



Rewarding Learning

ADVANCED

General Certificate of Education

2018

History

Assessment Unit A2 2
Historical Investigations and Interpretations



AHY21

[AHY21]

WEDNESDAY 13 JUNE, AFTERNOON

TIME

2 hours 30 minutes.

INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

Write your Centre Number and Candidate Number on the Answer Booklet provided.

Answer **three** questions from your chosen option. Answer Question 1, Question 2 and **either** Question 3(a) or 3(b).

Indicate clearly on your Answer Booklet which option you have chosen.

INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES

The total mark for this paper is 80.

Quality of written communication will be assessed in Question 3.

Option 1: England 1558–1603

Answer Question 1 and 2 and either Question 3(a) or 3(b).

Read the sources and answer the questions which follow:

Elizabeth I's relations with her Parliaments 1558–1603

Source 1

Extract from a statement by Elizabeth I to selected members of the House of Lords and the House of Commons in Whitehall Palace, 5 November 1566. The Queen is responding to pressure from Parliament over the issues of marriage and the succession.

How have I governed since the start of my reign in 1558? I will be tried by my own deeds since then. The petition made by both Houses consists of two points of concern, my marriage and the succession to the Crown. With regard to marriage, I have given an answer to my Privy Councillors. This was that any such marriage would be agreed by me alone. This they would not accept, even though it was spoken by their own Queen.

The second point was to do with the succession to my Crown. Here nothing was said by either House about my own safety in the face of threats against me, only their own concerns. It is a strange thing that Parliament should direct the monarch in such a grave cause, which with careful consideration affects me more than Parliament itself. Marriage at present is not convenient, and never will be without some danger to my person. I am your lawful and anointed Queen. I shall never be compelled by violence to do anything against my will.

Source 2

Extract from a speech by the Speaker, Sir John Croke MP, to the House of Commons, 25 November 1601. He is talking about a Monopolies Bill which had been passed the previous day.

Her Majesty has requested me to deliver unto you her most gracious message to the House. The Queen has been given to understand, through advice from some of her councillors and representations from some of her subjects, that she has approved laws which have harmed her people. The Queen never intended to grant anything that was evil in itself, nor was she aware that any laws she had approved had been abused. Her Majesty instructs me to tell the House that she herself will present orders to reform any such laws and to defend her people from all oppressions.

1 (a) Use Source 1 and Source 2 and your own knowledge of this period.

Which of the sources would an historian value most as evidence in the study of Elizabeth I's relations with her Parliaments in the period 1558–1603?

[15]

(b) Use Source 1 and Source 2 and other evidence you have studied.

How far do the sources support the view that Elizabeth I had full control over her Parliaments between 1558 and 1603?

[20]

Elizabeth I's policy towards France

Interpretation A

Extract from Susan Doran, *Elizabeth I and Foreign Policy 1558–1603*, published in 2002.

Elizabeth I pursued consistent foreign policy aims towards France. Her aims were primarily defensive and she entertained no dreams of expansionism in France. Her first priority was security. To defend her borders, she was prepared to use force to keep the French out of Scotland. To prevent a joint invasion by the Catholic powers, she tried to keep on good terms with both France and Spain; when she quarrelled with one, she sought better relations with the other. A secondary aim concerned the defence of European Protestantism. Thus, she provided diplomatic and financial aid to the Calvinists in France, which arguably contributed to their survival. Similarly, she gave loans and troops to enable Henry of Navarre to fight Spain's superior forces and the French Catholic League. This helped Henry in his darkest hours and by the time of Elizabeth I's death the Spanish presence had been removed from France.

© *Elizabeth I and Foreign Policy, 1558-1603* by Susan Doran (ISBN: 978-1134741205) Published by Taylor and Francis, 2002

Interpretation B

Extract from an article by Paul Hammer, entitled *The Crucible of War: English Foreign Policy 1589–1603*, published in 2005.

The assassination of Henry III in 1589 brought the French crown to Henry of Navarre, a Protestant prince whose accession as Henry IV of France was bitterly opposed by the Catholic League, which had allied itself with Spain. Although Elizabeth I aimed to restrict England's costly entanglement in European affairs, she could not afford to see Henry IV toppled by his Catholic enemies, or the French Channel ports made ready to welcome some future Spanish Armada. She therefore found herself compelled to support Henry IV and by September 1589 some 4,000 English troops were available to serve in France. But Elizabeth I mistrusted the French king, often threatening to withdraw English forces from France but then changing her mind. The widely acclaimed Anglo-French operation to capture Rouen proved a huge waste of lives and money. Henry IV's conversion to Catholicism in 1593 represented another setback for Elizabeth I's foreign policy. She withdrew her troops from France in February 1595, just a month after Henry IV had proved his commitment to England by formally declaring war against Spain. However, Elizabeth I reversed her decision after Spanish troops captured Calais in April 1596. On 14 May England and France concluded the Treaty of Greenwich, which committed Elizabeth to provide money and men to France to counteract the Spanish threat.

© *Tudor England and its Neighbours* by Susan Doran and Glenn Richardson (ISBN: 978-0333946107) Published by Palgrave Macmillan, 2005

2 Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B.

Using the interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of Elizabeth I's policy towards France do you find more convincing?

[25]

3 Quality of written communication will be assessed in this question.

Either

(a) “Catholicism represented a significant threat to Elizabeth I in England between 1558 and 1603.” To what extent would you agree with this statement? [20]

Or

(b) “Economic developments in England in the period 1558–1603 were characterised by change rather than continuity.” How far would you accept this verdict? [20]

Option 2: Ireland 1685–1714

Answer Questions **1 and 2** and either Question **3(a)** or **3(b)**.

Read the sources and answer the questions which follow:

The Causes of the Glorious Revolution

Source 1

Extract from the letter of invitation from the “Immortal Seven” to William of Orange, 30 June 1688. The “Immortal Seven” were representatives of the English political and religious establishment who were dissatisfied with the rule of James II.

The people are so dissatisfied with the government in relation to their religion and liberty that you can be confident that the vast majority desire political change. Most of the nobility and gentry are also discontented, and their leaders are sure to rally to you. If sufficient numbers accompanied you, any landing would attract enough support to outnumber the army. Indeed, so many soldiers express opposition to the advance of Catholicism that significant numbers are likely to desert to your cause. We believe that delay will only allow the situation to deteriorate, with more Catholics appointed as officers and soldiers of the army, and a packed parliament due to meet soon. Circumstances favour action now, with the people and ourselves ready to follow your leadership.

Source 2

Extract from William of Orange’s declaration of 30 September 1688 in response to the invitation from the “Immortal Seven” to undertake a military expedition to England.

The peace and happiness of any state cannot be maintained when its laws, liberties and customs are openly disregarded. This is especially the case when there is an attempt to alter the religion of a state. Those around King James II have claimed for the Crown a power to suspend or dispense laws that have been enacted by the authority of Crown and Parliament. The King had promised that he would support the Church of England, but as a result of the use of the dispensing and suspending powers, the Test Acts have been made ineffective. A Commission for Ecclesiastical Causes has been established which has further undermined the Church by suspending the Bishop of London and dismissing the President and Fellows of Magdalen College, the control of which has been placed in the hands of Catholics.

1 (a) Use Source 1 and Source 2 and your knowledge of this period.

Which of the sources would an historian value most as evidence in a study of the causes of the Glorious Revolution? [15]

(b) Use Source 1 and Source 2 and other evidence you have studied.

How far do the sources support the view that the most important reason for the Glorious Revolution was that James II had lost the support of England’s political leaders? [20]

The Reasons for the Failure of the Siege of Derry 1688–1689

Interpretation A

Extract from J.C. Beckett, *The Making of Modern Ireland 1603–1923*, published in 1966.

On 12 March 1689, James II had arrived in Ireland from France and in April he had advanced against Londonderry. The city had received some reinforcements from England, but it was in poor shape to withstand a siege, and James did not expect much resistance. He opened negotiations for surrender, and Robert Lundy, the governor, was inclined to accept the King's offer. Lundy seems to have thought that the city could not be defended. But popular feeling in Londonderry was overwhelmingly in favour of resisting James. Lundy was overthrown, James's terms were rejected and the siege began. Some 30,000 people were crowded within the walls. Supplies of food soon ran low; thousands died of starvation and the soldiers were so weakened by hunger that they could sometimes hardly stand on guard. But this hardship did not shake the resolution of the commanders who had overthrown Lundy. These were Major Henry Baker and Reverend George Walker, who had taken refuge in the city and now commanded the garrison. They refused to consider surrender terms, and their refusal was encouraged by the arrival of an English fleet in Lough Foyle in the middle of June.

© *The Making of Modern Ireland 1603–1923* by J.C. Beckett. Published by Faber and Faber, 1966

Interpretation B

Extract from Maurice Ashley, *James II*, published in 1977.

Louvois, the French Minister of War, had no wish to send regiments to Ireland when they were needed on the European mainland. He was also careful to ensure that the arms provided for the Irish were surplus to Louis XIV's requirements elsewhere, with the muskets and swords being of particularly poor quality. Even though James II was able to recruit a fairly large army, it was not well equipped. By mid-summer, James's position in Ireland had seriously deteriorated. At the end of July three provision ships succeeded in forcing their way into Lough Foyle, thus giving welcome relief to the harassed garrison of Londonderry which, owing to the blockade under the command of Marshal Rosen, had been eating dogs and cats. Rosen immediately ended the siege; a more aggressive attitude earlier might well have enabled him to capture the city. Rosen's only positive plan was to compel the garrison to surrender by terrorising it through slaughtering captured Protestants in front of the walls. James II vetoed that plan.

© *James II* by Maurice Ashley (ISBN: 978-0460120210) Published by J. M. Dent, 1978

2 Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B.

Using the interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of the reasons for the failure of the Siege of Derry do you find more convincing?

[25]

3 Quality of written communication will be assessed in this question.

Either

(a) To what extent was the Earl of Tyrconnell responsible for the problems James II encountered in Ireland in the period 1685–1688? [20]

Or

(b) “The motivation for the introduction of the Penal Laws was primarily political rather than religious.” How far would you agree with this statement? [20]

Option 3: Ireland 1778–1803

Answer Questions 1 and 2 and either Question 3(a) or 3(b).

Read the sources and answer the questions which follow:

The Catholic Question 1789–1798

Source 1

Extract from Wolfe Tone, *An Argument on Behalf of the Catholics of Ireland*, published in 1791.

It is said that the Catholics are ignorant and, therefore, incapable of liberty. If this is true, what has made them ignorant? Not the hand of nature, for I presume that they are born with ability like other men. Rather, it is the cruel injustice of Protestant bigotry that has made them ignorant. They are excluded by law from the possibility of education, something that every Irishman has a right to demand. They cannot obtain degrees and, therefore, do not enter university. Surely it is the duty of a conscientious Parliament to address this issue. Give them education, open their eyes, show them that the law amounts to more than Penal statutes. Give them the franchise, let them own property; let them be citizens, let them be men.

Source 2

Extract from a letter from the Reverend John Cleland, Church of Ireland minister for Newtownards, to his brother, James Cleland, 22 April 1795. He is reporting on a debate he witnessed in the Irish House of Commons about the recent dismissal of Earl Fitzwilliam as Lord Lieutenant by the British government.

Mr Grattan proposed that a committee be set up to investigate the dismissal of Earl Fitzwilliam. It should judge whether Fitzwilliam, his ministers in Ireland or the British cabinet was to blame for his dismissal. Grattan argued that the British cabinet was solely to blame, and had missed an opportunity to introduce the sensible policy of Catholic Emancipation and also reform a corrupt Irish government. Mr Robert Stewart replied on behalf of the Irish administration, declaring that he was happy for the House to judge whether Earl Fitzwilliam had acted according to his instructions from the British government or whether he had exceeded and disobeyed those instructions. He believed that Fitzwilliam was betrayed by Mr Grattan and his party, and made to believe that the Catholic Question must be addressed urgently. Fitzwilliam had then acted prematurely, justifying his recall. Mr Stewart then called on the country to rally around its King and his government at this very critical period.

1 (a) Use Source 1 and Source 2 and your knowledge of this period.

Which of the sources would an historian value most as evidence in a study of the Catholic Question in the period 1789–1798?

[15]

(b) Use Source 1 and Source 2 and other evidence you have studied.

How far do the sources support the view that the Catholic Question dominated Irish politics in the period 1789–1798?

[20]

The Act of Union 1800

Interpretation A

Extract from Michael J. Turner, *Pitt the Younger: A Life*, published in 2003.

Although the United Irish Rebellion of 1798 was an organisational and military failure, it confirmed Pitt in his opinion that Ireland and Britain should be united under one Parliament. Instability in Ireland had encouraged French intervention, first at Bantry Bay in 1796 and then in Connaught in August 1798, and since Ireland was a weak point in Britain's defences, it had to be brought into a more consolidated system. George III's message to the British Parliament relating to the proposed legislative union also stressed the need to defeat the supposed French plan of separating Ireland from Britain. Britain's security and international position were also on the mind of Auckland, the Postmaster-General, one of the Union's strongest supporters and a close friend of Pitt.

© *Pitt the Younger: A Life* by Michael J. Turner (ISBN: 978-1852853778) Published by Hambledon and London Limited, 2003

Interpretation B

Extract from Anthony Malcolmson, *The Act of Union*, published in 1981.

From the British government's point of view, the constitutional settlement of 1782 and 1783, by which the Irish Parliament had secured its independence of British control, left the connection between the two kingdoms dangerously vague and imprecise. In 1785 the British government made an attempt to make the connection tighter and better defined, but the attempt failed amid much bitterness on both sides of the Irish Sea. Then, in 1788, King George III went mad, and it became necessary to appoint a regent. Although the British and Irish Parliaments both named the Prince of Wales as Regent, the Irish Parliament appointed him Regent on different terms from the British. Fortunately, the King almost immediately afterwards recovered, but the episode served to increase the desire of British politicians to draw the two kingdoms more closely together, if necessary by a Union. The defect of the Irish Parliament, in the British government's view, was not that its loyalty to Britain was suspect. It was, on the contrary, almost extravagantly loyal. What was wrong with it was, first of all, that it was corrupt even by the standards of the contemporary British Parliament; and secondly, that it was strongly and bitterly opposed to all concessions to the Irish Roman Catholics, even though they composed the overwhelming majority of the population of Ireland.

© *The Act of Union* by Anthony Malcolmson. Published by Public Record Office of Northern Ireland, 1981

2 Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B.

Using the interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of the motives for the introduction of the Act of Union do you find more convincing? [25]

3 Quality of written communication will be assessed in this question.

Either

(a) "The decline of the Volunteers after 1782 was mainly a result of the personal and political rivalry between Henry Flood and Henry Grattan." How far would you agree with this assessment? [20]

Or

(b) To what extent was the failure of the 1798 Rebellion due to the shortcomings of its leaders? [20]

Option 4: Partition of Ireland 1900–1925

Answer Questions 1 and 2 and either Question 3 (a) or 3 (b).

Read the sources and answer the questions which follow:

The Causes of the Easter Rising of 1916

Source 1

Extract from an article by Patrick Pearse, entitled *From a Hermitage*, published in November 1913. Pearse became a leading member of the Irish Republican Brotherhood, an organisation pledged to the establishment of an Irish Republic by force of arms.

The present generation of nationalists is not only unfamiliar with arms but hates all who are familiar with arms. It is typical of the nationalist that he ridicules the Orangeman not for his numerous ridiculous beliefs, but for his readiness to fight to defend those beliefs. But this is wrong. The Orangeman should be respected for his willingness and ability to fight for his beliefs. It is foolish for the Orangeman to believe that his personal freedom will be threatened by Home Rule. But in his view, it is common sense and his clear duty that he should arm himself to defend his freedom. Personally, I think that the Orangeman with a rifle is a much less ridiculous figure than a nationalist without one. The rifles of the Orangemen are bound to be useful some day.

Source 2

Extract from an article by James Connolly, entitled *Cannon Fodder for British Imperialism*, published in February 1916. Connolly was the leader of the Irish Citizen Army, which played a key role in the Easter Rising of 1916.

Throughout the Home Rule game, the Irish Parliamentary Party (IPP) was outwitted and bulldozed by the Unionists. It surrendered every advantage to the skilful campaign of the Orange military gang in peacetime but has also behaved in a cowardly and treacherous manner in the war. The war has encouraged the IPP to allow the slaughter of its countrymen in exchange for the gracious smiles of the English. The IPP set out to prove that the nationalists were more like slaves than the Orangemen and would more readily kill and be killed at the bidding of an Empire that hated them both. The Orangemen have at least the satisfaction that they are fighting to save an Empire they have been prepared to fight for in the recent past. However, the nationalists have been called upon to save an Empire whose rulers have refused to grant them basic freedom.

1 (a) Use Source 1 and Source 2 and your knowledge of this period.

Which of the sources would an historian value most as evidence in a study of the causes of the Easter Rising of 1916?

[15]

(b) Use Source 1 and Source 2 and other evidence you have studied.

How far do the sources support the view that Ulster resistance to Home Rule was the main cause of the Easter Rising of 1916?

[20]

Asquith's handling of the Home Rule Crisis 1912–1914

Interpretation A

Extract from Patricia Jalland, *The Liberals and Ireland: The Ulster Question in British Politics to 1914*, published in 1980.

The British Government had two possible ways to deal with the Ulster problem in the autumn of 1913. It could press forward with its policy of giving Home Rule to the whole of Ireland, regardless of the consequences, and prepare to deal firmly with any resistance from north-east Ulster. This was still the official policy of the Government. Alternatively, it could introduce some form of Ulster exclusion to meet the Ulster Unionist grievances. The Government might have been wiser to provide special terms for Ulster in 1912. The cabinet as a whole only recognised the seriousness of the Ulster situation by the autumn of 1913; from that point onwards the Liberals were working at a disadvantage. Over time, the Unionists kept revising their terms for a settlement. Asquith attempted to keep his options open for as long as possible. He negotiated for the most favourable terms, whilst keeping both sides guessing. This depended on the Government being able to claim that it could and would use the army to enforce its Home Rule Act in the whole of Ireland. In March 1914 its ability to claim this was severely reduced by pressures for compromise.

© *The Liberals and Ireland: Ulster Question in British Politics to 1914* by Patricia Jalland (ISBN: 978-0751201826) Published by Gregg Revivals, 1993

Interpretation B

Extract from Roy Jenkins, *Asquith*, published in 1964.

During 1912 and 1913 Asquith was aware that a crisis was developing over Ulster, yet made no firm attempt to resolve it. He tended to watch events calmly until he saw an opportunity to intervene effectively. There was no such opportunity in 1912 or 1913. This was also the position of many sides in the dispute at this stage. Many Liberals and the Irish Parliamentary Party would not support any compromise on the Home Rule Bill of 1912. The Agar-Robartes amendment of 1912 is often regarded as a great missed opportunity. However, it would not have satisfied the unionist opposition. In fact, no arrangement for exclusion in 1912 would have destroyed the opposition to Home Rule. Half of the English unionists were more interested in Dublin than Belfast. The other half, led by Bonar Law, though genuinely concerned with Ulster, were more concerned with destroying the Liberal Government. It is therefore unlikely that Asquith would have achieved more by an earlier attempt at an Ulster settlement.

© *Asquith* by Roy Jenkins. Published by Harper Collins, 1964

2 Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B.

Using the interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of Asquith's handling of the Home Rule Crisis of 1912–1914 do you find more convincing? [25]

3 Quality of written communication will be assessed in this question.

Either

- (a) “The failure of British Government policies in Ireland in the period 1916–1918 was mainly responsible for the success of Sinn Féin in the General Election of 1918.”
To what extent would you accept this verdict? [20]

Or

- (b) “The poor military tactics of the Anti-Treaty forces led to their defeat by the Free State Army in the Irish Civil War of 1922–1923.” How far would you agree with this verdict? [20]

THIS IS THE END OF THE QUESTION PAPER

Permission to reproduce all copyright material has been applied for.
In some cases, efforts to contact copyright holders may have been unsuccessful and CCEA
will be happy to rectify any omissions of acknowledgement in future if notified.