Rewarding Learning

ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education
2019

History

Assessment Unit A2 1
Change Over Time

[AHY11]

WEDNESDAY 5 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 Constitutional Revolution of 1640–1642 changed the relationship between Crown and Parliament more than any other event in the period 1625–1714." 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 the Constitutional Revolution of 1640–1642 changed the relationship between Crown and Parliament more than any other event 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 whether the Constitutional Revolution changed the relationship between Crown and Parliament more than any other event 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.

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 the Constitutional Revolution changed the relationship between Crown and Parliament more than any other event 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 accurately 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 the Constitutional Revolution changed the relationship between Crown and Parliament more than any other event 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 'Constitutional Revolution' of 1640–1642
The relationship between Crown and Parliament was transformed by the 'Constitutional Revolution'. Parliament succeeded in restricting the King's ability to rule without it by the passing of the Triennial Act and the removal of some of the Crown's financial prerogatives and the feudal courts. Parliament appeared to have secured a more regular role in government and limited royal power. However, many of Parliament's aims were not secured. The King retained the right to appoint his ministers and control the armed forces and church. The right to call, dismiss and prorogue Parliament also remained in the hands of the monarch. Indeed, it was Parliament's attempt to further change the relationship with the Crown through the Nineteen Propositions which led to a complete breakdown in relations and the outbreak of Civil War.

(b) The Execution of Charles I 1649
Arguably, the clearest change in the relationship between Crown and Parliament came with the execution of the monarch. The events of the two Civil Wars reveal the extent of the breakdown in their relationship and Charles I's execution evidences how far Parliament distrusted the King. However, the decision to execute Charles I was not supported by all members of Parliament and the army played a vital role in his downfall. The decision to restore the Crown in 1660 suggests that the execution of Charles I was more about removing the man than the monarch.

(c) The Restoration Settlement 1660–c.1665
The Restoration of Charles II in 1660 saw the monarchy make a remarkable comeback and the relationship between the King and his Parliament re-established. Although the restrictions of the Constitutional Revolution

AVAILABLE MARKS

remained in place, the Crown was restored to the dominant position in the relationship. Although Parliament did succeed in restricting the King's financial position by fixing his revenue at £1.2 million per year, the expansion of trade during his reign allowed Charles II to be in a strong financial position. Parliament restored the power and position of the Church of England through the Clarendon Code and Test Acts. The strength of the King's position is evident in Charles II's ability to rule without Parliament after the Exclusion Crisis.

(d) The Glorious Revolution and the Revolution Settlement 1688/1689

The relationship between Crown and Parliament was transformed by the events of the Glorious Revolution and the settlement which followed. The pro-Catholic actions of James II had resulted in his personal loss of power and Parliament was integral in the creation of a joint Protestant monarchy to replace James II. Through the Coronation Oath, Bill of Rights and revised financial arrangements, Parliament had changed its relationship with the Crown and increased its role and status. An alternative perspective may be to argue that the Revolution Settlement tackled the abuses of the reign of James II rather than transforming the relationship between Crown and Parliament. Many of the changes made were to restore Parliament's existing rights, rather than gain any new power.

(e) The Nine Years' War 1688–1697

Arguably, the most significant and long-lasting changes in the relationship between Crown and Parliament came as a direct consequence of King William's foreign policy. In order to generate the finances required to lead the Grand Alliance in Europe, William was willing to make a number of concessions to his Parliament. The Triennial Act, Commission of Accounts, Civil List and Bank of England all increased the likelihood of a more regular calling of Parliament and it became in the monarch's interests to have ministers capable of working well with the Commons and Lords. The Act of Settlement secured the Protestant succession and reflected the extent of Parliament's influence upon this new style of monarchy. The impact of the war in Europe brought about the establishment of a more effective working relationship between Crown and Parliament.

(f) The War of the Spanish Succession 1702–1714

The Crown's response to the War of the Spanish Succession during the reign of Queen Anne demonstrates the new style of parliamentary politics in England. The events in Europe became an issue of political division between the pro-war Whigs and the Tory 'peace party'. Anne's need to work with Parliament is evidenced by her willingness to replace her Whig government with a Tory alternative as concerns intensified about the extent and cost of the war in Europe. Candidates may also note other major political issues in this period which affected the relationship between Crown and Parliament, such as the union with Scotland.

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

40

2 "During the period 1625–1714 Parliament's clashes with the Crown were primarily motivated by financial considerations." How far would you agree with this assessment?

AVAILABLE MARKS

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 and 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 Parliament was primarily motivated by financial considerations in its clashes with the Crown 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 whether Parliament's clashes with the Crown were primarily motivated by financial considerations 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 whether Parliament was

AVAILABLE MARKS

primarily motivated by financial considerations in its clashes with the Crown 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 accurately 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 Parliament was primarily motivated by financial considerations in its clashes with the Crown 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) Personal Rule and the 'Constitutional Revolution' of 1640–1642
During the period of Personal Rule the King's methods of raising money had created significant opposition, most notably in the protests against the collection of Ship Money. However, the resultant Constitutional Revolution was not predominantly due to Charles I's financial policies and Parliament's demands were not primarily focused on financial reform. Although the Crown's prerogative financial devices were abolished, the Constitutional Revolution focused more on attacking the King's ability to rule without his Parliament and his controversial changes to the church. 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. It could be argued that Parliament feared that, if Charles I was able to attain financial independence, he could dispense with it and re-introduce Personal Rule. This would enable the King to introduce Catholicism unhindered, build up a standing army and in a Catholic, absolutist state, ride roughshod over his subjects' liberties.

(b) The Execution of Charles I 1649
The attempts to reach agreement with the King, after the end of the Civil War, failed more because Charles I could not be trusted over religion than because of his financial policies. In many respects, it was the attitude and actions of Charles himself which led to his trial and execution; he had proved himself unable, or unwilling, to reach a settlement with his conquerors. The leaders of the politicised army believed that England could not continue under the rule of this 'man of blood' and sought the creation of a new form of government in England. The decision to execute Charles I was therefore not motivated primarily by finance.

(c) The Exclusion Crisis
The return of Charles II followed 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 II was to clash with Parliament over his foreign policy, religious toleration and choice of minsters, as well as his financial policy. The most significant clash, however, was over the

succession of his brother James and the latter's open Catholicism. This was a conflict determined by religion rather than finance, and challenging the very concept of divine right and the respective prerogative powers of Crown and Parliament.

(d) The Glorious Revolution 1688

The strong economic and political position James II inherited was undermined not primarily by his financial policies 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 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.

(e) Nine Years' War 1688–1697

Although there was increasing opposition to the King's War as it progressed, the period 1688–1697 was marked more by co-operation rather than conflict between Crown and Parliament in the area of finance. 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 war. Parliament achieved royal dependence and accountability through the Commission of Accounts and Civil List, and a new Triennial Act established the duration of a Parliament as three years. It could be argued that William III's financial reforms had introduced a new era of constitutional government, of which Parliament was a regular and essential part. After Mary's death, William became increasingly unpopular as memories of the causes of the 1688 revolution faded. William III's initial attempt to rule with 'non-party' ministers had failed and, while he appointed a number of capable administrators, he was unable to fully gain the support of either the Whig or Tory Party.

(f) War of the Spanish Succession 1702–1714

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, the conflicts over financial, religious and foreign policy were more often between these parties than between Crown and Parliament.

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

Option 1 **40**

AVAILABLE MARKS

Option 2: Ireland Under the Union 1800–1900

AVAILABLE MARKS

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

1 "Between 1800 and 1900 nationalists only experienced success when British governments were weak, while the successes of unionists were only achieved when British governments were strong." To what extent would you agree with this assessment?

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 the extent to which any successes of unionists and nationalists between 1800 and 1900 was due to the relative strength of British governments. 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 any successes of unionists and nationalists between 1800 and 1900 was due to the relative strength of British governments. 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 on whether the relative strength of successive British governments between 1800 and 1900 was the main factor in determining the success of unionists and nationalists. 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 accurately 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 the strength of successive British governments was the main factor in determining the success of unionists and nationalists between 1800 and 1900. 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 strength of successive British governments was undoubtedly a key factor in determining the success of nationalists.

Henry Grattan's success was more apparent retrospectively, but he was impeded in his desires by the strength of the British government immediately after the passage of the Act of Union. By the 1820s, with O'Connell's leadership of constitutional nationalism, the weakness of the Westminster government and the splits in the Tory Party between Wellington and Peel led to a situation where Catholic Emancipation was likely to be passed. Wellington's government was weak in 1829 and this helped O'Connell 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. Despite the fact that Home Rule never passed into law under Parnell's leadership, he had achieved tangible success by making Ireland the dominant issue in Westminster politics. Candidates may reflect on the strengths and weaknesses of Gladstone's governments. Revolutionary nationalists were unfortunate to face a succession of strong British governments which definitely hindered their chances of success. The Dublin Castle authorities were aware of Emmet's plans and ready to resist him. Young Ireland in 1848, although facing a government dealing with the Famine, still found that the resources of the British were ample to stop their uprisings. Similarly, the Fenians in 1867 were partially defeated by the concerted efforts of a strong British administration which had pre-empted their moves and taken appropriate actions, such as purging those sympathetic to the Fenians from army battalions in Ireland, shipping in loyal troops and suspending Habeas Corpus in anticipation of the rebellion. The strength of successive British governments thus contributed to both success and failure for nationalism.

AVAILABLE MARKS

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

Popular support can be said to have been a contributing factor. Daniel O'Connell attracted mass popular support for his campaign for Catholic Emancipation. Through the Catholic Association, he combined the power of the Catholic masses and the clergy. The tactics of the Association, including the collection of the penny rent and mass rallies, all proved extremely effective in the Emancipation campaign. Conversely, during the Repeal campaign, O'Connell still managed to attract mass popular support to his cause, but not so effectively. Parnell's ability to mobilise mass popular support was a key factor in his success. Parnell's association with the Land League and 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 of nationalism. The success of Parnell and the Irish Parliamentary Party in the 1885 general election showed how widespread mass support contributed to success. O'Connell's own personal charisma and keen political intelligence were vital. O'Connell's recognition of the crisis at Westminster and within the Tory Party also played a part. The support of the Roman Catholic Church could also be discussed, as O'Connell had it on his side in the Emancipation campaign, as did Parnell in the 1880s, and this undoubtedly helped their cause. By contrast, the Church was lukewarm in its support for the Repeal campaign in the 1840s and removed its support from Parnell after the O'Shea scandal, thereby helping to determine success or failure. The role of leadership could also be discussed. O'Connell's dynamic leadership helped Emancipation but he was arguably not so dynamic with Repeal. The same was true in the Home Rule era as, although Butt was capable, he lacked Parnell's charisma and discipline, qualities which undoubtedly led to success for Parnell. The oratorical skills of certain leaders could also be discussed, such as those of O'Connell and Parnell.

Revolutionary nationalists were also affected by a range of other factors.

The leadership in all three attempted rebellions was lacking. Emmet was blinded by romanticism and planned unrealistically, Young Ireland failed to recognise how limited its support was and the impact the Famine would have, and it also suffered from having most of its leaders imprisoned or transported. The Fenians suffered divisions between the Irish and American leadership and this weakened them significantly. The Catholic Church condemned all revolutionary groups, particularly the Fenians, depriving them of vital support.

(c) The strength of successive British governments was undoubtedly a key factor in determining the degree of success enjoyed by Irish unionists in this period.

Unionists were fortunate in that they tended to have a great deal of support in British parliamentary circles, especially amongst the Conservatives. When a Tory government was in power, the unionists received strong backing for their attempts to resist campaigns such as Home Rule. The influence of men such as Randolph Churchill undoubtedly added strength to unionist campaigns and increased their chances of success. Even when the Liberals were in power, for example under Gladstone, unionists were fortunate that Home Rule was such a divisive issue within Gladstone's own Liberal Party. This contributed to an inherent weakness in Gladstone's own policy for Ireland and unionism's chances of success were again increased.

		AVAILABLE MARKS
(d) Arguably, however, other factors contributed more to the degree of success experienced by unionists. Candidates could comment on the contrast in the support enjoyed by Ulster and southern unionists. Due to demographics, Ulster unionists enjoyed mass support and had no problem mobilising it due to their numerical advantage in the north, as shown by the sheer number of organisations, such as the Ulster Loyal and Patriotic Union and the Ulster Defence Union. In the north, where unionism enjoyed a permanent majority, unionists could be confident, outspoken and even radical in their defence of the union, sometimes hinting at the use of force. The Ulster Defence Union collected funds for the organisation of resistance to Home Rule. All these organisations were proof of the mass support enjoyed by Ulster unionists. Southern unionists could never use the same methods, due to their different status as a permanent 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, 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 in their cause. However, the fact that Southern unionists were never able to enjoy the same degree of mass support undoubtedly hindered their chances of success. The quality of leadership could also be discussed, with men like Cooke, Saunderson and Sinclair able to mobilise support in the north. Even though Southern unionists such as Lansdowne and Midleton were key figures, they arguably did not or could not inspire the same kind of following in the south. Any other valid material will be awarded appropriately.	[40]	40

2 "O'Connell and Gladstone totally dominated their respective halves of the nineteenth century." How far would you accept this verdict on political developments in Ireland between 1800 and 1900?

AVAILABLE MARKS

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 significance of O'Connell and Gladstone in their respective parts of the century. 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 O'Connell dominated the first half of the century and Gladstone the second half. 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 O'Connell dominated the first half of the century and Gladstone the second half.

AVAILABLE MARKS

Responses should also begin to introduce other figures who were significant in both halves of the century and offer a counter argument. 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 accurately 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 O'Connell can be said to have been dominant in the first half of the century with Gladstone being the more dominant in the second half, as well as showing an appreciation of other figures who arguably dominated events at certain times throughout the century. 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) 1800–1850

An argument can certainly be made that Daniel O'Connell dominated the political landscape of Ireland in the first half of the nineteenth century. Daniel O'Connell's rise was remarkable in the 1820s as he challenged the leadership of the old Catholic Board and replaced it with the formation of the Catholic Association. Through his inspired leadership, control of the Catholic masses and tactics of mass meetings and contesting elections, O'Connell forced his presence and the issue of Emancipation on the British Government and so clearly dominated the 1820s. The way in which he backed Wellington's Government into a corner over the emancipation issue could also be used to illustrate how dominant O'Connell was at this time. O'Connell's years in the Lichfield House Compact would prove less fruitful and ultimately force him into a campaign to Repeal the Union. The alliance with the Whigs would yield some results but they were small successes for O'Connell and his popularity and indeed influence began to wane. However, when he embarked on the campaign for the Repeal of the Union, although less dynamic and enjoying less support, he still dominated the political landscape through his monster meetings and by this period quite inflammatory and sectarian speeches. Crowds of tens of thousands still turned out to hear him speak showing the influence he still held in his twilight years. Despite O'Connell's lack of success with Repeal and his declining influence before his death in 1847, it can be argued that he dominated the political scene in both Ireland and at Westminster from the 1820s until 1847, thereby supporting the premise of the question.

Candidates may go on to introduce other figures who can be said to have been dominant in the first half of the nineteenth century, even if only for a short time. Henry Grattan could be discussed for his idea and the fact that he first started the constitutional nationalist effort for redress of Ireland's constitutional status in the nineteenth century, but his efforts were ultimately frustrated by the British Governments he faced. Robert Emmet was undoubtedly a key figure and, although his trial created a stir after his failed rebellion, an argument could be made that his legacy of romantic but

AVAILABLE MARKS

heroic failure became dominant in the first half of the century and lingered on throughout the century. Robert Peel could also be discussed, particularly regarding the way in which he outmanoeuvred O'Connell during the Repeal campaign, but O'Connell had got the better of him over Emancipation in the 1820s.

The Young Ireland rebellion of 1848 and some of its leaders such as Thomas Davis could be discussed in terms of his contribution to cultural nationalism but similarly to Emmet, the legacy of Young Ireland's failure became the dominant aspect of their story rather than the doomed rebellion of 1848.

Although other figures may have been dominant for short periods or may have had had a legacy that became dominant, there is certainly a strong argument to be made that O'Connell dominated the first half of the nineteenth century like no other figure.

(b) 1850–1900.

Events after 1850 would again seem to indicate that Gladstone was the stand out figure of that period. His twelve years as Prime Minster across four successive terms would seem to support this theory. The skill with which he worked with Parnell, harnessing the latter's skills in order to advance the Home Rule agenda, could be discussed. Candidates may also discuss how, after his moral conversion to Home Rule for Ireland, he introduced successive Home Rule Bills in addition to significant reforms of the Anglican Church, often splitting his own party in the process and on several occasions losing the support of his party and his position as Prime Minister, partly due to his commitment to Home Rule as an issue. Despite Home Rule never being passed in his lifetime, he had succeeded in making Ireland the dominant issue of British politics for the foreseeable future by the time he finally retired from frontline politics in 1894 at the age of 84.

Candidates could again offer a counter-argument that there were some other key figures in the latter half of the century, the most notable probably being Charles Stewart Parnell. Parnell's oratory and his relationship with renowned Fenians such as Devoy and Davitt bridged 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 here that Parnell's dominance of not only the IPP, but also the House of Commons, holding as he did the balance of power after 1885, could all be cited in order to argue that Parnell deserves to be regarded as a dominant figure at this time. He was still dominating politics as late as 1890, but his spectacular fall from grace and eventual death would, however, send constitutional nationalism into a terminal decline for the rest of the century and may be used as a way to claim that he may not be regarded as being as truly dominant as Gladstone had been.

The Fenian Rebellion of 1867 could be discussed but the failure of that rebellion, although again adding to the developing romantic legacy of revolutionary nationalists, meant that the Fenians arguably did not dominate events. Their leaders such as James Stephens and Thomas J. Kelly could be discussed for their vision and planning and the rebellion was the most serious revolutionary threat faced by the British to that point and, although a military failure, did have a political significance. Candidates may be able to discuss the role of Devoy in re-organising Fenianism with the New Departure and therefore linking to Parnell and the Home Rule Campaign, linking to Parnell's dominance of the 1880s.

	AVAILABLE MARKS
Unionism, although a significant movement in the last decades of the nineteenth century, arguably never produced a figure to rival any of those previously discussed. Unionists felt that they had to protect the Union with England 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. The leaders such as Cooke, Saunderson, Midleton and Lansdowne were able to articulate these feelings into campaigns that gave rise to a range of organisations such as the Ulster Defence Union and the Irish Loyal and Patriotic Union who gave voice to unionist resistance to Home Rule. All of these figures were, however, active for only brief periods and therefore candidates may conclude that it is difficult to describe them as being truly dominant individuals.	
Any other valid material will be awarded appropriately. [40]	40
Option 2	**40**

Option 3: The Causes and Consequences of Great Power Conflict 1848–1945

AVAILABLE MARKS

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

1 To what extent would you agree with the view that nationalism was the main cause of the wars which were fought in Europe between 1848 and 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 whether nationalism was the main cause of the wars which were fought 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 whether nationalism was the main cause of the wars fought in Europe between 1848 and 1945, possibly concentrating on only one or two 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

AVAILABLE MARKS

an understanding of the process of historical change. Arguments are developed, substantiated, illustrated and reach a judgement about whether nationalism was the main cause of the wars which were fought 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 accurately 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 nationalism was the main cause of 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) Nationalism had a role to play in starting many of the European wars between 1848 and 1945, posing threats to the status quo established at Vienna in 1815 and Paris in 1919. Countries fearing fragmentation were more inclined to risk conflict, hoping that external threats would defuse internal grievances. Nationalism made war more likely when outside help to nationalists threatened the integrity of the mother country. As national feelings increased in certain countries, inflamed public opinion exerted pressure for a more vigorous, possibly dangerous, foreign policy. The best responses will note not only instances where nationalism led directly or indirectly to war, but also show awareness that factors other than nationalism could also lead to conflict.

(b) The North Italian War of 1859 was predominantly nationalist, Piedmont and its French ally fighting to remove the Austrians from Lombardy and Venetia. The formation of the resultant Kingdom of Italy is often seen as a nationalist triumph. The wars of German unification may be seen as caused by nationalism. German nationalist opinion, outraged by Denmark's policies towards Schleswig-Holstein, supported the Austro-Prussian attack, ostensibly in the name of "Germany." The Austro-Prussian War of 1866 resulted in a new North German Confederation, while Prussia's victory over France (1870–1871) brought the southern German states into the Confederation, henceforth known as the German Empire.

(c) Against the proposition, responses may observe that Cavour was concerned with Piedmontese expansion, while Napoleon III envisaged only a tripartite Italy, not the nationalist dream of a unitary state. Similarly, Bismarck was interested only in Prussian hegemony, the war with France being fought to cement a united, but Prussian-dominated, Germany. In 1877, when Russia came to the aid of its fellow Slavs, the Bulgarians, against the Ottoman Empire, this was part of a drive to remove Turkish rule from the Balkans and replace it with Russian influence, rather than promoting Slav nationalism.

AVAILABLE MARKS

(d) In the two decades leading up to the Great War, nationalist issues were prominent in international relations. The Ottoman Empire continued its decline, steadily retreating in Europe and creating the potential for Balkan conflict. Various national groups pushed for autonomy, attracting sponsors and alarming those who feared that newly-created countries could harbour enemy influence. The Habsburg Empire was prey to such fears, its leaders rightly suspecting Russian designs on the Balkans. Austria had its own nationalist problems, especially in its southern provinces. Here, the South Slavs attracted the support of Serbia, which adopted a belligerent attitude to Vienna and found itself supported by Russia, whose professed interest in Pan-Slavism concealed expansionist ambitions. Austria was greatly alarmed by these developments. In Germany and France, right-wing pressure groups stoked up nationalist fervour and encouraged governments to increase military spending and adopt belligerent foreign policies. Bosnia-Herzegovina, an Austrian protectorate since 1878, was absorbed into the Habsburg Empire in 1908, a blow to South Slav national ambitions. This also poisoned relations with Serbia, dashing its hopes of leading a South Slav state. Nationalist aspirations also lay behind the Balkan League, which aimed to liberate the remaining Turkish territory in Europe. Thus, the Balkan War of 1912–1913, as well as its sequel, fought in 1913, may be seen as primarily inspired by nationalism.

(e) For the immediate causes of the First World War responses should note the hostility between Austria and a Serbia angered by the Imperial "occupation" of Slav lands. Princip, the assassin of Franz Ferdinand, was inspired by nationalist passions, while both the Austrian and Serb responses were influenced by nationalism – Austria by fear of it fragmenting the Empire, and Serbia by its own claim to be the champion of Slav aspirations. But the escalation of the crisis owed less to nationalism and more to mutual German and Russian wariness, leading to an arms race. Moreover, the German need to support Austria, its only serious ally, and the competing alliance systems, which drew all the major powers into a devastating war, may provide more compelling causes of the First World War than nationalism alone.

(f) The 1914–1918 war ensured the triumph of Balkan nationalism. Together with the earlier creations of Italy and Germany, and the post-war emergence of Poland and Czechoslovakia, the traditional form of nationalism and the perceived need for war to create nation-states were largely eliminated. But nationalism's relationship with war did not disappear altogether. The treaty-makers who painted the post-1918 map of Europe used a broad brush, leaving 19 million people living on the "wrong" side of the new frontiers. Croats, Slovaks and Transylvanian Magyars were, for example, denied national self-determination. But German grievances were the most important in helping to create a fresh war within twenty years. Even moderate German politicians such as Stresemann expressed concerns about perceived injustices at Versailles, and right-wingers like Hitler railed at the exclusion of Germans from their own country, whether in Austria, Czechoslovakia, eastern France or Poland. This emphasis on the *Volk* and the need to bring them "home" into the Reich was clearly nationalistic, and played a considerable part in the coming of war in 1939.

(g) After the First World War, Austria, shorn of its subject nations, had an overwhelmingly German population. Although it had never been part of the German Empire, Hitler made great play of its ethnicity, and, although an *Anschluss* was avoided in 1934, four years later, after agitation by Austrian Nazis, Germany invaded and incorporated Austria into the Third Reich. Although not a war, this was arguably a significant step towards one, as was the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia later in the same year. Germany

AVAILABLE MARKS

utilised the 3 million Sudeten Germans marooned on the Czech side of the border as an excuse for aggressive pressure until the western half of Czechoslovakia was absorbed into Germany, and Slovakia became a puppet state of Germany. Hitler had used nationalism to justify German expansion, and the same tactic was now employed against Poland, citing the alleged ill-treatment of the German population of the Polish Corridor. The other powers had failed to take effective action to preserve Austrian and Czechoslovakian independence. However, by 1939 France and Britain felt that they could stand aside no longer, and when Germany invaded Poland in support of fellow Germans, and therefore in the name of nationalism, war was declared, and the conflict of 1939–1945 had begun.

(h) Better responses may also consider the counter-argument to the proposition. They should note that the Second World War began for more reasons than nationalist ones alone. For example, economic reasons were key to Hitler's drive to the east as he sought not only *Lebensraum* but also guaranteed grain supplies; ideology was an important reason for attacking the USSR; and it was not only enclaves of Germans in Czechoslovakia and Poland which inspired German aggression, but, respectively, the Skoda munitions works and the need to reunite a divided Germany and gain control of Danzig.

(i) Candidates may choose to play down the part played by nationalism, arguing that Prussia's wars of the 1860s were fought in the interests of Prussian expansionism rather than German nationalism. The First and Second World Wars may be seen in the light of Great Power rivalry, something which predated nationalism, or as the result of economic factors, whereby trade rivalries and a struggle to gain control of vital raw materials or food supplies brought countries into conflict. Competing alliance systems may be held responsible for the escalation of a quarrel between Austria and Serbia into a World War in 1914. Another possible cause which could be mentioned is dissatisfaction caused by peace treaties, such as Versailles, which left some countries with grievances which festered and increased the likelihood of later conflicts.

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

AVAILABLE MARKS

2 "Alliances were more likely to lead to wars than to prevent them." To what extent would you agree with this view 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 influence of alliances on war or peace 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 whether alliances were more likely to lead to wars than to prevent them in Europe between 1848 and 1945, possibly referring only to one or two 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 role which alliances

AVAILABLE MARKS

played in causing or preventing 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 accurately 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 part played by alliances in bringing about the outbreak or prevention 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 proposition suggests that a country with allies is more likely to adopt a hardline bargaining position and be more prepared to risk war in pursuit of its objectives. Running counter to this is the argument of safety in numbers, that a potential adversary is less likely to run the danger of war if it knows that it will face a range of enemies. Additionally, there are occasions when, even without allies, a country may decide to go to war if it feels that its interests are sufficiently threatened. Examples of all these scenarios may be found in Europe between 1848 and 1945.

(b) 1859 offers support for the proposition. Piedmont, with unhappy memories of 1848, was not prepared to attack Austria unaided, so Cavour worked assiduously to secure a French alliance, even sending troops to fight in the Crimea in 1854. Napoleon III, lukewarm about Italian unification, saw a war as a means of pursuing his revisionist agenda vis-à-vis Vienna. Emboldened by French support, Cavour provoked Austria into a rash declaration of war. Prussia only went to war with Denmark in 1864 once it had secured an Austrian alliance, but this was not necessary for military purposes. Bismarck wished to be seen as acting in the name of all Germans, and Austria was a key member of the Confederation, while he may have secured the alliance to entrap Austria into a quarrel over Schleswig and Holstein. When that crisis led to war in 1866, Bismarck had arguably become more likely to go beyond the brink after signing an alliance with Italy, ensuring that Austria would have to divert 40 000 troops to fight on its southern front. Bismarck's victory over France (1870–1871) surprised contemporary observers, since Prussia was fighting on its own. Better answers might note, however, that the diplomatic isolation of his enemies may well have encouraged Bismarck to take greater risks, right up to declarations of war. Thus, in 1866 he had secured French neutrality, and four years later his diplomacy ensured that Austria and Britain both remained neutral.

(c) In the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–1878, Russia headed a coalition including Bulgaria, Rumania, Serbia and Montenegro. This undoubtedly made it confident in going to war, but it is likely that the Russian belief in terminal Ottoman weakness would have encouraged it to fight with or without allies. A later version of this alliance, the Balkan League, was formed in 1913 to

AVAILABLE MARKS

recapture what was left of Ottoman territory within Europe. This time Russia was not involved directly, but Bulgaria, Serbia, Greece and Montenegro went to war with Turkey to liberate Balkan territories. The alliance won, and responses may note that, individually, these countries would not have taken on even a clearly weakened Turkey. Again, when Bulgaria, dissatisfied with its paltry rewards from the First Balkan War, attacked its former allies, it is probable that it would not have done so without its Turkish ally.

(d) The years after the unification of Germany saw the creation of two rival alliance systems. The Triple Alliance, linking Germany, Austria and Italy, was complete by 1882, and even though Bismarck later tried to build bridges with Russia, and Austria and Russia agreed in 1897 to preserve the status quo in the Balkans, the Triple Alliance remained essentially intact. France and Russia allied in 1894, and Britain signed ententes, not quite alliances, but a step towards them, with France in 1904 and Russia in 1907. The existence of these two power blocs may be seen as illustrative of the pros and cons of the proposition. Obviously, there was a risk of a localised war escalating to take in all the powers, but the deterrent effect of alliances was also seen in the years before 1914. Morocco was a French protectorate, but Germany resented this, and on two separate occasions, in 1905 and 1911, it acted provocatively to demand French withdrawal, even sending a gunboat into the Moroccan port of Agadir. These were highly dangerous actions which could have led to war, but at each crisis Great Britain stood by its agreements with France, making it clear it would, if necessary, go to war, and Germany backed down. Even in the summer of 1914 political leaders in all the main capitals believed the threat of conflict to be further off than it had been for years, partly because of the danger of one dragging all into an unwanted war.

(e) The events at Sarajevo, and their aftermath, did, however, produce a major war. To a great extent this was due to the alliance system, thus supporting the proposition. Key to this was the German attitude: Austria was a vital ally and could not be seen to suffer humiliation from Serbian provocation. Thus, Austria received an unconditional declaration of support from its ally Germany. Allies France and Russia agreed a joint response to Austrian pressure on Serbia and the stage was set for conflagration. Individual statesmen were undoubtedly guilty of indifference during the crisis, but the main players were contracted to support their allies, and hence escalation was inevitable, despite Britain hesitating, but pointlessly, as its naval agreement with France would surely have brought it into the war.

(f) In the 1920s war weariness and economic exhaustion made general war unlikely, but this changed when the aggressive revisionist Hitler came to power in Germany. His targets lay to the east, where he could regain lost German territory and pursue economic security by seizing agricultural land. This placed Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland and the Soviet Union in his sights. Initially, after the experience of the First World War, major powers shied away from alliances, although the Little Entente of Czechoslovakia, Rumania and Yugoslavia, supported by France, lasted from 1920 until 1936. Before Italy and Germany became allies, Mussolini saw Austria as an Italian sphere of influence and, although more a “protector” than an ally of Austria, he successfully challenged a German attempt to seize it in 1934. Following the Anti-Comintern Pact of 1936, Italy and Germany moved towards a full-blown alliance, so in 1938 Austria had no allies, and was an easy prey for Hitler, who could claim *Anschluss* to be the will of its citizens. Czechoslovakia, however, was allied to France, which was in turn allied to

	AVAILABLE MARKS
Britain. Nonetheless these allies were of little use to Czechoslovakia, as, after increasing German pressure, they agreed at Munich in 1938 to meet Hitler's demands for what amounted to a German takeover. When Hitler placed Poland in his sights, both Britain and France offered guarantees of its continued independence, but logistics suggested that these guarantees were of no practical value. A possible deterrent might have been a triple guarantee involving the USSR, but this was not to be. Not only did Poland have no realistic allies in 1939, it faced invasion from both sides, as Stalin agreed with Hitler to partition the conquered country. The Nazi-Soviet Pact was, for Hitler, an alliance that gave him the freedom to attack Poland with impunity, thus supporting the proposition.	
Any other valid material will be awarded appropriately. [40]	40
Option 3	**40**

Option 4: The American Presidency 1901–2000

AVAILABLE MARKS

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

1 "Of all the American presidents in the twentieth century, the presidency of John F. Kennedy (1961–1963) witnessed the largest gap between what it promised and what it actually achieved." 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 the presidency of John F. Kennedy witnessed the largest gap between promise and achievement of all the American presidents in the twentieth century. 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 the presidency of John F. Kennedy witnessed the largest gap between promise and achievement of all the American presidents in the twentieth century. 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 the presidency of John F. Kennedy witnessed the largest gap between promise and achievement of all the American presidents in the twentieth century. 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 accurately 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 the presidency of John F. Kennedy witnessed the largest gap between promise and achievement of all the American presidents in the twentieth century. 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) John F. Kennedy

Candidates may choose to begin, and perhaps conclude, their consideration of the topic of presidential promise and achievement with the presidency of John Kennedy (JFK). The debate about the achievements of his presidency is ongoing. Certainly there are no legislative landmarks and one could argue that his 1000-day presidency was largely dominated by crisis management of the Cold War. However, there appears to be a broad consensus that, in his short time in office, he outshone all other twentieth-century presidents in terms of promise, particularly in the cultivation of a particular image and style. There are a number of factors that candidates might consider to explain the enduring Kennedy phenomenon.

In contrast to the somewhat staid image of the Eisenhower years of the 1950s, the new decade of the 1960s saw the birth of the youth culture that has dominated America ever since. It might not be a coincidence that, in 1960, 43-year-old John Kennedy became the youngest man ever elected president. In some ways, he remains frozen in time as a figure of youthful vigour and much-argued-about promise.

Kennedy's words were always more idealistic than his actual deeds, which tended towards the cautiously pragmatic. Even though he was disappointingly timid about the civil rights movement, he possessed an aura that made people think him a champion of freedom and hope. He also had the valuable knack of inspiring others to be bolder and nobler than he himself was. His presidency spawned a wave of idealism whose ripples could be felt for decades. His legislative achievement may be unimpressive, but the galvanising power of his image has lasted.

AVAILABLE MARKS

Young and attractive, John and Jackie Kennedy as a couple provided a stark contrast with the dowdiness of the likes of Truman, Eisenhower and Nixon. The Kennedy style blended perfectly with the aspirations of a middle-class country that had grown increasingly prosperous in the years since World War II. While he became the very icon of dashing manhood, his wife's impeccable taste was even more modern.

During a speech at Yale in 1962, President Kennedy told his audience, "The great enemy of truth is very often not the lie – deliberate, contrived, and dishonest – but the myth – persistent, persuasive, and unrealistic." He could not have known it at the time, but he might have been describing his own place in history. But that place in history, which arguably allowed his presentation or style ultimately to mask his lack of substantive achievement, was secured for him by his widow. The most enduring image of Kennedy's presidency, and of his whole life, is that of Camelot, the idyllic castle of the legendary King Arthur. As Jackie Kennedy said after his death: "There'll be great presidents again, and the Johnsons are wonderful, they've been wonderful to me – but there'll never be another Camelot again."

However, an alternative reading of the Kennedy presidency is that promise and achievement actually complemented each other during a critical period in the Cold War. While it would be difficult to assess the abortive Bay of Pigs operation in April 1961 as anything other than a failure for Kennedy, his handling of the Cuban missile crisis of October 1962 has generally been judged a master class of Cold War leadership. While carefully avoiding provocative action and coolly calibrating each Soviet countermeasure, Kennedy and his lieutenants brooked no compromise; they held firm, despite Moscow's efforts to link a resolution to extrinsic issues and despite predictable Soviet blustering about American aggression and violation of international law. In the tense 13 day crisis, the Americans and Soviets went eyeball to eyeball. Thanks to what Kennedy's special assistant Arthur Schlesinger Jr characterised as the president's "combination of toughness and restraint, of will, nerve, and wisdom, so brilliantly controlled, so matchlessly calibrated", the Soviet leadership blinked: Moscow dismantled the missiles, and a cataclysm was averted.

Similarly, JFK's response to the building of the Berlin Wall can be considered an achievement in that he was not drawn into a possible direct confrontation with the Soviet Union in the summer of 1961, but at the same time gave reassurance to the population of West Berlin that they were not going to be abandoned by their allies. Here, candidates might cite Kennedy's speech of June 1963 as an example of promise serving a practical purpose in confirming America's resolve to stand shoulder to shoulder with the people of that city and keep the torch of freedom alight.

In relation to Civil Rights, candidates might argue that Kennedy did assist with the registration of James Meredith, a black man, at the segregated University of Mississippi at Oxford in September 1962, by negotiating with Mississippi governor Ross Barnett. The president also responded to the violence employed by the authorities in Birmingham, Alabama, against Civil Rights protestors in the spring of 1963 by drawing up a Civil Rights Bill that would eventually be passed by his successor Lyndon Johnson.

(b) Franklin Roosevelt

There are possibly three other candidates who merit special consideration in terms of their emphasis on promise. One is Franklin Roosevelt (FDR), whose New Deal of the 1930s has been interpreted as essentially a public relations exercise that gave the impression of tackling the Great Depression but in

AVAILABLE MARKS

fact made relatively little headway. This theory places great emphasis on FDR as the great showman, with his radio "fireside chats", who gave people hope in the midst of despair, but who in fact achieved little until war pulled the country out of the economic doldrums. Whatever one's view of FDR's domestic policy, there can be little argument that his leadership in World War II was of real substance, so an analysis of this presidency might conclude that Roosevelt combined presentation and achievement. Indeed, by the time he died in April 1945, at the beginning of an unprecedented fourth term in office and with America on the brink of becoming a superpower, it could be argued that FDR's achievements had more than matched his promise.

(c) Ronald Reagan

A similar verdict might be passed on the presidency of Ronald Reagan. The so-called "Reagan Revolution" delivered a restored economy and substantive progress in nuclear arms reduction in the Cold War, but the former film star also knew how to deliver his lines on camera, and his public appearances were always meticulously stage managed. For example, when he was scheduled to give a speech on defence at the Lockheed assembly plant in Palmdale, California, in October 1984, the first sight the crowd had of the president was when he walked round the nose of the massive B1 Lancer bomber. As Sam Donaldson of ABC News remarked: "That was pure Hollywood. That was pure Ronald Reagan." Although this was not a repeat of "Camelot", Reagan and his wife Nancy were both former Hollywood stars who brought glamour back to the White House.

However, in support of the counter-proposition, candidates may develop a pro-Kennedy argument by nominating the presidency of Ronald Reagan as the one that witnessed the largest gap between promise and actual achievements. A possible interpretation of the Reagan years is that nuclear arms reduction and the eventual victory for the West in the Cold War had more to do with the enlightened policies of Michael Gorbachev than the hard-line stance of Ronald Reagan. A critical analysis of Reagan's foreign policy might also consider the Strategic Defence Initiative to have been a bluff that luckily paid off, while the official stance against negotiating with terrorists was seriously compromised by the revelations of the Iran–Contra affair. In relation to the economy, it could be argued that sustained growth was achieved at the price of a tripling of the US national debt, from $900 billion to $2.7 trillion. Furthermore, Reagan had actually pledged to *reduce* the national debt.

(d) Bill Clinton

Candidates might include the Clinton presidency in their analysis of promise and achievement by America's twentieth-century presidents. While his achievements are modest by comparison with many other presidents, Clinton is probably the one who most closely replicates the personal charisma and attractiveness of JFK. Like Kennedy, he could think on his feet and could carry an audience with his oratory. These gifts helped him survive scandal and impeachment.

(e) Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson and Harry Truman

Falling into a different category are those presidencies that can claim significant achievements but without being overly concerned with promise.

Both Woodrow Wilson and Teddy Roosevelt were significant social reformers and internationalists – Roosevelt by conviction and 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 Wilson set the agenda for the post-war world with his plan for a League of Nations.

		AVAILABLE MARKS
	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 guided America 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. These were truly important figures in the twentieth-century presidency who added new dimensions to the office and did not rely on gimmicks or artificial posturing to achieve their goals.	
(f)	**Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon** If the Kennedy presidency is regarded as a watershed event when promise became more important than achievement and changed how the office operated, the next two presidents do not conform to this pattern. Johnson and Nixon were not unmindful of their image, but it had a much lower priority than policy goals. Johnson's 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, while the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Voting Rights Act of 1965 addressed the twin problems of segregation and denial of the franchise to many black Americans. Nixon ended the war in Vietnam, which had bitterly divided America, and 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. Any other valid material will be awarded appropriately. [40]	40

2 "Richard Nixon (1969–1974) achieved more in foreign policy than any other American president in the twentieth century." To what extent do you agree with this statement?

AVAILABLE MARKS

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 Richard Nixon achieved more in foreign policy than any other American president in the twentieth century. 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 Richard Nixon achieved more in foreign policy than any other American president in the twentieth century. 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 whether Richard Nixon

AVAILABLE MARKS

achieved more in foreign policy than any other American president in the twentieth century. 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 accurately 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 Richard Nixon achieved more in foreign policy than any other American president in the twentieth century. 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) Richard Nixon

Richard Nixon was far more interested in foreign policy than in domestic affairs. It was in this arena that Nixon intended to make his mark. Although his base of support was within the conservative wing of the Republican Party, and, although he had made his own career as a militant opponent of communism, Nixon saw opportunities to improve relations with the Soviet Union and establish relations with the People's Republic of China. Politically, he hoped to gain credit for easing Cold War tensions; geopolitically, he hoped to use the strengthened relations with Moscow and Beijing as leverage to exert pressure on North Vietnam to end the war – or at least interrupt it – with a settlement. He would play China against the Soviet Union, the Soviet Union against China, and both against North Vietnam.

A year before his election, Nixon had written in the political journal *Foreign Affairs* of the Chinese, that "there is no place on this small planet for a billion of its potentially most able people to live in angry isolation". Relations between the two great communist powers, the Soviet Union and China, had been deteriorating since the 1950s and had erupted into open conflict with border clashes during Nixon's first year in office. The president sensed an opportunity and began to send out tentative diplomatic feelers to China. Reversing Cold War precedent, he publicly referred to the communist nation by its official name, the People's Republic of China.

A breakthrough of sorts occurred in the spring of 1971, when Mao Zedong invited an American table tennis team to China for some exhibition matches. Before long, Nixon dispatched his National Security Adviser Henry Kissinger to secret meetings with Chinese officials. As America's foremost anti-communist politician of the Cold War, Nixon was in a unique position to launch a diplomatic opening to China, leading to the birth of a new political maxim: "Only Nixon could go to China." The announcement that the president would make an unprecedented trip to Beijing caused a sensation among the American people, who had seen little of the world's most populous nation since the communists had taken power. Nixon's visit to China in February 1972 was widely televised. It was only a first step, but a decisive one, in the budding rapprochement between the two states.

AVAILABLE MARKS

The announcement of the Beijing summit produced an immediate improvement in American relations with the USSR – namely, an invitation for Nixon to meet with Soviet premier Leonid Brezhnev. It was a sign that Nixon's effort at "triangulation" was working; fear of improved relations between China and America was leading the Soviet Union to improve its own relations with America, just as Nixon hoped. In meeting the Soviet leader, Nixon became the first American president to visit Moscow.

Of more lasting importance were the treaties the two men signed to control the growth of nuclear arms. The agreements – a Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty and an Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty – did not end the arms race, but they paved the way for future pacts which sought to reduce and eliminate arms. Nixon also negotiated and signed agreements on science, space and trade.

With regard to the war in Vietnam, Nixon tried to use improved relations with the Soviets and Chinese to pressure North Vietnam to reach a settlement, but ultimately was only able to negotiate a flawed agreement in January 1973.

In his first year in office, Nixon had tried to settle the war on favourable terms. Through secret negotiations between Kissinger and the North Vietnamese, the president warned that, if major progress were not made by 1 November 1969, "we will be compelled – with great reluctance – to take measures of the greatest consequences". The National Security Council staff made plans for some of those options, including the resumed bombing of North Vietnam and the mining of Haiphong Harbor.

Nixon then took a step designed both to interfere with communist supplies and to signal a willingness to act irrationally to achieve his goals – he secretly ordered the bombing of communist supply lines on the Ho Chi Minh Trail in Cambodia. The president did not reveal any of this to the American people. Publicly, he said that his strategy was a combination of negotiating and "Vietnamisation", a programme to train and arm the South Vietnamese to take over responsibility for their own defence, thus enabling American troops to withdraw.

When he judged it necessary – as in Cambodia in 1970 and Laos in 1971 – Nixon was prepared to launch cross-border expeditions against communist sanctuaries in supposedly neutral countries in order to facilitate the Vietnamisation programme and also protect the remaining American forces in South Vietnam. These actions were extremely controversial, but Nixon would not be diverted from his strategy to extricate America from Vietnam. Nixon and Kissinger anticipated that the biggest threat to their plans would be a dry-season communist offensive in 1972. Their worst fears were realised when the North Vietnamese army poured into the South in March 1972. Nixon responded by implementing some of the plans he had made in 1969. He mined Haiphong Harbour and used B-52s to bomb the North. The combined power of the American and South Vietnamese military ultimately stopped the offensive, though not before the communists had more territory under their control.

The final American phase of the war saw Nixon launch the so-called "Christmas Bombing" of 1972, which convinced all parties to sign up to the outline agreement that Kissinger had drafted in October 1972. When negotiations resumed in January, the few outstanding issues were quickly resolved. The Paris Peace Accords were signed on 23 January 1973, ending America's most divisive conflict since the Civil War of 1861–1865.

AVAILABLE MARKS

(b) Theodore Roosevelt

Candidates have considerable scope to construct a counter-argument across the span of the twentieth century, with the two Roosevelts, Wilson, Truman and Reagan standing out as major foreign policy presidents.

Untrammelled by the US Constitution, which allowed presidents pretty much a free rein in foreign policy, Theodore Roosevelt demonstrated a new assertiveness by issuing his Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine in 1904. Two years later, Roosevelt was in the headlines again when he became the first American to win the Nobel Peace Prize (or indeed any Nobel prize) in recognition of his efforts in mediating a conclusion to the Russo-Japanese War.

The rise of Japan as a power in the Pacific added some urgency to the plans Roosevelt already had to enhance US naval capability across the globe. This was demonstrated by two episodes in TR's presidency. One was the construction of the Panama Canal (1904–1913), primarily to facilitate US fleet movements between the Atlantic and the Pacific, while the other was the round-the-world cruise by what was dubbed the "Great White Fleet" between 1907 and 1909, demonstrating the key role that the US Navy was to play in projecting American power.

(c) Woodrow Wilson

Though viewed initially as primarily a domestic reformer, Woodrow Wilson soon made his mark in foreign policy in the moral leadership he provided for both the United States and the world after America entered World War I in April 1917. 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.

(d) Franklin Roosevelt

Even before the United States officially entered World War II, Franklin Roosevelt (FDR) had been making significant efforts to align his country in support of the United Kingdom through initiatives such as "cash and carry" and 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.

(e) Harry Truman

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 in June 1948, 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 Defence, the National Security Council and the Central Intelligence Agency.

(f) Ronald Reagan

While Richard Nixon had helped to reduce tension in the Cold War and began to de-escalate the conflict, it was Ronald Reagan who presided over its conclusion. Under Reagan, America experienced its biggest peacetime defence build-up, including research on a space-based missile defence system (the Strategic Defence Initiative). Intermediate nuclear weapons (Cruise and Pershing missiles) were placed in Western Europe to counter the threat from the Soviet SS-20 missiles in the East. Only when America was sufficiently strong – and the morale of its armed forces restored after the trauma of Vietnam – did Reagan enter into negotiations with the USSR that ultimately produced the Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty of 1987 and paved the way for victory in a war that many had for so long believed could not be won.

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 "During the period 1917–1991 relations in Europe between the Soviet Union and western governments were primarily determined by economic considerations". How far would you agree with this assessment?

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 in Europe between the Soviet Union and western governments during the period 1917–1991 were primarily determined by economic considerations. 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 relations in Europe between the Soviet Union and western governments during the period 1917–1991 were primarily determined by economic considerations. 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 relations in Europe between the Soviet Union and western governments during the period 1917–1991 were primarily determined by economic considerations. 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 accurately 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 in Europe between the Soviet Union and western governments during the period 1917–1991 were primarily determined by economic considerations. 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) 1917–1924

Economic considerations played a key part in relations between Russia and western governments between 1917 and 1924. Lenin's withdrawal from the First World War and the Bolsheviks' decision not to honour the debts of the Tsarist regime reflected the financial predicament in which Soviet Russia found itself. After 1920 Soviet Russia and western governments displayed a willingness to conclude trade agreements, such as the Anglo–Russian Trade Agreement in 1921 and a commercial treaty between Britain and Soviet Russia in 1924. Economic co-operation also formed part of the Treaty of Rapallo, concluded between the Soviet Union and Germany, the two pariah states, in April 1922.

However, candidates should observe that relations between Soviet Russia and western governments in this period were also determined by a range of other factors. The establishment of the Comintern in 1919 and the Russo-Polish War might be cited as evidence of the importance Lenin attached to promoting world revolution. At the same time, the main aim of Soviet foreign policy was the survival of the Bolshevik regime, while the policies of western governments were also heavily influenced by security considerations. Their ideologically motivated fears of Soviet Russia found expression in their support for the Whites in the Russian Civil War and undiplomatic statements by leading western politicians about strangling the new regime in its infancy. In spite of developing economic ties with Soviet Russia from 1921 onwards, ideological tensions remained, as shown by the Curzon Ultimatum, issued in May 1923, and the Zinoviev letter, published in October 1924.

AVAILABLE MARKS

(b) 1924–1933

From 1924 to 1933, Stalin focused on economic considerations at the expense of ideology and this was reflected in the reduced role played by the Comintern. To promote the economic reconstruction of the Soviet Union, 'Socialism in One Country', Stalin aimed to establish closer economic ties with the more technologically advanced western governments and in 1926 signed the Treaty of Berlin with Weimar Germany. The introduction of a series of Five Year Plans from 1928 onwards emphasises the importance Stalin attached to economic reconstruction. However, both the Soviet Union and western governments were also motivated by security considerations. Stalin feared that the Dawes Plan (1924) and Locarno Treaty (1925) made an attack on the Soviet Union more likely, while Britain and France continued to regard the Soviet Union as the main threat to European peace in the period 1924–1929. It was not until the rise of the Nazis in the early 1930s that western democratic governments recognised the need for closer diplomatic ties with the Soviet Union as a bulwark against Germany.

(c) 1933–1945

Economic considerations did not exert a key influence on Stalin's relations with western governments during this period. Nonetheless, he maintained close economic ties with Germany in the early 1930s, while economic factors also influenced the Soviet Union's intervention in the Spanish Civil War, when Stalin did not provide any military aid until he had received an advance of gold. Ideology arguably exerted even less influence on Soviet foreign policy since, in the face of the growing threat from Nazi Germany, Stalin was prepared to form alliances with his ideological enemies in his 'desperate search for security' (Teddy Uldricks). In support of this argument, candidates may refer to the Soviet Union's mutual assistance pacts with France and Czechoslovakia in 1935, as well as the Nazi-Soviet Pact in 1939 and the formation of the Grand Alliance two years later. The policies of western democratic governments in the 1930s were determined primarily by ideological and security considerations as opposed to economic factors since, even after the Nazis' rise to power, political leaders in London and Paris still regarded Communism as a greater threat than National Socialism. Britain and France pursued an appeasement policy towards Germany from 1935 onwards and only put aside their ideological misgivings in March 1939, when they belatedly began negotiations with the Soviet Union about a defensive alliance.

(d) 1945–1956

Economic considerations played an important part in determining relations between the Soviet Union and western governments after the Second World War. In view of the enormous material damage European Russia had suffered, Stalin sought to exploit the economic resources of Eastern Europe, focusing, in particular, on securing reparations from Germany. However, security was arguably an even more important influence on Soviet foreign policy because Stalin was determined to ensure that the Soviet Union could never again be invaded, establishing a 'buffer zone' of friendly states on the Soviet Union's western border. For western governments, economic, security and ideological considerations were also closely intertwined. Fearing that economically deprived people would be vulnerable to Communism, the United States aimed to promote the economic recovery of Western Europe through the creation of Bizonia and, in particular, the introduction of Marshall Aid. Candidates may also discuss the Truman Doctrine, particularly in relation to Greece and Turkey, as evidence of the importance of security considerations in motivating American policy in Europe after 1945.

AVAILABLE MARKS

(e) 1956–1979

Although security was arguably the key motivation of Soviet foreign policy from 1956 to 1979, economic considerations also played an important part. Khrushchev cut back on the Soviet Union's conventional forces for economic reasons, while Brezhnev's policy of détente in the 1970s was influenced by the need to reduce the huge cost of the Soviet Union's military forces, develop trade links with the West and acquire western technology. Economic motives were also evident in the decision to construct the Berlin Wall. However, for Khrushchev and Brezhnev security considerations were more influential in their backing for détente. In support of this argument, candidates may refer to *Ostpolitik*, the SALT 1 treaties (1972) and the Helsinki Accords of 1975. At the same time, the Soviet Union's quest for security also involved the suppression of dissent in its own sphere of influence, as illustrated by its ruthless response to the Hungarian Uprising (1956) and Prague Spring (1968). From the western perspective, economic considerations were arguably of secondary importance during this period. Although the wish to reduce its huge military expenditure influenced American support for détente in the 1970s, the resulting trade links brought more benefits to the Soviet Union than the West. On the other hand, security arguably represented the primary concern of western governments. Candidates may illustrate this by exploring the muted response of the West to Soviet military intervention in Hungary and Czechoslovakia, as well as its low-key reaction to the construction of the Berlin Wall. On each occasion western protests were limited to verbal condemnations of Soviet actions. There was no threat of military intervention for fear escalating the tense situation.

(e) 1979–1991

Soviet foreign policy under Michael Gorbachev was heavily influenced by economic considerations. In 1985 the Soviet Union was almost bankrupt, its citizens were suffering economic hardship and military spending comprised 25 per cent of its Gross National Product. It was clear that the Soviet Union could no longer match US military spending. Thus, it could be argued that *perestroika*, the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan, cuts in military spending and Gorbachev's ultimate rejection of the Brezhnev Doctrine were based on economic considerations. However, ideology was also important, since Gorbachev rejected Marxist Leninist assumptions about the nature of history and the role of class. Similarly, ideological factors exerted an important influence on western leaders, such as British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and US President Ronald Reagan, who in March 1983 described the Soviet Union as an 'evil Empire'. But, if ideological factors determined the policy of western governments towards the Soviet Union, it was their economic superiority which enabled them to achieve their objectives. During Reagan's first term in office American military expenditure was 43 per cent higher than at the height of the Vietnam War and he ruthlessly exploited the Soviet Union's economic weakness.

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

2 "Whilst the aims of Soviet foreign policy in Europe between 1917 and 1991 were defensive, the main aim of western governments was the destruction of the Soviet Union." To what extent would you accept this verdict?

AVAILABLE MARKS

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 Soviet Union pursued defensive foreign policies in Europe between 1917 and 1991, while western governments sought the destruction of the Soviet Union. 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 western states adopted foreign policies in Europe between 1917 and 1991 aimed at the destruction of the Soviet Union, while the latter was focused on defence. 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,

AVAILABLE MARKS

substantiated, illustrated and reach a judgement about the extent to which the Soviet Union was primarily focused on defence, while the western governments adopted policies aimed at destroying the Soviet Union between 1917 and 1991. 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 accurately 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 Soviet Union was primarily focused on defence in Europe, while western governments adopted policies aimed at destroying the Soviet Union during the period 1917–1991. 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) From aggression to co-existence 1917–1939

The aggression of western powers was evident in the immediate aftermath of the communist takeover in 1917. Support for the Whites in the Civil War is illustrative of the hostility to the recently established revolutionary state. Equally, the Russo-Polish War of 1920 was a further example of aggression directed against the Soviet Union, as the Poles launched an attack on the besieged communist government. Subsequent attempts at diplomatic isolation and indeed the refusal to allow Soviet Russia to participate in the Paris peace talks at the end of World War One, and the fact that Russia was denied entry to the League of Nations, reinforce the impression of a generally aggressive approach by western governments to the Soviet Union in this period.

For the Bolshevik regime, withdrawal from the First World War and the acceptance of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk could be seen as examples of a defensive approach to foreign affairs, but more aggressive actions by Lenin and his associates were also evident. The establishment of the Comintern, the repudiation of Tsarist debts and the willingness to exploit the weakness of the Polish army to create a bridge to the rest of Europe in the hope of igniting revolutionary fires across the capitals and citadels of capitalism all suggest an aggressive foreign policy.

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 point out 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. To some degree the same judgement could be applied to western governments due to the impact of the Great Depression which began in 1929.

AVAILABLE MARKS

However, the rise of fascism in Italy, Germany and Spain was to see aggressive foreign policies taken to unprecedented levels. This was most evident in the signing of the Anti-Comintern Pact of 1936 between Germany and Japan, which were then joined by Spain and Italy in 1937. However, the rise of fascism was to witness the Soviet Union and democratic western states initially setting aside ideological differences for a more conciliatory and co-operative approach, leading to different motivations and approaches by various western governments. The Soviet Union joined the League of Nations in 1934 and Mutual Assistance Pacts were signed with France and Czechoslovakia in 1935.

(b) Total War and shifting alliances 1939–1945

The turbulent war years saw shifting alliances and, despite the temporary nature of the expedient Nazi–Soviet Pact, it was clear that the Nazi regime was intent on annihilating the Soviet Union. The cost to the latter was such that it profoundly shaped the post-war years. Equally, the Grand Alliance has often been described with some accuracy as "a marriage of convenience." The conferences of Tehran, Yalta, and particularly Potsdam, not only highlighted the challenges the Allies faced but also the levels of distrust and distinctly different aims of the surviving states.

(c) Origins of the Cold War 1945–1955

From a Soviet perspective, the desire of the victorious western powers to rebuild Germany, combined with the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan, amounted to an imperialist assault on its existence and a failure to grasp the nature and expectations of Soviet interests. Western actions in the Greek Civil War seemed to indicate to the Soviet Union that capitalist governments were as aggressively determined to destroy communism as fascist ones had been. From the western perspective, the establishment of puppet states across Eastern Europe, the blockade of Berlin and the Soviet Union reneging on the Declaration on Liberated Europe announced at Yalta all highlighted the malign nature and intent of the communist superpower.

(d) Peaceful co-existence and détente 1955–1979

Following the death of Stalin it is plausible to suggest that a pattern re-emerged that was reminiscent of Lenin's later years. Khrushchev had declared co-existence to be not only possible, but also essential. This was evident in the Geneva Summit of 1955, the first in a decade, the Soviet withdrawal of troops from Austria in the same year, Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin and his visit to Camp David in 1959. However, despite such thawing in the seeming permafrost of the Cold War, sharp drops in the temperature of relations regularly occurred. Soviet actions, most notably in Hungary in 1956, Berlin in 1961 and later under Brezhnev in 1968 with the suppression of the Prague Spring, all indicated that the Soviet Union seemed to be far from defensive and peacefully minded. In each case it appeared that national movements or popular actions that reflected the will of local populations were met with the iron fist of force. Alternatively, from a Soviet perspective the uprisings in Hungary and later Czechoslovakia were not so much popular movements as attempts to undermine the security of the Soviet Union through the break-up of its buffer zone. In the case of Berlin, it was not only the lure of the city to the flood of economic migrants but also western espionage that necessitated the building of the wall, itself a defensive action.

The late 1960s and 1970s were to witness the period of the Cold War known as détente. Once again both western governments and the Soviet Union appeared to find a way to co-exist in a mutually beneficial fashion. SALT I, *Ostpolitik* and the Helsinki Final Act all reflected the diverse components of

détente, the cumulative effect of which seemed to suggest that neither the western powers nor the Soviet Union sought the other's destruction.

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

The late 1970s saw the end of détente. Whether it was the actions of western governments which occasioned the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan is a moot point but it was this event which was to prove pivotal in the last decade of the Cold War. Western governments developed and deployed a new generation of missiles and the years of co-existence gave way to what was to be termed the Second Cold War. However, despite the aggressive nature of the Reagan Doctrine, it was perhaps ultimately to be the Communist Party of the Soviet Union that was to bring about an end to the revolution it had initiated. The political beliefs and actions of Mikhail Gorbachev led to a series of calculations that would not leave the revolution strengthened but fatally weakened. Withdrawal from Afghanistan and the lack of will to maintain the Brezhnev Doctrine saw the loosening and eventual shedding of the Soviet straitjacket that immobilised Eastern and Central Europe.

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

Option 5 **40**

AVAILABLE MARKS