



ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education
2018

History

Assessment Unit A2 1
Change Over Time

[AHY11]

WEDNESDAY 6 JUNE, AFTERNOON

MARK
SCHEME

General Marking Instructions

Introduction

The main purpose of the mark scheme is to ensure that examinations are marked accurately, consistently and fairly. The mark scheme provides examiners with an indication of the nature and range of candidates' responses likely to be worthy of credit. It also sets out the criteria which they should apply in allocating marks to candidates' responses.

Assessment objectives

Below are the assessment objectives for **GCE History**.

Candidates should be able to:

- AO1** Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.
- AO2** Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.
- AO3** Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Quality of candidates' responses

In marking the examination papers, examiners should be looking for a quality of response reflecting the level of maturity which may reasonably be expected of a 17 or 18-year-old which is the age at which the majority of candidates sit their GCE examinations.

Flexibility in marking

Mark schemes are not intended to be totally prescriptive. No mark scheme can cover all the responses which candidates may produce. In the event of unanticipated answers, examiners are expected to use their professional judgement to assess the validity of answers. If an answer is particularly problematic, then examiners should seek the guidance of the Supervising Examiner.

Positive marking

Examiners are encouraged to be positive in their marking, giving appropriate credit for what candidates know, understand and can do rather than penalising candidates for errors or omissions. Examiners should make use of the whole of the available mark range for any particular question and be prepared to award full marks for a response which is as good as might reasonably be expected of a 17 or 18-year-old GCE candidate.

Awarding zero marks

Marks should only be awarded for valid responses and no marks should be awarded for an answer which is completely incorrect or inappropriate.

Type of mark scheme

Mark schemes for questions which require candidates to respond in extended written form are marked on the basis of levels of response which take account of the quality of written communication.

Levels of response

In deciding which level of response to award, examiners should look for the 'best fit' bearing in mind that weakness in one area may be compensated for by strength in another. In deciding which mark within a particular level to award to any response, examiners are expected to use their professional judgement.

The following guidance is provided to assist examiners.

- **Threshold performance:** Response which just merits inclusion in the level and should be awarded a mark at or near the bottom of the range.
- **Intermediate performance:** Response which clearly merits inclusion in the level and should be awarded a mark at or near the middle of the range.
- **High performance:** Response which fully satisfies the level description and should be awarded a mark at or near the top of the range.

Quality of written communication

Quality of written communication is taken into account in assessing candidates' responses to all questions that require them to respond in extended written form. These questions are marked on the basis of levels of response. The description for each level of response includes reference to the quality of written communication.

For conciseness, quality of written communication is distinguished within levels of response as follows:

Level 1: Quality of written communication is basic.

Level 2: Quality of written communication is satisfactory.

Level 3: Quality of written communication is good.

Level 4: Quality of written communication is of a high standard.

In interpreting these level descriptions, examiners should refer to the more detailed guidance provided below:

Level 1 (Basic): The candidate makes only a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 (Satisfactory): The candidate makes a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 (Good): The candidate makes a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 (High Standard): The candidate successfully selects and uses the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high degree of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Option 1: Crown and Parliament in England 1625–1714

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Answer **either** Question 1 or Question 2.

- 1 “The relationship between Crown and Parliament in England in the period 1625–1714 was characterised by co-operation rather than conflict.” To what extent would you accept this verdict?

Synoptic Assessment

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

This question targets AO1: the candidate’s ability to demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[10])

Answers at this level may recall some accurate knowledge and display understanding of mainly one part of the period and one perspective. The answer will be characterised throughout by limited accuracy and a lack of clarity. Answers may provide a descriptive narrative of events. There will be few links and comparisons made between different parts of the period. Answers will be mainly a series of unsubstantiated assertions with little analysis of the extent to which the relationship between Crown and Parliament in the period 1625–1714 was characterised by co-operation rather than conflict. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([11]–[20])

Answers at this level may recall and deploy knowledge which draws from examples across the period. The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy and at times lack clarity. The answer will provide some explanation, though at times will lapse into narrative. Links and comparisons will be made but these will not be fully developed or analysed. Answers will contain some unsubstantiated assertions but also arguments which are appropriately developed and substantiated about the extent to which the relationship between Crown and Parliament in the period 1625–1714 was characterised by co-operation rather than conflict. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation,

spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([21]–[30])

Answers at this level will recall and deploy knowledge accurately, drawing from all parts of the period with clarity and focus. Answers provide focused explanations and make links and comparisons which are developed and analysed, indicating an understanding of the process of historical change. Arguments are developed, substantiated, illustrated and reach a judgement about the extent to which the relationship between Crown and Parliament in the period 1625–1714 was characterised by co-operation rather than conflict. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([31]–[40])

Answers at this level will demonstrate accurate recall of knowledge from across the period studied with clarity and precision. Answers will provide detailed and focused insightful explanations, drawing on actions, events, issues or perspectives across the period, and there is an excellent understanding of the connections or interrelationships between these. A judgement is reached using arguments that are fully developed, illustrated and substantiated about the extent to which the relationship between Crown and Parliament in the period 1625–1714 was characterised by co-operation rather than conflict. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high standard of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Indicative Content

(a) The reign of Charles I 1625–1649

Two civil wars and the execution reveal the extent of the conflict between Crown and Parliament in this period. However, co-operation had broken down by 1629, long before war broke out, and the period of Personal Rule which followed was a deliberate attempt by the King to rule without Parliament. Charles I's financial and religious policies in this period led to increasing opposition which came to a head when he was forced to recall Parliament. The Constitutional Revolution revealed the extent of opposition, as Parliament succeeded in reducing the King's prerogative powers, although many of its main demands were not fulfilled. Despite this breakdown in their relationship, which led directly to conflict on the battlefield, Charles I retained the support of many parliamentarians and even the decision to put him on trial did not have the support of a full Parliament.

(b) The reign of Charles II 1660–1685

Charles II's return to England after the Interregnum is evidence, in itself, of the co-operation between Crown and Parliament. The Cavalier Parliament restored to Charles II virtually the same powers as his father had, although the reforms of the 'Constitutional Revolution' did remain in place. He could call, prorogue and dissolve Parliament, veto legislation, dispense individuals, appoint ministers and control foreign policy and he remained the Head of

AVAILABLE
MARKS

the Church. Despite this position of strength and the loyalty of Charles II's first Parliament, there were several significant conflicts during his reign. He clashed with Parliament over his foreign, financial and religious policies, and over his choice of ministers. Perhaps the most significant clash came during the Succession Crisis, when exclusionist MPs challenged the right of his Catholic brother James to inherit the throne. The extent of conflict is evidenced by Charles II's decision to pursue a period of personal rule and work to manufacture a loyal Tory Parliament for his brother. This period also saw the emergence of political parties connected by shared political aims rather than family or factional loyalties. Arguably, this made it more likely for the King to face opposition in Parliament.

(c) The reign of James II 1685–1688

By 1688 James II's aim to secure religious and political toleration for Catholics had caused a breakdown in his relationship with Parliament, leading to his removal from the throne in the Glorious Revolution. However, in 1685 his succession was remarkably peaceful given the opposition he had faced in the Succession Crisis. Even the ill-fated Monmouth Rebellion later that year only served to strengthen his economic and political position. Despite this initial position of strength, he had closed down his Parliament by the end of the first year of his reign and would never recall it again. His actions in promoting individual Catholics, in contravention of the Test Act, and his decision to attack the Anglican Church, created huge opposition to his rule. The growing criticism of James II was cemented by the issuing of a second Declaration of Indulgence and the public show trial of the seven bishops. The birth of a Catholic son and heir was the final straw for his opponents.

(d) The reign of William and Mary 1688–1702

Parliament's desire to expediently replace James II suggests a high degree of co-operation with the new joint monarchs and the terms of the Revolution Settlement certainly indicated a willingness on both sides to create a new form of monarchy. However, many of these changes can be interpreted as an attempt to fix the abuses of James II rather than create a genuine revolution in the way England was governed. Nonetheless, it did create a period of co-operation rather than conflict where William was willing to work with Parliament in order to secure finance for his war in Europe. A revised Triennial Act helped to ensure the regular calling of Parliament and the establishment of a Commission of Accounts and Civil List allowed Parliament a degree of control over the King's spending. The Act of Settlement of 1701 determined the religion of the monarch and clarified Parliament's role in foreign affairs. Increasingly it was in the monarch's interests to ensure that his ministers had the approval of Parliament and that it was called regularly to maintain his financial position. This final decade of the century saw an increasingly effective working relationship develop between King and Parliament. However, there remained significant areas of conflict between Crown and Parliament. For example, the King's War became increasingly unpopular, as did William and his circle of Dutch advisers.

(e) The reign of Queen Anne 1702–1714

Anne's reign was notable for the extent of the co-operation rather than conflict between Crown and Parliament. This was evidenced by her attempt to work with a coalition government in the early stages of her reign and then one dominated by moderate Whigs. She then reluctantly accepted a

purely Whig government and eventually approved the peace-loving Tory government. During Anne's reign conflict tended to be between the emerging political parties rather than between Parliament and the Crown. One major area of conflict was the length and cost of the European war, with Tory opposition intensifying as the war progressed.

Any other valid material will be awarded appropriately. [40]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

40

- 2 **“Clashes over foreign policy had the greatest impact on the relationship between Crown and Parliament in England in the period 1625–1714.”**
How far would you agree with this statement?

Synoptic Assessment

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

This question targets AO1: the candidate's ability to demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[10])

Answers at this level may recall some accurate knowledge and display understanding of mainly one part of the period and one perspective. The answer will be characterised throughout by limited accuracy and a lack of clarity. Answers may provide a descriptive narrative of events. There will be few links and comparisons made between different parts of the period. Answers will be mainly a series of unsubstantiated assertions with little analysis of the extent to which clashes over foreign policy had the greatest impact on the relationship between Crown and Parliament in the period 1625–1714. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([11]–[20])

Answers at this level may recall and deploy knowledge which draws from examples across the period. The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy and at times lack clarity. The answer will provide some explanation, though at times will lapse into narrative. Links and comparisons will be made but these will not be fully developed or analysed. Answers will contain some unsubstantiated assertions but also arguments which are appropriately developed and

substantiated about the extent to which foreign policy had the greatest impact on the relationship between Crown and Parliament in the period 1625–1714. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([21]–[30])

Answers at this level will recall and deploy knowledge accurately, drawing from all parts of the period with clarity and focus. Answers provide focused explanations and make links and comparisons which are developed and analysed, indicating an understanding of the process of historical change. Arguments are developed, substantiated, illustrated and reach a judgement about the extent to which foreign policy had the greatest impact on the relationship between Crown and Parliament in the period 1625–1714. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([31]–[40])

Answers at this level will demonstrate accurate recall of knowledge from across the period studied with clarity and precision. Answers will provide detailed and focused insightful explanations, drawing on actions, events, issues or perspectives across the period, and there is an excellent understanding of the connections or interrelationships between these. A judgement is reached using arguments that are fully developed, illustrated and substantiated about the extent to which foreign policy had the greatest impact on the relationship between Crown and Parliament in the period 1625–1714. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high standard of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Indicative Content

(a) The reign of Charles I and the ‘Constitutional Revolution’ 1640–1642

At the beginning of his reign Charles I’s foreign policy actions, under the disastrous leadership of the Duke of Buckingham, engendered a clash with his Parliament. However, his decision to dissolve Parliament was triggered more by his domestic policies. During the Personal Rule it was his controversial religious and financial policies, rather than a clash over foreign affairs, which led to the Constitutional Revolution of 1640–1642, although Parliament did seek to restrict the King’s control of the armed forces. Parliament primarily tackled the King over his perceived misuse of his prerogative power and sought to restrict his ability to act without them in the future. The Triennial Act and the Act Against Own Dissolution were designed to avoid a repetition of Personal Rule and the abolition of the prerogative courts restricted the King’s independence in the legal system.

(b) The Execution of Charles I 1649

The point at which the relationship between Crown and Parliament was at its

AVAILABLE
MARKS

most fractured was after the execution of Charles I. However, the decision to execute the monarch was not motivated by the foreign policy of Charles I but by his actions before, during and after the Civil War. Arguably, it was the issue of religion which motivated many of the King's most vocal critics.

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

The return of Charles II came out of a period of economic, political and social turmoil. The Restoration Settlement strengthened the position of monarchy and seemed to indicate an improved relationship between Crown and Parliament. However, Charles was to clash with Parliament over his foreign policy, religious toleration and choice of ministers, as well as his financial policy. Despite the early period of his rule being marked by co-operation with his Cavalier Parliament, there was criticism of his failures in the Dutch War and his pro-French policies later in his reign, most notably in the Treaty of Dover, were widely opposed. The most significant clash, however, was over the succession of his brother James and his open Catholicism. This was a conflict determined by religion rather than foreign policy, and challenging the very concept of Divine Right and the respective prerogative powers of Crown and Parliament.

(d) The Glorious Revolution and the Revolution Settlement 1688/89

The strong economic and political position James II inherited was undermined not primarily by his foreign policy but by clashes over the liberties of his subjects and, most contentiously, his religious policy. By the end of his first year in power, he had clashed with Parliament over his desire to retain a standing army with a significant number of Catholic officers. His desire to secure political and religious equality for Catholics, rather than any foreign or financial policies he pursued, resulted in a complete breakdown in his relationship with the ruling elite and ultimately his removal in the Glorious Revolution. James II was perceived to be seeking to create an absolutist monarchy and the birth of his son seemed to have ensured a Catholic dynasty. It could be argued that his strong links with Louis XIV contributed to this perception of James II seeking to model his kingdom upon Catholic, absolutist France. It is also valid to consider the role of William of Orange and his desire to acquire the throne to further his European interests. In this respect, foreign affairs played a crucial part in changing the relationship between Crown and Parliament, even if it was not the actual policies of James II which were to blame.

(e) The reign of William III and Mary 1688–1702

William's commitment to the Grand Alliance meant that he was willing to make substantial concessions to ensure that Parliament continued to authorise taxation to finance the European war. This resulted in a greater degree of co-operation, rather than conflict, with his Parliament. Royal dependence and accountability were established through the Commission of Accounts and Civil List, and a new Triennial Act set the duration of a Parliament as three years. Parliament's support for 'The King's War' was conditioned by its desire to maintain a Protestant monarchy and expand its powers and prerogatives. The change in relationship during this period was influenced by religion, finance and the struggle for political power, as well as by the foreign policy of the monarch. It could be argued that it was during a time of foreign policy agreement that the relationship between Crown and Parliament was most transformed.

(f) War of the Spanish Succession

Queen Anne faced considerable opposition, notably from the Tory Party, to England's involvement in the European-wide conflict. Although this was a direct criticism of her foreign policy, it was partly motivated by the growing cost of this widespread and lengthy war. The Tories were also critical of Whig profiteering during the conflict and the threat to the Anglican Church posed by dissenters. Perhaps the most notable feature of this period was the growing importance of party politics and the increasing need for the monarch to work with ministers drawn from the dominant party in Parliament. Clashes with the monarchy tended to come from either the Whig or Tory parties rather than from a unified Parliament. Indeed, often the conflict over foreign, or even religious and financial, policy was inter-party rather than between Crown and Parliament.

Any other valid material will be awarded appropriately.

[40]

Option 1

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

40

40

Option 2: Ireland Under the Union 1800–1900

AVAILABLE
MARKSAnswer **either** Question 1 or Question 2.

- 1 “In the period 1800–1900 unionists and constitutional nationalists in Ireland only experienced success when they enjoyed popular support.” How far would you agree with this statement?

Synoptic Assessment

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

This question targets AO1: the candidate’s ability to demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[10])

Answers at this level may recall some accurate knowledge and display understanding of mainly one part of the period and one perspective. The answer will be characterised throughout by limited accuracy and a lack of clarity. Answers may provide a descriptive narrative of events. There will be few links and comparisons made between different parts of the period. Answers will be mainly a series of unsubstantiated assertions with little analysis of whether unionists and constitutional nationalists in Ireland only experienced success when they enjoyed popular support. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([11]–[20])

Answers at this level may recall and deploy knowledge which draws from examples across the period. The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy and at times lack clarity. The answer will provide some explanation, though at times will lapse into narrative. Links and comparisons will be made but these will not be fully developed or analysed. Answers will contain some unsubstantiated assertions but also arguments which are appropriately developed and substantiated about whether unionists and constitutional nationalists in Ireland only experienced success when they enjoyed popular support. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and

grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([21]–[30])

Answers at this level will recall and deploy knowledge accurately, drawing from all parts of the period with clarity and focus. Answers provide focused explanations and make links and comparisons which are developed and analysed, indicating an understanding of the process of historical change. Arguments are developed, substantiated, illustrated and reach a judgement on whether unionists and constitutional nationalists in Ireland only experienced success when they enjoyed popular support. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([31]–[40])

Answers at this level will demonstrate accurate recall of knowledge from across the period studied with clarity and precision. Answers will provide detailed and focused insightful explanations, drawing on actions, events, issues or perspectives across the period, and there is an excellent understanding of the connections or interrelationships between these. A judgement is reached using arguments that are fully developed, illustrated and substantiated about whether unionists and constitutional nationalists in Ireland only experienced success when they enjoyed popular support. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high standard of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Indicative Content

- (a) **The role of popular support was undoubtedly a key factor in determining the success of constitutional nationalists.** Henry Grattan laid the foundations for constitutional nationalism but in his efforts to secure Catholic Emancipation at Westminster between 1805 and 1820, he did not really have, or seek popular support. His success was arguably more apparent retrospectively. Daniel O’Connell attracted popular support for his campaign for Catholic Emancipation. Through the creation of the Catholic Association, he combined the power of the Catholic masses, as well as the clergy. He also appealed to the goodwill of Irish Presbyterians. The tactics of the Association, including the collection of the penny rent and mass rallies, when coupled with O’Connell’s electoral strategy, provided his support base with a tangible role in the struggle for Emancipation. The campaign for the repeal of the Union was different. O’Connell still managed to attract popular support to his cause but it was not as effective as for the Emancipation campaign. Presbyterian support was lukewarm and the masses arguably did not buy into the idea of repeal with similar conviction. O’Connell’s decision to ally with Young Ireland backfired, since he could not control the movement as he had hoped, leading to a split. Parnell’s ability to mobilise popular support was a key factor in his success. Parnell’s association with the Land League and ex-Fenians such as Davitt led to the “New Departure” which brought together mass popular support, the endorsement of the Catholic Church and co-operation with some of the more radical elements

AVAILABLE
MARKS

of nationalism. Successes were soon apparent such as the Land Act of 1881 and the Arrears Act of 1882. The success of Parnell and the IPP in the general election of 1885, and the subsequent introduction of the Home Rule Bill of 1886, could also be discussed to show how widespread mass support contributed to success.

(b) Other factors were also of crucial importance in determining the degree of success enjoyed by constitutional nationalists in this period.

The role of the British Government was crucial. O'Connell's recognition of the weakness of the Westminster Government and the splits in the Tory Party between Wellington and Peel led to a situation where Emancipation was likely to be passed. Wellington's Government was weak in 1829 and this helped O'Connell immensely in his campaign for Emancipation. The opposite was true in the 1840s when Peel headed a united party and government and was able to resist Repeal with ease. Parnell later enjoyed backing from Gladstone which aided him greatly. The support of the Roman Catholic Church could also be discussed, as O'Connell had the Church on his side in 1829, as did Parnell in the 1880s, and this undoubtedly helped their causes. By contrast, the Church was lukewarm in its support for Repeal and then ultimately cost Parnell his support base after the O'Shea scandal, thereby helping to determine success or failure. The role of leadership could also be discussed, in that O'Connell's dynamic leadership, personal charisma and keen political intelligence helped to achieve Emancipation but he was arguably not so dynamic with Repeal. The same was true in the Home Rule era as, although Butt was capable, he lacked Parnell's charisma and discipline and this undoubtedly led to more success for Parnell. The oratorical skills of certain leaders could also be discussed, such as those of O'Connell and Parnell, as well as Parnell's failures of leadership after 1886.

(c) Popular support also helped to determine the degree of success enjoyed by Irish unionists in this period.

Candidates should here show the contrast in the support enjoyed by Ulster and southern unionists. Ulster unionists enjoyed support and had no problem mobilising it due to their numerical advantage in the north. In Ulster, where unionism enjoyed a majority, unionists could be confident, outspoken and even radical in their defence of the Union, sometimes hinting at the use of force. Organisations such as the Ulster Loyalist Anti-Repeal Union and the Ulster Defence Union, which collected funds for resisting Home Rule, were proof of the popular support enjoyed by Ulster unionists. Southern unionists could never use the same methods due to their different status as a minority in the remaining three provinces. However, southern unionists were able to exert their influence in the House of Lords, as well as use their considerable financial power to back their defence of the Union; these were advantages not possessed in the same way by their northern counterparts. The veto possessed by the Lords in this period was a constant reminder of just how powerful the political contacts of southern unionists were for the cause. However, the fact that southern unionists were never able to enjoy the same degree of support undoubtedly hindered their chances of success.

(d) Other factors also contributed to the degree of success experienced by unionists such as their motives.

Unionists north and south emphasised different motives in order to further their campaigns, such as religious, economic and imperial concerns. Economic and religious fears were more prevalent in the north and could be linked directly to the degree of support

AVAILABLE
MARKS

enjoyed, given the power of arguments regarding “Rome Rule” and apparent threats to Ulster’s industrial prosperity. Imperial concerns were more important in the south and several high profile southern unionists viewed Ireland within the imperial context, arguing that it could never be as well off outside the British Empire. The quality of leadership could also be discussed with men like Cooke, Saunderson and Sinclair able to mobilise support in the north. Southern unionist leaders, such as Lansdowne and Midleton, were key figures, but arguably did not or could not inspire the same kind of following in the South, as their main focus was the House of Lords.

Any other valid material will be awarded appropriately.

[40]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

40

- 2 **“The Act of Union determined political events in Ireland in the first half of the nineteenth century, while the Famine determined political developments between 1850 and 1900.” To what extent would you accept this verdict?**

Synoptic Assessment

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

This question targets AO1: the candidate’s ability to demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[10])

Answers at this level may recall some accurate knowledge and display understanding of mainly one part of the period and one perspective. The answer will be characterised throughout by limited accuracy and a lack of clarity. Answers may provide a descriptive narrative of events. There will be few links and comparisons made between different parts of the period. Answers will be mainly a series of unsubstantiated assertions with little analysis of the extent to which the Act of Union and the Famine determined the political events that followed in each case. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([11]–[20])

Answers at this level may recall and deploy knowledge which draws from examples across the period. The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy

and at times lack clarity. The answer will provide some explanation, though at times will lapse into narrative. Links and comparisons will be made but these will not be fully developed or analysed. Answers will contain some unsubstantiated assertions but also arguments which are appropriately developed and substantiated about the extent to which the Act of Union and the Famine determined the political events that followed in each case. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([21]–[30])

Answers at this level will recall and deploy knowledge accurately, drawing from all parts of the period with clarity and focus. Answers provide focused explanations and make links and comparisons which are developed and analysed, indicating an understanding of the process of historical change. Arguments are developed, substantiated, illustrated and reach a judgement about the extent to which the Act of Union determined political events up to 1850 and also how the same can be said of the Famine for political developments after 1850. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([31]–[40])

Answers at this level will demonstrate accurate recall of knowledge from across the period studied with clarity and precision. Answers will provide detailed and focused insightful explanations, drawing on actions, events, issues or perspectives across the period, and there is an excellent understanding of the connections or interrelationships between these. A judgement is reached using arguments that are fully developed, illustrated and substantiated about the extent to which the Act of Union determined political events up to 1850 and also how the same can be said of the Famine for political events after 1850. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high standard of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Indicative Content

- (a) **The Act of Union had a significant impact on the political events up to 1850**, starting with the rebellion of Robert Emmet in 1803, which had in part been caused by a desire to remove the Act of Union and indeed any link between Ireland and England. It could be argued that the passing of the Act of Union exacerbated these revolutionary feelings as the Union was seen by some as a further dilution of Ireland's sovereignty. Emmet's rebellion was, however, easily suppressed by the British but his legacy would endure long after his trial and execution.

Daniel O'Connell's campaigns were initiated by the failings of the Union by the 1820s. Instead of proving a panacea for all of Ireland's ills, the Union had failed to take hold or be effective as in the case of Scotland. The fact that the promise of Catholic Emancipation, which had accompanied the

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Act of Union, never materialised gave O'Connell the appearance of being on a divine crusade, bringing the support of the masses and the Catholic Church. O'Connell skilfully read the situation and backed Wellington's weak government into a corner, in order to secure the passing of an Emancipation Act in 1829. All of this was arguably a result of the failures of the Act of Union. O'Connell's experiences in the Lichfield House Compact in the 1830's would prove less fruitful and ultimately force him into a campaign to Repeal the Union. Although less dynamic and enjoying less support than the campaign for Emancipation, it was troublesome for the British Government before Peel's victory over O'Connell with the banning of the Clontarf meeting in 1843. Peel's subsequent reforms for Ireland in the 1840s can be interpreted as a belated Tory attempt to make the Union seem effective.

The Young Ireland rebellion of 1848 was again an attempt to change Ireland's constitutional status and can be seen as a continuation of the path started by Emmet, as well as a sign of the frustration with the failures of constitutional nationalism by 1848. Although again easily suppressed, disorganised, lacking support, condemned by the Catholic Church and poorly led, the rebellion was yet more proof that the Act of Union had set Ireland on a path in the nineteenth century where seeking redress of constitutional and sovereign grievances would lead to constant struggles, whether constitutional or revolutionary, to modify Ireland's relationship with England.

(b) The Famine undoubtedly influenced the political events after 1850.

It ultimately transformed Ireland's relationship with Great Britain due to a growing perception among some in Ireland that the British Government had allowed Ireland to starve during the years of the Great Hunger. Britain had made efforts to help, including the importing of Peel's Indian corn, the extension of the Poor Law to Ireland and various relief schemes, but not enough to combat such a full-scale crisis. The reputation gained by some officials such as Charles Edward Trevelyan contributed to a further deterioration in relations.

The Fenian Rebellion of 1867 was another in the continuing line of revolutionary nationalist attempts to gain Irish independence. Arguably caused every bit as much by the failures of the Union as by the fallout from the Famine, the rebellion was the most serious revolutionary threat faced by the British in the nineteenth century but failed again due to a variety of factors, including weak leadership, poor planning, condemnation from the Catholic Church and a strong British governmental response. The Fenians would, however, remain in one guise or another for the next half century and beyond, becoming arch infiltrators of all other nationalist organisations. Anger due to the Famine could be said to have caused some of this sentiment, as indeed could the shortcomings of the Union.

The birth of the Home Rule movement under Isaac Butt and later Charles Stewart Parnell was in many ways more evidence that the desire to change Ireland's constitutional status was still as strong towards the end of the century. Butt enjoyed limited success and was not really able to harness or focus the ill-feeling of the population, but Parnell proved much more effective. Parnell's oratory and his relationship with renowned Fenians such as Devoy and Davitt would bridge the gap between the revolutionary

and constitutional traditions. Parnell's dominance as a leader coupled with his harnessing of public support in order to win crushing victories such as that in the election of 1885, forced an already sympathetic Gladstone to accommodate him. It could be argued that the long decades of the perceived failure of the Act of Union, added to the bitterness that had been caused by the Famine, gave Parnell a potency that many of his predecessors had never enjoyed.

The birth of unionism as a political phenomenon was inextricably linked to the Act of Union and so that relationship should be discussed. Unionists felt that they had to protect the Union with Great Britain as they saw it as the basis of their prosperity, position and livelihoods in both north and south. The Act of Union had unwittingly allowed for the creation of this new ideology and, as the century progressed, the feelings of unionists became stronger for a variety of religious, economic and imperial reasons. Leaders such as Cooke, Saunderson, Midleton and Lansdowne were able to articulate these feelings into campaigns that gave rise to a plethora of movements, such as the Ulster Defence Union and the Irish Loyal and Patriotic Union, which gave voice to unionist resistance to Home Rule. The Famine may have acted as a catalyst in making Ulster unionism more extreme in its outlook as Ulster had been the least affected province and it was another aspect that created yet more division between Ulster and the rest of the island, but the Act of Union had really been the event that had led to the rise of unionism in Ireland and its ongoing struggle in the face of both revolutionary and constitutional nationalism.

Any other valid material will be awarded appropriately.

[40]

40

Option 2

40

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Option 3: The Causes and Consequences of Great Power Conflict 1848–1945AVAILABLE
MARKSAnswer **either** Question 1 or Question 2.

- 1 “German ambition was the cause of nearly all the wars fought in Europe between 1848 and 1945.” To what extent would you accept this judgement?

Synoptic Assessment

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

This question targets AO1: the candidate’s ability to demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[10])

Answers at this level may recall some accurate knowledge and display understanding of mainly one part of the period and one perspective. The answer will be characterised throughout by limited accuracy and a lack of clarity. Answers may provide a descriptive narrative of events. There will be few links and comparisons made between different parts of the period. Answers will be mainly a series of unsubstantiated assertions with little analysis of the extent to which German ambition was the major cause of nearly all the wars in Europe between 1848 and 1945. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([11]–[20])

Answers at this level may recall and deploy knowledge which draws from examples across the period. The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy and at times lack clarity. The answer will provide some explanation, though at times will lapse into narrative. Links and comparisons will be made but these will not be fully developed or analysed. Answers will contain some unsubstantiated assertions but also arguments which are appropriately developed and substantiated about the extent to which German ambition caused nearly all the wars in Europe between 1848 and 1945, possibly concentrating on one or both World Wars. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([21]–[30])

Answers at this level will recall and deploy knowledge accurately, drawing from all parts of the period with clarity and focus. Answers provide focused explanations and make links and comparisons which are developed and analysed, indicating an understanding of the process of historical change. Arguments are developed, substantiated, illustrated and reach a judgement about the extent to which German ambition was the cause of nearly all the wars in Europe between 1848 and 1945. There will be consideration of other causes as well. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([31]–[40])

Answers at this level will demonstrate accurate recall of knowledge from across the period studied with clarity and precision. Answers will provide detailed and focused insightful explanations, drawing on actions, events, issues or perspectives across the period, and there is an excellent understanding of the connections or interrelationships between these. A judgement is reached using arguments that are fully developed, illustrated and substantiated about the extent to which German ambition was the cause of nearly all the wars fought in Europe between 1848 and 1945. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high standard of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Indicative Content

- (a) The wars of German unification may be seen as examples of “German ambition”, initiated by Bismarck, and supported to an extent by German nationalists. In 1864 Bismarck pushed the German Confederation into occupying Holstein and Austria into invading Denmark. Bismarck manoeuvred Austria into appealing to the Confederation against Prussia, helping to precipitate the Austro-Prussian war. The creation of the North German Confederation, anathema to Austria, required either capitulation or a fight to the finish. The Franco-Prussian War (1870-71) was similarly provoked by Bismarck: the edited Ems Telegram forced France into attack, but French defeat was a necessary prelude to creating the Empire. Bismarck’s brinkmanship and ambition were key to each outbreak of hostilities.
- (b) Other nineteenth century wars owed little or nothing to German ambition. The Crimean War (1853–1856) was the result of Napoleon seeking Catholic support, Russian attempts to roll back Ottoman frontiers and British determination to support the Turks. Its origins had nothing to do with Germany or Prussia, as was true of the North Italian War of 1859, fought by Piedmont to drive Austria out of northern Italy, assisted by an opportunist France and a growing nationalism. Nationalism, coupled with a perception of increasing Turkish weakness, provoked other wars. In 1877 Russia took advantage of Balkan uprisings to set up an independent Bulgaria, only pulling back when the other powers, fearing further Russian encroachment, stepped in. In 1911 the Italian attack on Tripoli inspired the formation of the Balkan League. The ensuing Balkan Wars displayed Russian rather than

AVAILABLE
MARKS

German ambition in action, in conjunction with Balkan nationalism and the collapse of Turkish hegemony in South East Europe.

- (c) Under William II the German Empire acted provocatively over many years. The naval race worsened relations with England and German provocation of France over Morocco arguably moved the Anglo-French Entente towards a full-blown alliance. The race between Germany and Britain for colonies and for maritime superiority was a clear result of German ambition, but better answers may note that by 1914 these issues were no longer a serious cause of friction. What was, however, was the South Slav problem, with its implications for German's only serious ally, Austria. This was the background to what some have seen as German ambition in terms of its guarantees to its ally after the assassination of Franz Ferdinand and Austrian threats to Serbia: whether this was German ambition or a defensive reaction is open to debate. The growing belief among its élite that Germany would have to fight Russia to break out of "encirclement," the sooner the better for logistical reasons, as well as the resultant Schlieffen Plan, which ultimately brought Britain into the conflict in 1914, may be discussed in the light of the proposition. The September Programme, a detailed plan for German expansion into eastern Europe, has been cited as clear evidence of German ambition.
- (d) There were some European conflicts during the inter-war years which owed nothing to German ambition: for example, the Russo-Polish War (1919–1921), the product of the two countries' territorial ambitions; the Spanish Civil War, with German participation, but on a more limited scale than that of Italy, internal conflict its cause rather than German ambition; and the Italian takeover of Albania in 1939, solely the result of Mussolini's urge for expansion.
- (e) The Second World War certainly did owe its outbreak to German ambitions. Before Hitler's accession to power, the German sense of grievance over the Treaty of Versailles led even moderate Weimar governments to demand revision, and Germany had stopped paying reparations before Hitler came to power. Determined to break free of the Treaty, he continually challenged its disarmament clauses, testing Britain's and France's will to halt German rearmament, revealing their powerlessness to stop the reappearance of a Luftwaffe or the remilitarisation of the Rhineland. Hitler, aiming to unite all German-speaking peoples, sought allies to support his demands: Italy, so that he would not be thwarted in his ambitious second attempt to swallow up Austria in 1938, and the Soviet Union, so as not to have to face a war on two fronts when he seized Poland. Appeasement will be mentioned as an invaluable asset to German ambition, reaching its lowest point with the capitulation over the Sudetenland in 1938. German ambition was also based on its perceived need to guarantee its supplies of food and raw materials, leading it to seek *Lebensraum* in the east.
- (f) Better answers will challenge the proposition, suggesting that factors other than German ambition may have been involved. A quest for security has been argued to be the main cause of the alliance system that dragged the Great Powers into war in 1914, while fear of sudden, unexpected attack from enemies may explain the failures of diplomacy in that year. A nation state, although achieved in Italy and Germany, was still sought by the South Slavs, with fatal consequences, while manoeuvring for economic advantage

AVAILABLE
MARKS

may have been instrumental in the outbreak of wars, especially in 1914. Peace treaties which left unfinished business or festering grudges, such as Versailles and the treaties following the Balkan Wars, were potent causes of later conflict. Weakness on the part of decaying empires led to instability, as others sought to take advantage. In the 1930s, weakness on the part of the other major powers, largely disarmed and reluctant to go to war again, encouraged Hitler to continue his demands. The League of Nations was hopelessly weakened by 1939, leaving only Britain and France, the former unprepared for an aggressive war, the latter geared only to a defensive war, to cope with German ambition.

Any other valid material will be awarded appropriately. [40]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

40

- 2 **“Fear of rivals was a more important cause of war among the great powers than aggression.” To what extent would you agree with this assessment of the outbreak of wars in Europe in the period 1848–1945?**

Synoptic Assessment

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

This question targets AO1: the candidate’s ability to demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[10])

Answers at this level may recall some accurate knowledge and display understanding of mainly one part of the period and one perspective. The answer will be characterised throughout by limited accuracy and a lack of clarity. Answers may provide a descriptive narrative of events. There will be few links and comparisons made between different parts of the period. Answers will be mainly a series of unsubstantiated assertions with little analysis of the extent to which fear or aggression was the main cause of war in Europe between 1848 and 1945. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([11]–[20])

Answers at this level may recall and deploy knowledge which draws from examples across the period. The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy

and at times lack clarity. The answer will provide some explanation, though at times will lapse into narrative. Links and comparisons will be made but these will not be fully developed or analysed. Answers will contain some unsubstantiated assertions but also arguments which are appropriately developed and substantiated about the extent to which fear played a larger part than aggression in starting wars in Europe between 1848 and 1945. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([21]–[30])

Answers at this level will recall and deploy knowledge accurately, drawing from all parts of the period with clarity and focus. Answers provide focused explanations and make links and comparisons which are developed and analysed, indicating an understanding of the process of historical change. Arguments are developed, substantiated, illustrated and reach a judgement about the balance between fear and aggression as factors in the outbreak of wars in Europe between 1848 and 1945. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([31]–[40])

Answers at this level will demonstrate accurate recall of knowledge from across the period studied with clarity and precision. Answers will provide detailed and focused insightful explanations, drawing on actions, events, issues or perspectives across the period, and there is an excellent understanding of the connections or interrelationships between these. A judgement is reached using arguments that are fully developed, illustrated and substantiated about the extent to which fear and aggression were present, and sometimes combined to bring about the outbreak of wars in Europe between 1848 and 1945. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high standard of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Indicative Content

- (a) The Crimean War (1853–1856) was partially motivated by fear of Russian encroachment on the Ottoman Empire, the threat to the Straits an act of aggression harmful to British interests. Piedmont's war against Austria in 1859 was partly nationalist, more Piedmontese aggrandisement, but not born out of fear. The wars which unified Germany similarly owed little to fear, fought in the interests of Prussia's struggle against Austria for control over the later German Reich. Bismarck sought Prussian hegemony, initially by bluster and threats, but was always prepared to use aggression if necessary. In the Franco-Prussian War of 1870–1871, the Hohenzollern candidature provoked French fears of encirclement if a German became King of Spain. Bismarck's editing of the Ems Telegram may be seen as an aggressive act, placing France in a position where its only choices were a humiliating climb

AVAILABLE MARKS

down or going to war. The war between Turkey and Russia (1877–1878) and the Balkan League and the Ottomans (1912–1913) were caused by growing nationalism among Balkan peoples wanting to strike against their enfeebled rulers, no longer fearful but aggressive in pursuit of their ambitions for autonomy.

- (b)** Long-term causes of the First World War may be utilised to illustrate the proposition. A combination of Germany's position between Russia and France, as well as a fear of Russian anger resulting from German support for Britain at the Congress of Berlin, led Bismarck to seek security through the Dual Alliance with Austria (1879), incorporating Italy by 1881. This, in turn, alarmed Germany's neighbours, and the Franco-Russian Alliance of 1894 resulted. By 1914, there were two power blocs, born out of insecurity, and a war between any of the powers could, and did, involve others. Further fears were raised as Bismarck's wars were analysed. Their lessons seemed to be that security demanded large armies and rapid mobilisation. The former led to conscription and a growth of militarism, seen by some as a cause of the Great War; the latter made it crucial to mobilise before one's opponents, with obvious risks for peace.
- (c)** The years from 1900 to 1914 offer several examples to support the proposition. Fear of being outgunned at sea led to a naval race between Britain and Germany. This provoked poor relations, although better answers may note that in the last years before 1914, as Germany accepted that it could not catch up, relations improved. Franco-German relations were damaged by their rivalry over Morocco: this may be seen as aggression rather than fear. No immediate war resulted, but a general war was brought closer as Britain's entente with France moved towards a military alliance. Germany's fears still centred on its vulnerability, with potentially two fronts to defend. This unease led to the Schlieffen Plan, by which Germany would knock out France before turning eastwards towards Russia. However, this would entail breaching Belgian neutrality, a cardinal point of British foreign policy. Austrian fears regarding its cosmopolitan Empire were extremely important, with Poles, Czechs and, crucially, South Slavs all looking for greater autonomy. The rise of the Pan-Slav movement, with Russian backing, increased Habsburg paranoia, leading them to regard Serbia as the arch-enemy. The Serbs themselves feared that the Austrian annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina meant the end of their ambitions to lead a South Slav state.
- (d)** As 1914 approached, influential and fearful voices in Germany talked of waging war on Russia before 1916, when its rearmament plan would be complete. Austrian Chief of Staff Conrad had already wanted to attack Serbia in 1913, and, when Franz Ferdinand was assassinated in June 1914, there were fears that the Habsburg Empire faced disintegration if Serbia escaped punishment. Germany could not let its ally lose face, even if this brought confrontation with Russia, and the "blank cheque" offered by Bethmann-Hollweg emboldened Austria to present an unacceptable ultimatum to Serbia. Fear of being caught unprepared led to precautionary mobilisation of troops, and this made war more likely.
- (e)** The Second World War was largely caused by German aggression, but at various moments elements of fear also contributed. The Treaty of Versailles

AVAILABLE MARKS

was based partly on fear of German resurgence, but failed in that respect, Clemenceau's draconian proposals being eventually watered down. Nevertheless, the fear felt on the part of the victors and the resultant Treaty produced widespread resentment in Germany and contributed to Hitler coming to power. For the most part, the events of the 1930s, which paved the way for the outbreak of the Second World War, were firmly rooted in aggression. The attempted *Anschluss* of 1934, its successful sequel in 1938, the takeover of the Sudetenland, the breakup of the rest of Czechoslovakia in 1939 and the invasion of Poland may all be perceived as German aggression, but were also linked with Hitler's anxiety to ensure food supplies. Fear also influenced other countries' responses to German aggression. In Britain, appeasement was partly caused by fear of another conflict, fuelled by new threats from aerial bombardment. However popular at the time, appeasement only encouraged Hitler to believe that his aggression would not be resisted. Fear of futile wars in the east, therefore, meant that Britain and France did nothing to save Austria or Czechoslovakia. War finally came in 1939, partly due to German fears of having to fight on two fronts if the western powers defended Poland. For that reason the Nazi-Soviet Pact was signed, clearing the way for the assault on Poland. The attack on Russia in 1941 arose not from fear but greed for land, food and raw materials: aggression, not fear.

Any other valid material will be awarded appropriately.

[40]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

40

Option 3

40

Option 4: The American Presidency 1901–2000

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Answer **either** Question 1 or Question 2.

- 1 “American presidential power increased during wartime but decreased during peacetime.” To what extent would you accept this verdict on how the American presidency developed in the period 1901–2000?

Synoptic Assessment

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

This question targets AO1: the candidate’s ability to demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[10])

Answers at this level may recall some accurate knowledge and display understanding of mainly one part of the period and one perspective. The answer will be characterised throughout by limited accuracy and a lack of clarity. Answers may provide a descriptive narrative of events. There will be few links and comparisons made between different parts of the period. Answers will be mainly a series of unsubstantiated assertions with little analysis of the extent to which American presidential power increased during wartime and decreased during peacetime in the period 1901–2000. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([11]–[20])

Answers at this level may recall and deploy knowledge which draws from examples across the period. The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy and at times lack clarity. The answer will provide some explanation, though at times will lapse into narrative. Links and comparisons will be made but these will not be fully developed or analysed. Answers will contain some unsubstantiated assertions but also arguments which are appropriately developed and substantiated about the extent to which American presidential power increased during wartime and decreased during peacetime in the period 1901–2000. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([21]–[30])

Answers at this level will recall and deploy knowledge accurately, drawing from all parts of the period with clarity and focus. Answers provide focused explanations and make links and comparisons which are developed and analysed, indicating an understanding of the process of historical change. Arguments are developed, substantiated, illustrated and reach a judgement about the extent to which American presidential power increased during wartime and decreased during peacetime in the period 1901–2000. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([31]–[40])

Answers at this level will demonstrate accurate recall of knowledge from across the period studied with clarity and precision. Answers will provide detailed and focused insightful explanations, drawing on actions, events, issues or perspectives across the period, and there is an excellent understanding of the connections or interrelationships between these. A judgement is reached using arguments that are fully developed, illustrated and substantiated about the extent to which American presidential power increased during wartime and decreased during peacetime in the period 1901–2000. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high standard of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Indicative Content**Wartime**

Candidates may differ as to what constitutes a “war” in the twentieth century, perhaps drawing a distinction between what might be considered a conventional conflict, such as World War II, and what some have described as the “armed peace” of the Cold War. As such, there is no prescriptive content in terms of candidates’ argument in relation to the “wartime” aspect of the proposition.

(a) The World Wars – Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt

Candidates might approach this question by first considering the two world wars and the presidencies of Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt. A case can be made in support of the proposition by considering how the Wilson administration was able to manage the national effort in World War I by conscripting almost 3 million men and assembling an army of 2 million in France by the summer of 1918. However, candidates might argue that Wilson as president really made his mark in the moral leadership he provided for both the United States and the world. Victorious in war, Wilson hoped to revolutionise the conduct of international affairs at the peace table with his “14 Points”, including the proposal for a League of Nations. That America chose not to join the League of Nations does not really undermine the claim that Wilson was the first US president to be considered a world statesman.

Even before the United States officially entered World War II, Franklin Roosevelt had been making significant efforts to align his country in support of Great Britain, through initiatives such as “cash and carry” and

AVAILABLE MARKS

the Lend-Lease programme. After the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in December 1941, America officially joined the fight and most of the major strategic decisions about both the war in Europe and that in the Pacific were subsequently made by FDR in Washington. By the time the war reached its climax in 1945, conferences of the “Big Three” – FDR, Churchill and Stalin – had become a regular feature of Allied co-operation, but there was no question that Roosevelt was the “biggest” of the Big Three.

(b) The Cold War – Harry Truman, Dwight Eisenhower and John F. Kennedy

President Harry S. Truman confronted unprecedented challenges in international affairs during his nearly eight years in office. He guided the United States through the closing stages of World War II – including the use of the nuclear bomb against Japan – the beginning of the Cold War and intervention in the conflict between North Korea and South Korea. Furthermore, Truman’s foreign policy established some of the basic principles and commitments that marked American foreign policy for the remainder of the twentieth century. He announced in March 1947 what came to be known as the Truman Doctrine, pledging US support for the pro-Western governments of Greece and Turkey and, by extension, any similarly threatened government. When the Soviet Union blocked Western access routes to Berlin, Truman was determined not to abandon the city and ordered an airlift of food and fuel to break the blockade. In 1949, he led the United States into its first ever peacetime military alliance under the terms of the North Atlantic Treaty.

It was also under Truman that the governmental support structure was created to allow America – and its president – to effectively act as Leader of the Free World. This was put in place by the National Security Act of 1947, which established the Department of Defense, the National Security Council and the Central Intelligence Agency. Truman’s immediate successors, Eisenhower and Kennedy, would have at their disposal awesome military power, which they would deploy with varying degrees of discretion.

(c) Vietnam – Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon

The undeclared war in Vietnam arguably saw presidential power further enhanced under Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon, by means of the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution in 1964 and Nixon’s secret bombing of communist supply lines in neutral Cambodia. Candidates might argue that the “imperial presidency” established by Truman had now become one that allowed subsequent presidents to wage war without any restraints placed on them.

(d) The End of the Cold War – Ronald Reagan

The last great military confrontation of the century sees Ronald Reagan, through a massive increase in defence expenditure and the proposed SDI project, determine that the Cold War should be ended by going for victory. Despite widespread criticism, Reagan did not waver from this commitment or alter what was seen as a high-risk strategy.

Peacetime

(a) William Howard Taft, Warren Harding, Calvin Coolidge and Herbert Hoover

Argument in support of the proposition might be further developed by consideration of the essentially passive presidencies of Taft, Harding,

Coolidge and Hoover. Candidates might argue that these peacetime presidents were content to let the office of president revert to its pre-twentieth century character.

Counterargument

(a) Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, Lyndon Johnson and Ronald Reagan

Candidates do have scope to argue against the proposition, in the sense that not all peacetime presidents were like the office holders of the 1920s. The best example of an activist peacetime president is possibly Theodore Roosevelt, who began the process of transforming the office at the beginning of the twentieth century. Roosevelt broke up some of the great business monopolies in the United States and made provision for the country's future network of national parks.

Furthermore, a case can be made that many of the wartime presidents were also significant in domestic affairs, and that their importance was not limited to foreign policy and the conduct of war. Here one might cite: Woodrow Wilson's programme of progressive economic, social and financial reform that was put in place during his first term in office; FDR's New Deal of the 1930s, which tackled the problems of the Depression and transformed people's attitude to and expectations of the government; Truman's decision to desegregate the US armed forces in 1948; LBJ's civil rights legislation of 1964–1965, War on Poverty and Great Society programmes; and Reagan's economic regeneration policies in the early 1980s which tackled and tamed the twin evils of inflation and unemployment.

Any other valid material will be awarded appropriately. [40]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

40

2 “The most significant American presidents of the twentieth century were also those who most abused the office.” How far would you agree with this statement?

Synoptic Assessment

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

This question targets AO1: the candidate's ability to demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[10])

Answers at this level may recall some accurate knowledge and display understanding of mainly one part of the period and one perspective. The answer will be characterised throughout by limited accuracy and a lack of clarity. Answers may provide a descriptive narrative of events. There will be few links and comparisons made between different parts of the period. Answers will be mainly a series of unsubstantiated assertions with little analysis of the extent to which the most significant American presidents of the twentieth century were also those who most abused the office. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([11]–[20])

Answers at this level may recall and deploy knowledge which draws from examples across the period. The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy and at times lack clarity. The answer will provide some explanation, though at times will lapse into narrative. Links and comparisons will be made but these will not be fully developed or analysed. Answers will contain some unsubstantiated assertions but also arguments which are appropriately developed and substantiated about the extent to which the most significant American presidents of the twentieth century were also those who most abused the office. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([21]–[30])

Answers at this level will recall and deploy knowledge accurately, drawing from all parts of the period with clarity and focus. Answers provide focused explanations and make links and comparisons which are developed and analysed, indicating an understanding of the process of historical change. Arguments are developed, substantiated, illustrated and reach a judgement about the extent to which the most significant American presidents of the twentieth century were also those who most abused the office. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([31]–[40])

Answers at this level will demonstrate accurate recall of knowledge from across the period studied with clarity and precision. Answers will provide detailed and focused insightful explanations, drawing on actions, events, issues or perspectives across the period, and there is an excellent understanding of the connections or interrelationships between these. A judgement is reached using arguments that are fully developed, illustrated and substantiated about the extent to which the most significant American presidents of the twentieth century were also those who most abused the office. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high standard of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Indicative ContentAVAILABLE
MARKS**(a) Richard Nixon**

An argument in support of the proposition might focus first on the presidency of Richard Nixon, which seemed to veer from monumental achievement to dramatic abuse of power. Nixon's greatest achievements were all in the field of foreign policy, and in the context of the late 1960s and early 1970s they were quite stunning in their scope and imagination. When Richard Nixon assumed office in 1969, the Cold War was characterised by a spiralling nuclear arms race and a lack of substantive contact between America and the USSR, with the potential for any one of a number of flashpoints across the world (such as Berlin) to set off a crisis similar to that of Cuba in 1962. At the same time, China, the world's most populous country and a superpower in the making, remained in the international wilderness and outwardly hostile to the United States. Nixon also inherited from Johnson and Kennedy a war in Vietnam in which over 36 000 US service personnel had already lost their lives. Even though the US had more than half a million troops on the ground, there was still no end in sight.

In relation to Vietnam, Nixon introduced the policy of Vietnamisation – to hand over the burden of the fighting to the South Vietnamese army – and began to withdraw US troops. The peace that was achieved by January 1973 was far from perfect, but the war that had bitterly divided America was over and South Vietnam at least had a fighting chance of survival. While conducting this policy, Nixon totally transformed the Cold War by his approach to China, which not only began the process of normalising Sino-US relations, but also made the USSR more willing to negotiate a de-escalation of conflict with the West. The fruits of detente were substantial. Not only was Nixon the first US president to visit China and the USSR, but he also signed the ABM and SALT agreements in Moscow in May 1972. It was little wonder that he was re-elected by a landslide later that same year.

And yet, almost at the moment of his supreme triumph, Nixon's presidency began to fall apart as a consequence of Watergate. The unfolding scandal, which encompassed illegal wiretapping, burglary, criminal conspiracy and general abuse of power, would leave the presidency a damaged institution and Richard Nixon a political pariah, only avoiding impeachment by becoming the first president to resign from office in August 1974. Such was the scale of the wrongdoing that the very word "Watergate" entered the political lexicon as a generic term for malfeasance in public life.

(b) Lyndon Johnson

Lyndon Johnson, by any standard, is likely to be considered one of the twentieth century's most significant presidents, but his presidency was also flawed, though not perhaps to the same extent as that of Nixon. His programmes of social reform – encompassing the Great Society and the War on Poverty – were the most far-reaching and ambitious since the New Deal of the 1930s. However, many would argue that Johnson's greatest achievement was the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Voting Rights Act of 1965, which addressed the twin problems of segregation and denial of the franchise to many black Americans. What made this legislation all the more remarkable – apart from the fact that the issues had existed for 100 years – was that, as a white Southerner, LBJ was the last person who might have been expected to take the lead on civil rights.

However, like Nixon, Johnson's achievements were overshadowed by his handling of the war in Vietnam. A war that he kept saying was being won by America had still not ended by 1968, leading to the so-called "credibility gap" between what Johnson *claimed* to be the case and what many Americans actually *believed* was the case. When Johnson tried to convince the nation that the Tet offensive of 1968 had been a massive defeat for the North Vietnamese – which in fact was true – public opinion generally seemed no longer prepared to give this president the benefit of the doubt. Facing a challenge from within his own party for the presidential nomination and with the anti-war movement gaining momentum, LBJ withdrew. Like Nixon, four years after achieving a landslide election victory, LBJ's political career was over and his reputation shattered.

(c) Franklin Roosevelt

Candidates might extend analysis in support of the proposition by considering the presidency of Franklin Roosevelt. FDR is clearly a significant president – from the New Deal to the intimate bond that he established with the American people and his leadership of the country in World War II – but the success was not unqualified. The attempt to "pack" the Supreme Court was extremely controversial and attracted criticism from within his own party and from his vice president. Even the length of time that he served as president (12 years) provoked a negative reaction in some circles, having broken the unwritten rule established by George Washington that a president should serve no more than two terms in office. Candidates might argue that these actions were an abuse of power.

(d) Ronald Reagan

Much like Franklin Roosevelt, the popular and successful presidency of Ronald Reagan had its dark side in the form of the Iran–Contra affair. In 1986, some of the National Security Council staff were found to have engineered an arms sale to Iran in an ill-conceived attempt to win the release of Americans held hostage in Lebanon. Some of the proceeds from the arms sales were funnelled to rebels (the "Contras") opposing the Marxist government of Nicaragua. A subsequent investigation absolved Reagan of direct involvement or wrongdoing, but he was criticised for his "hands off" approach to government.

(e) Bill Clinton

Candidates might include the Clinton presidency in their argument in support of the proposition. While his achievements are modest by comparison with those of the presidents listed above, his period in office was certainly tainted by scandal, ranging from the Whitewater investments to the Monica Lewinsky affair, culminating in Clinton's impeachment and trial by the US Senate in 1999.

Counterargument

(e) Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson and Harry Truman

A strong counterargument can be constructed based on those presidencies that can claim to be significant but which were largely free of scandal and any obvious damage to the institution, such as those of Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson and Harry Truman. Eisenhower and Kennedy might also merit inclusion in this category.

Both Wilson and Teddy Roosevelt were significant social reformers and internationalists – Roosevelt by conviction, Wilson by necessity in the context of German aggression in World War I. Furthermore, the first Roosevelt established the US as a great naval power, while Woodrow Wilson set the agenda for the post-war world with his plan for a League of Nations. These were truly important figures in the twentieth presidency who added new dimensions to the office and took nothing away from it through scandal.

Harry Truman arguably added more than any other president to the power of the presidency in the context of the Cold War. Truman's foreign policy established some of the basic principles and commitments that marked American foreign policy for the remainder of the twentieth century, including the Truman Doctrine and the North Atlantic Treaty. It was also under Truman that the governmental support structure was created to allow America – and its president – to effectively act as Leader of the Free World. This was put in place by the National Security Act of 1947, which established the Department of Defense, the National Security Council and the Central Intelligence Agency. While there were controversies in the Truman administration, no scandal was ever personally attached to the president.

Any other valid material will be awarded appropriately.

[40]

40

Option 4

40

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Option 5: Clash of Ideologies in Europe 1900–2000

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Answer **either** Question 1 or Question 2.

- 1 “Relations between the Soviet Union and Western governments in the period 1917–1991 were primarily characterised by co-existence rather than conflict.” To what extent would you accept this verdict?

Synoptic Assessment

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

This question targets AO1: the candidate’s ability to demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[10])

Answers at this level may recall some accurate knowledge and display understanding of mainly one part of the period and one perspective. The answer will be characterised throughout by limited accuracy and a lack of clarity. Answers may provide a descriptive narrative of events. There will be few links and comparisons made between different parts of the period. Answers will be mainly a series of unsubstantiated assertions with little analysis of whether relations between the Soviet Union and Western governments were primarily characterised by co-existence rather than conflict. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([11]–[20])

Answers at this level may recall and deploy knowledge which draws from examples across the period. The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy and at times lack clarity. The answer will provide some explanation, though at times will lapse into narrative. Links and comparisons will be made but these will not be fully developed or analysed. Answers will contain some unsubstantiated assertions but also arguments which are appropriately developed and substantiated about whether there was either more co-existence than conflict in the relations between the Soviet Union and Western governments throughout the period analysed. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary.

Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Level 3 ([21]–[30])

Answers at this level will recall and deploy knowledge accurately, drawing from all parts of the period with clarity and focus. Answers provide focused explanations and make links and comparisons which are developed and analysed, indicating an understanding of the process of historical change. Arguments are developed, substantiated, illustrated and reach a judgement about whether there was a greater degree of co-existence rather than conflict between the Soviet Union and Western governments throughout the entire period. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([31]–[40])

Answers at this level will demonstrate accurate recall of knowledge from across the period studied with clarity and precision. Answers will provide detailed and focused insightful explanations, drawing on actions, events, issues or perspectives across the period, and there is an excellent understanding of the connections or interrelationships between these. A judgement is reached using arguments that are fully developed, illustrated and substantiated about whether relations between the Soviet Union and Western governments were primarily characterised by co-existence rather than conflict throughout the given period. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high standard of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Indicative Content

(a) Revolution and accommodation 1917–1924

The years immediately following the Bolshevik revolution were characterised by conflict. The ideological orientation of the new state, the withdrawal from World War One through the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk and the establishment of the Comintern mark the commencement of a period of intense conflict. This manifested itself most clearly with the intervention of Britain and France in the Russian Civil War on behalf of the Whites and also with the outbreak of the Russo-Polish War in 1920.

However, by 1920 there was a noticeable improvement in the international atmosphere. There was the development of the Anglo-Soviet trade arrangements in 1921 and the Treaty of Rapallo was signed with Germany in 1922, which significantly saw the normalisation of diplomatic relations between the communist and capitalist states. At the same time, the Soviet Union attended the Genoa conference reflecting the considerably less tense relations than had been the case in the immediate aftermath of the Bolshevik seizure of power.

(b) Isolation, co-operation and conflict 1924–1945

Stalin's emergence as the leader of the Soviet Union in the late 1920s has traditionally been viewed as marking a distinct turn from the internationally minded Lenin. However, any calm was to be shattered with the emergence of fascism in southern and central Europe. In its various manifestations fascism was in open conflict with communism, both domestically and internationally. The Spanish Civil War highlighted this conflict, with the involvement of both the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany on opposing sides, as does the signing of the Anti-Comintern pact between Mussolini and Hitler in 1937.

This bitter ideological struggle also allowed for limited co-operation between the Soviet Union and traditional democratic states, most notably with the admission of the Soviet Union into the League of Nations and the signing of the Mutual Assistance Pacts with France and Czechoslovakia in 1935. Such alliances proved to be largely meaningless, as states switched commitments on the basis of brutal political realities, and by 1941 the Nazi-Soviet Pact had collapsed with the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union. The period 1941–1945 saw uneasy co-existence between capitalist and communist states as fascism brought the most devastating conflict in human history to the members of the Grand Alliance. The uneasy nature of this co-existence was evident in the conferences in Tehran, Yalta and Potsdam, which also witnessed the emergence of the United States as a key influence in the relations between the European states.

(c) The origins of the Cold War 1945–1956

The co-operation and uneasy co-existence that had been evident at times during the inter-war years and had been most evident in the opposition to fascism, was to flounder in the aftermath of the war, as two blocs emerged in distinct conflict with each other. The Cold War took several forms but did not break out into direct conflict. What was to appear a reasonable action by one superpower was frequently regarded as anything but by the opposing power. The Soviet takeover of eastern Europe could be interpreted as either inherently aggressive or a recognition of the security needs of the Soviet Union. The establishment of the Marshall Plan was either the most generous act in human history or an example of "dollar imperialism." At the heart of the conflict was Germany, and in particular Berlin. Indeed, the nature of the conflict was epitomised in the Berlin Blockade and the subsequent airlift of 1948–1949.

(d) Peaceful co-existence and détente 1956–1979

The death of Stalin and the emergence of Khrushchev, and then Brezhnev, had considerable impact on relations between the major powers. A pattern of co-existence emerged that was punctuated by frequent spikes in tension which never developed into overt conflict across the continent of Europe. The shift from conflict to co-existence was signalled by Khrushchev in his "secret speech" of 1956 and appeared evident in the Geneva summit of the previous year. However, tensions remained evident, with the creation of the Warsaw Pact in 1955 and the Soviet invasion of Hungary in 1956, the building of the Berlin Wall in 1961 and the Soviet suppression of Czechoslovakian reformism in the spring of 1968. The hostility of the West remained largely rhetorical and, although there appeared to be every likelihood that events outside Europe, such as those in Cuba, could lead

AVAILABLE
MARKS

to everyone's demise, degrees of co-operation remained evident in the establishment of the "hotline" between Moscow and Washington and the signing of Test Ban Treaty in 1963.

Despite the changes in governments and leaderships across Europe, or indeed within the United States, it could be argued that co-existence remained the dominant characteristic of the era. Notwithstanding the assertion of Soviet dominance over its eastern European Empire with the creation of what became known as the Brezhnev Doctrine, relations appeared to reach a new high. Co-existence took the form of what was to be known as détente. In 1972 SALT appeared to address anxieties about the arms race and this was followed up with agreement on the Prevention of Nuclear War in 1973. Summit diplomacy reached its apex with the Helsinki Accords of 1975.

(e) The end of the Cold War 1979–1991

Co-existence collapsed with the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in December 1979 and the development of what became known as "The Second Cold War." While once again there was no direct conflict, there was a notable shift away from the co-existence of previous years. The ideological chill was evident in the new regimes in London and Washington and the arms race gained a new intensity with the arrival of Pershing and Cruise missiles and the Soviet deployment of SS20s. The propaganda conflict was waged intensely, with western governments and institutions promoting dissident movements throughout eastern Europe, most notably in Poland.

However, it was to be a communist leader who was to bring about victory for democracy and capitalism. Gorbachev's radical domestic policies were coupled with an equally radical set of foreign policies that were to culminate in the rejection of both the Brezhnev Doctrine and nuclear diplomacy. The resurgence of summits was to witness a new era of co-existence that led firstly to the end of the Cold War and then the collapse of the Soviet Union itself. A near century-long conflict ended not through military victory but with the internal collapse of one of the two Empires.

Any other valid material will be awarded appropriately.

[40]

40

- 2 "Fascist and communist governments adopted aggressive foreign policies, while democratic governments pursued peaceful and conciliatory policies." How far would you agree with this assessment of the foreign policies of the Soviet Union and Western governments in the period 1917–1991?**

Synoptic Assessment

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

AVAILABLE
MARKS

This question targets AO1: the candidate's ability to demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[10])

Answers at this level may recall some accurate knowledge and display understanding of mainly one part of the period and one perspective. The answer will be characterised throughout by limited accuracy and a lack of clarity. Answers may provide a descriptive narrative of events. There will be few links and comparisons made between different parts of the period. Answers will be mainly a series of unsubstantiated assertions with little analysis of the extent to which the fascist and communist governments adopted aggressive foreign policies, while democratic governments pursued peaceful and conciliatory policies. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([11]–[20])

Answers at this level may recall and deploy knowledge which draws from examples across the period. The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy and at times lack clarity. The answer will provide some explanation, though at times will lapse into narrative. Links and comparisons will be made but these will not be fully developed or analysed. Answers will contain some unsubstantiated assertions but also arguments which are appropriately developed and substantiated about the extent to which the democratic states adopted peaceful and conciliatory policies in contrast to fascist states and the Soviet Union. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([21]–[30])

Answers at this level will recall and deploy knowledge accurately, drawing from all parts of the period with clarity and focus. Answers provide focused explanations and make links and comparisons which are developed and analysed, indicating an understanding of the process of historical change. Arguments are developed, substantiated, illustrated and reach a judgement about the extent to which it is accurate to claim that fascist and communist governments adopted aggressive foreign policies, while democratic governments pursued peaceful and conciliatory policies. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([31]–[40])

Answers at this level will demonstrate accurate recall of knowledge from across the period studied with clarity and precision. Answers will provide detailed

AVAILABLE
MARKS

and focused insightful explanations, drawing on actions, events, issues or perspectives across the period, and there is an excellent understanding of the connections or interrelationships between these. A judgement is reached using arguments that are fully developed, illustrated and substantiated about the extent to which fascist and communist governments adopted aggressive foreign policies, while democratic governments pursued peaceful and conciliatory policies. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high standard of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Indicative Content

(a) **Revolution, aggression, uneasy co-existence and a gathering storm 1917–1939**

The Russian Revolution of 1917 witnessed internal regime change and the breaking of diplomatic protocols with the cancelling of foreign debts. The intervention of the major western powers in the Russian Civil War was equally forceful, as was the Polish attack on the new state in 1920. The establishment of the Comintern in the same year, with its intention to promote revolution abroad and sweep capitalism from the face of the planet, also demonstrated the forceful nature of the new regime.

By the early 1920s there was an uneasy normalisation of relations. A range of treaties, and the Genoa Conference of 1922, highlighted a less aggressive approach on the part of all states. However, candidates could highlight that tension was never far from the surface, as was evident in both the Curzon Ultimatum and the Zinoviev letter in 1923 and 1924 respectively. The emergence of Stalin saw a more isolationist Soviet approach, as domestic affairs took precedence and to some degree the same judgement could be applied to western governments due to the devastation of the Great Depression.

However, the rise of fascism in Italy, Germany and Spain was to see aggressive foreign policies taken to unprecedented levels. The response of the Soviet Union and democratic states was initially to set aside ideological differences for a more conciliatory and co-operative approach. The Soviet Union joined the League of Nations in 1934 and Mutual Assistance Pacts were signed with France and Czechoslovakia in 1935.

In contrast, fascist states, with their contempt for both “weak” democracy and Soviet communism, consolidated their approach with the brutal assault of the Nazi Condor Legion against the democratic forces and civilian population in Spain between 1936 and 1939 and also Italian and Spanish membership of the Anti-Comintern Pact of 1937. However, alliances proved highly flexible and former aggressors alternated partners as political circumstances dictated.

(b) **Total War and shifting alliances 1939–1945**

The Nazis betrayed France and Britain, as the latter had betrayed Czechoslovakia in 1938, and temporarily formed the Non Aggression Pact

AVAILABLE
MARKS

with the Soviet Union in 1939. However, as expected, the Pact was short-lived and the fascist powers, with the Nazis at the forefront, sought the annihilation of the Soviet Union from 1941 onwards. Mutual need led the allies to join with Stalin in the formation of the Grand Alliance. The temporary nature of the alliance was probably never in doubt and indeed the Soviets suspected the western governments of unnecessarily stalling over the liberation of Western Europe in an attempt to irrevocably weaken it.

(c) Origins of the Cold War 1945–1956

In the immediate aftermath of World War Two the aggressive Soviet takeover of eastern Europe was to lead the main opponents of communism to adopt a range of strategies, which were encapsulated in the Truman Doctrine of 1947. The combination of financial support and the military willingness to resist communism outside the sphere of Soviet interest was to shape the ensuing decades. While tensions could rise, and the possibility of outright aggression by either side seemed occasionally possible, there was in effect a balance of power. The Berlin Blockade and Airlift highlighted this, as the West resisted Soviet aggression but was not prepared to risk armed conflict. Equally, the defeat of the Greek communists and the support of fascist monarchical and dictatorial regimes, not just in Greece in the late 1940s, but across the Iberian Peninsula, and the creation of NATO in 1949, witnessed the flexibility of western governments in dealing with Soviet communism in the immediate post-war years. What constituted aggression and defence appeared to be in the eye of the beholder.

(d) Peaceful co-existence and détente 1956–1979

In the years following the death of Stalin the existential threat of nuclear war led to a willingness to compromise and tacitly accept each others' areas of control or power across Europe. The major western governments largely followed a pattern of condemning Soviet control of eastern Europe, most notably when there was violent suppression of opposition to communist rule. This was evident in the mid-1950s when there were riots in Berlin and Poland and an uprising in Hungary in 1956, and when the Soviet-backed leadership of East Germany erected the ultimate symbol of a divided Europe, the Berlin Wall, in 1961. More noticeable were the summits and diplomatic initiatives. The Partial Test Ban Treaty of 1963 and the establishment of a "hot line" between Washington and Moscow demonstrated that the Soviet Union and western governments sought accommodation rather than conflict. The era most associated with this attitude was the period of détente that stretched from the late 1960s through the end of the 1970s. The SALT Agreement (1972) and the Helsinki Final Act of 1975 created the appearance of a settled set of relations between ideological adversaries.

(e) The Second Cold War and the collapse of Communism 1979–1991

The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan on Christmas Day 1979 coincided with the rise to power of virulent anti-communists in both Britain and the USA. The impact of this was to see the commencement of what became known as the Second Cold War. Western renewal of nuclear arsenals, virulent rhetoric and propaganda, support for dissident movements and the announcement of the "Star Wars" programme all signalled an aggressive foreign policy shift by western governments. Conflict seemed much more likely than co-operation. However, the destruction of the Soviet Union was to emerge through internal collapse rather than external aggression. The sea change in East-West relations originated from the rise to power of Gorbachev and his unilateral

decision to abandon the Brezhnev Doctrine and his rejection of the belief in the inevitable triumph of communism. His internal reforms sowed the seeds of imperial collapse and the short century that had been dominated by three competing ideologies emerged with a single victor by default.

Any other valid material will be awarded appropriately.

[40]

Option 5

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

40

40