



Rewarding Learning

**ADVANCED**

General Certificate of Education

---

# History

Assessment Unit A2 2  
Historical Investigations and Interpretations



\*AHY21\*

## [AHY21] Assessment

---

### TIME

2 hours 30 minutes.

### Assessment Level of Control:

Tick the relevant box (✓)

Controlled Conditions	
Other	

### INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

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

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

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

### INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES

The total mark for this paper is 80.

Quality of written communication will be assessed in Question 3.

## Option 1: England 1558–1603

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

Read the sources and answer the questions which follow:

### Elizabeth I and Mary, Queen of Scots

#### Source 1

Extract from a letter from Sir Francis Walsingham to the Earl of Leicester, 25 October 1586. Walsingham is referring to the aftermath of the trial of Mary, Queen of Scots. The trial had been overseen by a Commission comprising the leading nobility and members of the Privy Council.

Even in the opinion of her best friends, including some such as Lord Lumley and Lord Montague who had been appointed as commissioners to investigate her, Mary had been found guilty. The evidence produced by the secretaries of the court was found to be convincing by all the commissioners, bearing in mind that some of them were inclined to give her every possible benefit of the doubt. However, once they considered the nature of the evidence, every one of them gave his verdict against the Scottish queen, finding her not only part of the conspiracy, but also someone who was prepared to plan Her Majesty's assassination.

#### Source 2

Extract from a speech by Elizabeth I to a delegation from Parliament, 24 November 1586. The parliamentarians attended the Queen at Richmond Palace with the purpose of convincing her to delay no longer in signing the death warrant of Mary, Queen of Scots.

I admit that the advice I have received from you is unanimously in favour of Mary's execution. However, if some other means might be found of punishing the Queen of Scots, this would make me happier than anything else. But evidently my safety cannot be guaranteed without a queen's head being sacrificed. In my reign I have pardoned many rebels, turned a blind eye to many acts of treason and have been prepared to suffer many humiliations in silence. Should I now be forced to execute another queen? During my reign, I have also been aware of many books and pamphlets which were critical of me and my realm, accusing me of being a tyrant. How much more critical will they be when it is reported that, for the safety of my own life, I was prepared to spill the blood of even my own relative?

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

How valuable is Source 1 to an historian as evidence in a study of the threat posed by Mary, Queen of Scots to Elizabeth I? [15]

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

How far do the sources support the view that Elizabeth I was entirely blameless for the death of Mary, Queen of Scots? [20]

## The Problem of the Succession and the Opposition faced by Elizabeth I at the Beginning of her Reign

### Interpretation A

Extract from S.T. Bindoff, *Tudor England*, published in 1950.

Did Elizabeth I deserve to be on the English throne? Her father's Will and an Act of one of his Parliaments said so, and doubtless for the vast majority of Englishmen these were sufficient. But what of those who did not agree that kings or parliaments had the right to make and unmake marriages or declare legitimate or illegitimate the children of such marriages? In Catholic eyes, Elizabeth, the child of an unlawful marriage, could not be a legitimate sovereign, and her throne ought to pass without delay to the person next in line whose legitimacy was beyond dispute. The Catholic king who was most uncompromising on the subject was Henry II of France. For in his daughter-in-law, Mary Stuart, Henry had the obvious Catholic claimant to the English throne. On the death of Mary Tudor he did not hesitate in having Mary Stuart proclaimed Queen of England. The question which faced Elizabeth I was whether the country could be preserved from the twin catastrophes of internal chaos and foreign domination? Furthermore, could a young princess, such as Elizabeth herself, who had no formal education in the art of ruling, restore to the throne the strength and the prestige once associated with it?

### Interpretation B

Extract from D. Starkey, *Elizabeth: Apprenticeship*, published in 2012.

Parliament was in session on the day of Mary Tudor's death, and in the late morning the Speaker and the MPs were summoned to the House of Lords. There, Nicholas Heath, Archbishop of York and Lord Chancellor, announced Mary's death and Elizabeth's accession. Heath's brief speech produced a perfect balance between grief at Mary's death and rejoicing at Elizabeth's succession, noting that the new Queen's "most lawful right and title to the crown, thanks be to God, we need not doubt". The assembled Lords and Commons then cried "God save Queen Elizabeth!" It was not quite a parliamentary confirmation of Elizabeth's title, as no Act of Parliament was produced, but it amounted to much the same thing. It was an extraordinarily smooth accession for one who had had such a rocky road to the throne. From the death of Mary to Elizabeth's proclamation took only six hours. Between these two events, the transition of power was smooth: swift, open, legal and unchallenged.

## 2 Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B.

Using the interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of the problem of the succession and the opposition faced by Elizabeth I at the beginning of her reign do you find more convincing? [25]

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

**Either**

(a) “The foreign policy of Elizabeth I between 1558 and 1603 was dominated by relations with the Netherlands.” How far would you agree with this verdict? [20]

**Or**

(b) “In her dealings with Parliament in the period 1558–1603, Elizabeth I was always securely in control.” To what extent would you accept this statement? [20]

## Option 2: Ireland 1685–1714

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

Read the sources and answer the questions which follow:

### The Penal Laws

#### Source 1

Extract from a letter from an Irish Catholic priest in Brussels to the ambassador of the Austrian Empire in London, 21 September 1697. The letter is discussing the Bishops' Banishment Bill of 1697, which received the royal assent four days later.

If the Bishops' Banishment Bill is enforced in its entirety, we will soon find that there are no priests in Ireland. The Bill specifically says that all the Catholic bishops, all the senior clergy and the trainee priests, as well as all monks and nuns, will be banished for ever. If there are no Catholic bishops, there will be no one with the authority to create new Catholic priests. Thus, just as night follows day, there will be no more priests to celebrate the Mass or assist the faithful in this poor kingdom. It is therefore only right that King William should ensure that this Bill is not passed into law, as the banishment of the members of religious orders is against certain articles of the Treaty of Limerick.

#### Source 2

Extract from a memorandum by a Protestant bishop in Ireland. It was written in 1697, when the Bishops' Banishment Bill was being considered by the Irish Parliament. This Bill was the first proposed Penal Law directed at the Catholic Church.

The Catholic bishops are forcing their own poor people into even deeper poverty by making them pay their dues to the Catholic Church, even though these same people are already obliged to support our own Protestant clergy in tithes. All Catholic bishops and all ordinary parish priests should have severe penalties placed on them and be banished from the country. The members of religious orders, namely monks, may stay because it is the parish priests who are troublesome and ambitious. Every parish priest aspires to be an archdeacon, then a dean, then a bishop. On the other hand, the members of religious orders are for the most part harmless, ignorant, poor men, who only preach morality and gather no riches for themselves or for the Pope.

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

How valuable is Source 1 to an historian as evidence in a study of the Penal Laws? [15]

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

How far do the sources support the view that the Penal Laws aimed to eradicate the Catholic religion in Ireland? [20]

## The Changing Position of Catholics and Protestants in England 1685–1689

### Interpretation A

Extract from S. Schama, *A History of Britain: The British Wars 1603–1776*, published in 2001.

The portrayal of James II as a brutal, absolute monarch is a rewriting of history from the perspective of the Glorious Revolution. There is no question whatsoever, of course, that James was a convinced believer in the Divine Right of Kings. But the cause about which he was most enthusiastic was toleration, the “liberty of conscience” which he now extended to Catholics. No wonder, then, that some of James’s most committed allies were not just Catholics, but Protestant Dissenters, like the Quaker William Penn the younger. And by no means all the men of science and reason in England were opposed to the King’s policies. Samuel Pepys, for one, James’s Secretary of the Navy and the perfect example of humane reasonableness, remained loyal to the bitter end. It is odd that, while some of the most controversial rulers of the eighteenth century get credit for imposing toleration on their subjects, the same credit is not extended to James II.

### Interpretation B

Extract from W.S. Churchill, *A History of the English-Speaking Peoples*, published in 1956.

It is disputed whether toleration was all King James II sought. He was a convert to Rome. He was also a bigot, and there was no sacrifice he would not make for his faith. Toleration was the natural first step to the revival of Catholicism. The King was determined that Catholics should not be persecuted, and, for tactical reasons, extended his protection to the Dissenters at a later date. English Protestants would have been very foolish to trust themselves to the merciful tolerance of James II. They did not do so. They were quite sure from his character and his actions – Halifax removed from the Privy Council, Sunderland appointed Lord President of the Council, Jeffreys made Lord Chancellor – that, once James obtained the absolute power he sought, the choice for Protestants would be the Mass or death. Protestant opinion never doubted that, if James gained absolute power, he would use it for his religion in the same ruthless manner as Louis XIV of France had done.

## 2 Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B.

Using the interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of the changing position of Catholics and Protestants in England in the period 1685–1689 do you find more convincing? [25]

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

**Either**

**(a)** “James II’s pro-Catholic policies in Ireland in the period 1685–1689 were only strictly implemented in the army.” To what extent do you agree with this judgement? [20]

**Or**

**(b)** “The Second Siege of Limerick was the most critical military engagement in determining the outcome of the Williamite Wars.” How far would you accept this verdict? [20]

### Option 3: Ireland 1778–1803

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

Read the sources and answer the questions which follow:

#### The Volunteers 1778–1783

##### Source 1

Extract from Lord Charlemont's account of the origins of the Volunteer movement in 1778. Charlemont was a member of the Irish House of Lords and a leader of the Volunteers. This account was written in 1786.

Serious invasion was expected hourly. Abandoned by the government, the men of Belfast were left to their own defence and boldly undertook it. Companies were formed, officers were chosen and military skill and discipline were practised. Almost at the same instant, many companies were formed throughout the neighbouring counties. The enemy was at our doors and the government had no possible means of resistance. Unsupported by England, and lacking both men and money, the Irish administration was in a panic at the prospect of foreign invasion. It feared and consequently hated the Volunteers, but at the same time depended on them for assistance. The extent of Volunteer military organisation was most alarming to those who maintained English control of Ireland.

##### Source 2

Extract from a speech by Barry Yelverton MP in the Irish House of Commons, 30 November 1783. He was opposing the Volunteer Bill calling for reform, which Henry Flood had brought before the Irish House of Commons from the Dublin Convention of Volunteers. Flood's Bill was defeated by 158 votes to 49.

I do not want to have this Bill discussed in the House of Commons if it comes from an armed body of Volunteers. We do not sit in this Parliament to support the proposals of another assembly or obey this Volunteer Convention at the point of a bayonet. I admired the Volunteers in the past when they limited themselves to their original aim of preserving the domestic peace in Ireland and resisting the possibility of foreign invasion. But they turned away from this honourable conduct. They formed themselves into debating societies and used the crude bayonet to threaten radical changes to a political system that required only a little adjustment – then I lost all respect for the Volunteers. This Bill originates from the Volunteers and not ourselves as MPs. It is Parliament that must be obeyed, not the Volunteers.

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

How valuable is Source 1 to an historian as evidence in a study of the Volunteers between 1778 and 1783?

[15]

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

How far do the sources support the view that the Volunteers posed a threat to the way Ireland was governed?

[20]

## The Failure of the 1798 Rebellion

### Interpretation A

Extract from N. Curtin, *The United Irishmen: Popular Politics in Ulster and Dublin, 1791–1798*, published in 1994.

The defeat of the Rebellion in 1798 could not be solely explained by the failure of Ulster to assert itself effectively due to informers or timid leadership. It is true that the United Irishmen were ill-prepared for the Rebellion in terms of their small stockpiles of arms and ammunition. They had hoped for more weapons and support from the largely Catholic militia. If the Rebellion had proved more successful at the outset, the United Irishmen may have gained the support of some government troops in time. But instead the militia stood loyal to the Crown, sometimes excessively so. Another source of rebel disillusionment was the failure of the French to arrive when expected. When the promised assistance came, in August 1798, it was a story of too little, too late. General Humbert's landing at Killala rallied thousands of Irishmen from Connaught and they made a desperate but valiant march towards Dublin before they were finally defeated, in September, at the Battle of Ballinamuck by overwhelming forces under the command of Lord Cornwallis.

### Interpretation B

Extract from K. Whelan: *The Tree of Liberty: Radicalism, Catholicism and the Construction of Irish Identity 1760–1830*, published in 1996.

The Orange Order was very valuable to the authorities. General James Knox was quick to spot the potential of the Order in neutralising units of the United Irishmen. The Orange Order was an effective counter-revolutionary device. It inserted a barrier to the linking of the United Irishmen and Defender territories; it pulled Protestants in general to a conservative, pro-government stance; it split the emerging Presbyterian-Catholic alliance; it ended United Irish infiltration of the yeomanry and militia. Given these advantages, the government quickly abandoned its earlier anxiety about the Orange Order and backed it. From then on, the Orange Order rapidly ascended the social ladder and was supported by landed gentlemen. The Dublin lawyer, Peter Burrowes, was accurate in his assessment that the Orangemen were encouraged by the Protestant Ascendancy. It was government policy to divide the people in order to weaken the United Irishmen. The government's acceptance of the Orange Order ran alongside a much tighter security policy. Dublin Castle was prepared to abandon the law in order to contain the spread of disaffection.

## 2 Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B.

Using the interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of the reasons for the failure of the 1798 Rebellion do you find more convincing?

[25]

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

**Either**

- (a) “The most important reason for the establishment of the Society of United Irishmen in 1791 was the influence of the French Revolution.” How far would you agree with this assessment? [20]

**Or**

- (b) “The Act of Union of 1800 was successfully managed through the Irish Parliament because the supporters of the Union were more united than its opponents.” To what extent would you agree with this assessment? [20]

## Option 4: Partition of Ireland 1900–1925

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

Read the sources and answer the questions which follow:

### The Defeat of the Irish Parliamentary Party in the General Election of 1918

#### Source 1

Extract from a speech delivered by John Dillon, leader of the Irish Parliamentary Party, in the House of Commons, 5 November 1918.

Our party has become very unpopular among our own people because we have made too many concessions. The history of the last five years has been a history of repeatedly broken promises and delayed hopes. Thus, the people of Ireland have lost all faith in constitutional action. Today many Irish people think that they can only win their rights by force. Last spring the tide started to flow back to the constitutional movement. We won three successive by-elections and would undoubtedly have won the fourth in East Cavan but for the intervention of the government. At that moment it sprung conscription on Ireland, and arrested all the Sinn Féin leaders. The moment the government arrested Arthur Griffith, who would have been defeated in that by-election, he became a hero.

#### Source 2

Extract from the memoir of William X. O'Brien, a leader of the Irish Labour Party. It was published in 1969.

In 1918 we, the leaders of the Irish Labour Party, had several talks with representatives of Sinn Féin about the upcoming general election. Sinn Féin was a well organised political party whose members were controlled or inspired by its leaders. Labour was not in that position at all as it was mostly made up of the trade unions. Some of our members questioned certain Sinn Féin policies, such as non-attendance at Westminster and the Republican oath. Sinn Féin wanted us to agree with them about the general election. It seemed to me that, unless we made an agreement, it might result in Labour and Sinn Féin candidates competing against each other and, thus, in a number of places the Irish Parliamentary Party might get elected on a split vote. I urged my party executive not to put forward any candidates, but instead to support Sinn Féin. It agreed.

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

How valuable is Source 1 to an historian as evidence in a study of the reasons for the defeat of the Irish Parliamentary Party in the General Election of 1918? [15]

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

How far do the sources support the view that the actions of Sinn Féin were the main cause of the defeat of the Irish Parliamentary Party in the General Election of 1918? [20]

## The Outcome of the Home Rule Crisis by September 1914

### Interpretation A

Extract from M. Laffan, *The Partition of Ireland 1911–1925*, published in 1983.

In September 1914 the Home Rule Bill was finally passed. The Act was accompanied by an amendment declaring that Home Rule would not come into operation until the war had ended and until special legislation had been introduced for Ulster. Almost everyone assumed that the war would be brief. Nationalists celebrated all over Ireland. Home Rule was now the law of the land; Redmond had succeeded where others had failed. Bonar Law's speech of protest was bitter. It seemed to all sides that the Unionists had good cause for their bitterness. It was impossible for Ulster Unionists to know if exclusion would be granted. Bonar Law wanted six counties excluded, but had no way of knowing if Asquith would concede this. Asquith was glad to escape the Irish dilemma. He saw the war as a stroke of luck in relation to his Irish policy. Carson, too, was fortunate that the war distracted attention from Ulster, because it prevented a Unionist rebellion, which had seemed possible in the summer of 1914.

### Interpretation B

Extract from R. Fanning, *Fatal Path: British Government and the Irish Revolution 1910–1922*, published in 2013.

The announcement of the royal assent to the Home Rule Bill in September 1914 was greeted with wild enthusiasm in the House of Commons by Liberals and Nationalists, and by the embittered absence of the Unionists, who had walked out of the House. However, Unionist embitterment was as misplaced as Nationalist enthusiasm, for the achievement of Home Rule was more apparent than real. For the Ulster Unionists, suspension of Home Rule for what might only be a few months disguised what was in reality a victory. For Southern Unionists, and some Ulster Unionists, there was no victory. By the summer of 1914 ministers had gone too far down the path of partition to reverse their tracks. Lloyd George and Churchill had been committed to the exclusion of Ulster since February 1912; Asquith had offered the exclusion of six north-eastern counties in March 1914. The Nationalist party, on the other hand, lost more than it gained from an Act that deprived it of its only reason for existence. Its members appeared to have achieved their goal and yet they had nothing to show for it: no parliament in Dublin, no political offices to fill, no role to play in government during a war that lasted for four long years.

## 2 Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B.

Using the interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of the outcome of the Home Rule crisis by September 1914 do you find more convincing? [25]

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

**Either**

(a) “The impact of the First World War on Ireland was the most important cause of the Easter Rising of 1916.” To what extent would you accept this verdict? [20]

**Or**

(b) “The superior negotiating skills of the British delegation prevented Sinn Féin from achieving a republic in the Anglo-Irish Treaty talks of 1921.” How far would you agree with this statement? [20]

---

**THIS IS THE END OF THE QUESTION PAPER**

---





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