irish Republican Brotherhood. Clarke, who had been prominent in the Irish Republican Brotherhood for many years, provided a direct link with the Fenian tradition in his own person, and was determined to break the connection with Britain by force. The formation within the Irish Republican Brotherhood of a secret Military Council in May 1915 to plan for a rising places that organisation at the forefront of the Rising. The Irish Republican Brotherhood infiltrated the Irish Volunteers, the Gaelic League and the Gaelic Athletic Association, imported guns from Germany and made contacts with republicans in America. Without the Irish Republican Brotherhood, the Rising of 1916 could not have taken place. While the outbreak of the revolt was labelled a "Sinn Féin" rising, it was the leaders of the Irish Republican Brotherhood who recruited, armed and conspired to bring it about. There will be a satisfactory analysis of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject **or** a partial evaluation of **both**. For example, contemporary interpretations could include comments from key individuals in the leadership of the Irish Republican Brotherhood such as Clarke, Pearse and Connolly. Later interpretations could include Rees' analysis of the

AVAILABLE
MARKS

reasons for the outbreak of the Easter Rising of 1916. 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 with some specialist vocabulary.

Level 4 ([16]–[20]) AO1(b) Knowledge, ([12]–[15]) AO2(b) Interpretations

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation and analysis are very well developed and substantiated. Answers will attempt in a more definite and sustained way an assessment of the role of key individuals in the leadership of the Irish Republican Brotherhood and other factors in an explanation of how the Rising of 1916 came about. The outbreak of the First World War created the opportunity for the Rising to take place. The war brought about an indefinite postponement of Home Rule and created a political vacuum which the rebel leaders of 1916 could exploit. The war which commenced in August 1914 was supposed to be short and victorious, with a Home Rule parliament working in Dublin thereafter. By 1916, the end of the war and the promised Dublin parliament appeared equally elusive. Redmond now led a party with no real objective except to await the outcome of the war. Redmond’s Woodenbridge speech in September 1914 split the Irish Volunteers and created the opportunity for the Irish Republican Brotherhood to infiltrate the smaller dissident members who were now led by Eoin MacNeill. By 1916, the initial enthusiasm for the war in Ireland had given way to disillusionment. Voluntary enlistment had declined, Kitchener’s refusal to acknowledge nationalists’ contribution caused offence, while the creation of a wartime coalition in May 1915 meant that a settlement of the Home Rule question on terms favourable to Redmond was less likely. During 1915–1916 leaders of the Irish Republican Brotherhood set their plans for revolt in motion. “England’s difficulty” had provided “Ireland’s opportunity”. The war also offered the rebels the prospect of German help. Answers may reflect on the influence of the “New Nationalism,” epitomised by the Gaelic Athletic Association and the Gaelic League, which created the atmosphere of revolt. The Gaelic League, while a cultural organisation, often attracted young men who felt politically excluded from the established forces of constitutional nationalism. Answers may also reflect on how Ulster Unionist opposition to Home Rule indirectly contributed to causing a republican rising. The formation of the Ulster Volunteer Force in 1913 and the success of unionist threats of violence in opposition to Home Rule were instrumental in rekindling the Fenian flame. Pearse became an advocate of armed rebellion, inspired by the formation of the Ulster Volunteer Force. They may also comment on the mistakes made by officials at Dublin Castle in the days before the Rising, who failed to act on intelligence that a revolt was imminent at Easter. Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of this subject. Contemporary interpretations could include, for example, the views of leaders of the Irish Republican Brotherhood such as McDermott, MacDonagh and Plunkett. Later interpretations could include, for example, the opinions of Ferriter, Lyons and Townshend on the reasons for the outbreak of the Easter Rising of 1916. 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 use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. [35]

Option 4

AVAILABLE
MARKS

35

70