

GCE



CCEA GCE A2  
Exemplifying Examination  
Performance  
**History**

This is an exemplification of candidates' performance in GCE A2 examinations (Summer 2018) to support the teaching and learning of the History specification.



*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.*

# EXEMPLIFYING EXAMINATION PERFORMANCE

## GCE History

### Introduction

These materials illustrate aspects of performance from the 2018 summer A2 examination series of CCEA's revised GCE Specification in 2016.

Students' grade A responses are reproduced verbatim and accompanied by commentaries written by senior examiners. The commentaries draw attention to the strengths of the students' responses and indicate, where appropriate, deficiencies and how improvements could be made.

It is intended that the materials should provide a benchmark of candidate performance and help teachers and students to raise standards.

For further details of our support package, please visit our website at [www.ccea.org.uk](http://www.ccea.org.uk)

Best wishes



Helen Parks

Education Manager, History

Email: [hparks@ccea.org.uk](mailto:hparks@ccea.org.uk)

Telephone: 028 9026 1200 ext. 2906



**GCE: A2 History**

**AHY11: Change Over Time**

**Grade: A Exemplar**



## Option 1 Crown and Parliament in England 1625–1714

**Q1** “The relationship between Crown and Parliament in England in the period 1625–1714 was characterised by co-operation rather than conflict.” To what extent would you accept this verdict? [40]

### Student’s response

*The relationship between Crown and Parliament in England in the period 1625-1714 saw the development of a working relationship. In 1625, tensions in the relationship was high and mistrust was felt on both sides, however, by the reign of William in 1694, a working relationship had been established and the effects of this was felt throughout the reign of Anne until 1714.*

*The reign of Charles I saw a great law point in relations between the crown and Parliament as it included two civil wars and the execution of the king. Throughout his early reign, Charles conducted a disastrous foreign policy, introduced laudian reforms and abused financial devices. These were seen as abuses of power by Parliament and increased tensions. This ultimately led to Parliament challenging the crown through the three resolutions and petition of right in 1628. This ultimately represented a total breakdown in relations as Charles’ response to this protest was to dissolve Parliament and embark on a period of personal rule. The constitutional revolution also represented a great challenge to the relations between crown and parliament as parliament attempted to impose restrictions on the crown through the Triennial Act 1641 which challenged the crown’s right to summon, prorogue and dissolve Parliament. The abolition of prerogative financial devices also meant the crown become more dependent on parliament for finance. This deep mistrust further broke down relations in this period. The execution off the king in 1649 represented a total breakdown in relations between crown and Parliament in the reign of Charles I as it was the ultimate removal of the king. However, this can not be completely regarded as the conflict between monarchy and Parliament. This was rather an attack on Charles himself rather than the institution of monarchy.*

*Furthermore, the significance of this event is further limited as the following period of interregnum rather than destruction of monarchy and subsequent restoration in 1660 suggested Parliament wished for a cooperative working relationship.*

*The reign of Charles II supports the view that the relations were of cooperation as it saw the restoration of monarchy. The restoration of 1660 saw Charles II gain virtually the same powers his father had in the Constitutional Revolution. Parliament made many concessions such as giving up control over the country, powers of judiciary, and control of army. This indicates that Parliament knew if chaos and conflict were avoided, they must establish a working relationship. Although prerogative taxes and courts remained illegal, a reformed Triennial Act of 1664 was passed, stating Parliament ‘ought’ to be called, and the crown was given further protection through the Act of Safety and Preservation of his Majesty’s person, which protected the crown from treason. However, whilst this was deemed a working relationship, the relations between Parliament and crown were to once more deteriorate once Parliament attempted to assert it’s power over the succession. The*

*subsequent exclusion crisis led to the dissolving of Parliament by Charles. This can be seen as a breakdown in relations however, this allowed Charles II to pursue a quo warranto campaign, recalling charters with the intent of crushing Whigs to establish a new supportive Tory Parliament for James II's reign in 1689. This therefore shows once again, an attempt to establish a better cooperative working relationship with Parliament.*

*James II's reign began with a strong working relationship, with his parliament providing an Act of Attainder and standing army against Monmouth when faced with a rebellion. However, James II quickly alienated both his Parliament and subjects. With the suspension of test acts and coronation oath, James' strive for toleration was perceived by Parliament to be a strive towards absolutism. This ultimately led to the invitation of William and removal of James. This is, like 1649, a low point in relations between the monarchy and crown. However, once again, this cannot be completely regarded as a conflict between institution, rather a conflict between personnel. This can be demonstrated through the immediate replacement of James II with an alternative monarch. Therefore, whilst James II had soured his relationship with Parliament through his abuse of illegal financial devices and 'wooing' of dissenters, it was evident Parliament had the desire to preserve the monarchy through the crowning of William and Mary. James II's actions caused the Glorious Revolution and ultimately paved the way for a new working relationship of cooperation in future.*

*The reign of William and Mary was significant in that it paved the way for the greatest moves towards a cooperative relationship within the period of 1689–1714. Their reign saw a number of concessions made on both behalfs. Parliament was willing to establish a joint monarchy to establish a cooperative relationship, and William and Mary were willing to make great concessions as their interests lay further afield. The Mutiny Act, Bill of Rights and Coronation Oath ensured the religion of the monarch from levying taxes without parliamentary consent and gave parliament free elections and press to debate. In return, parliament gave William and Mary further protection allowing them laws to protect them from an event alike the Glorious Revolution. At this stage parliament was still working towards a cooperative settlement, but this laid the foundations for a cooperative relationship, never seen before in the period of 1689–1714.*

*It was in the final decade of William's reign which saw the most cooperative relationship between the crown and Parliament. As William was preoccupied with the king's war and was desperate to secure funding, he was willing to sacrifice a great number of royal prerogatives. The creation of Commission of Accounts and Civil List ultimately gave parliament control over the king's finances. Parliament was also granted free press to debate, and with the establishment of the newly founded Bank of England, this was a necessary requirement. Parliament also gained more control over foreign policy, as it subsidised the war they expected to be consulted over this. This can also be seen in the 1701 Act of Settlement, which stated that the king could not carry out a military intervention to protect a foreign domain without the consent of Parliament. The crown's willingness to cooperate with this settlement and terms set by Parliament demonstrated a positive, cooperative working relationship had been fully established by William's reign. The effects of this can be felt truly throughout Anne's reign until 1714.*

*In Anne's reign, the effects of the established cooperative relationship can be felt. Anne's involvement in the War of Spanish Succession demonstrates how she had to use mixed ministries in order to achieve her goals. To ensure a full scale military intervention went ahead, She sided with the Whig party in parliament, appointing Marlborough and Godolphin to ensure the intervention went ahead according to royal policy. Once she wanted peace, Anne sided with Tories, appointing Harley to achieve this. Her use of prerogative power of appointment and mixed ministries demonstrated when she needed to play party politics in order to achieve her goals, again demonstrated when she once more sided with Whigs to pass the Anglo-Scottish Union. Whilst royal policy still prevailed, overall, the crown had to cooperate with parliament in order to pursue royal policy.*

*In conclusion, it is evident that whilst in the early years of the period 1625-1714 conflict seemed to be evident in relations, these conflicts simply were between personnel rather than the institution of Crown and Parliament. This is clear through the complete establishment of a cooperative working relationship in the reign of William. This was significant as it had lasting effects, ensuring a relationship of cooperation was felt throughout Anne's reign to 1714.*

### Examiner's comments

The response presents a clear and focused analysis of the period with a consistent focus on the proposition. Relevant evidence is utilised to support and enhance the line of argument.

The short introduction focuses on the changing relationship between Crown and Parliament, arguing that although there were significant 'tensions' and 'mistrust', by the end of the period a 'working relationship' had developed. The following section of the response presents a confident analysis of the cooperation and conflict in the reign of Charles I. Some of the tensions in his early reign are referred to including his 'disastrous foreign policy', 'Laudian reforms' and the 'Petition of Right'. The breakdown in relations is evidenced by the period of Personal Rule. The main focus of this section is a confident explanation of the conflict surrounding the Constitutional Revolution and the execution of the King.

The next section of the response addresses the rule of Charles II arguing that the Restoration of the king was evidence of the 'cooperation' between Crown and Parliament. There is a well-argued explanation of the importance of the Restoration Settlement with excellent use of supporting evidence, e.g. the Triennial Act. The response also notes how relations deteriorated during the reign of Charles II by highlighting the Exclusion Crisis and the King's use of the Quo Warranto campaign during his short period of personal rule at the end of his reign.

The analysis of the reign of James II again begins with a direct connection to the question and a confident explanation of the developing conflict with Parliament. The impact of his pro-Catholic and, apparently absolutist, actions is addressed and connected to the Glorious Revolution and the political settlement which followed. The response argues that, as with the execution of Charles I, the conflict is more concerned with the individual than the institution.

The reign of William and Mary is highlighted as making the 'greatest moves towards a cooperative relationship' in the period. The changing nature of the relationship is explained with a range of supporting evidence. The candidate here presents the longest and most convincing analysis of any of the reigns addressed, taking time to present a convincing argument of the increasing cooperation between Crown and Parliament. The response explains how the 'effects of the established cooperative relationship' can be clearly seen in the reign of Anne and takes time to outline how she was compelled to work with the emerging political parties.

The answer concludes with a renewed focus on the proposition. The argument is sustained throughout the response and is re-stated; that conflict was primarily between individuals rather than institutions and that cooperation had been established by the end of this period.

The response was assessed as a mid-Level 4.

**Q2** "Clashes over foreign policy had the greatest impact on the relationship between Crown and Parliament in England in the period 1625–1714." How far would you agree with this statement? [40]

### Student's response

*The Seventeenth century marked a colossal change in the relationship between Crown and Parliament. Individually, finance had the greatest impact, and once parliament had asserted their control financially they moved to religion, and only when these issues had been resolved did foreign policy begin to be important. the relationship is assessed by altering balance of power and conflict.*

*Finance was initially the greatest issue. The monarch Charles II was initially dominant in finance, shown by the use of the forced loan in 1628. However later need for supply impacted the relationship for example the need for £700000 for war resulted in the Petition of Right whereby the crown could no longer billet soldiers or imprison without cause. Furthermore the resources transformed the relationship as there was conflict and the speaker held down as an act of rebellion. the Personal Rule allowed the crown to show power for example in the use of monopolies, distraint of knighthood. Although this didn't alter balance of power it still caused conflict individuals like Hampden and the crown loss of judges support. Finance was also more important in the constitutional crisis of 1640-42 as it was used to dismantle personal rule and altered the relationship through the loss of courts and taxes eg distraint of knighthood. This shows that finance was clearly making a greater impact as any opposition eg Pym and Hampden was due to finance, and parliament could use it to enact change eg customs duties being for a short time ensured regular meeting.*

*In Charles II's reign however it had less of an impact: The £1.2 million annual settlement and the confirmed abolition of prerogative courts meant parliament had to meet regularly. they also had power over the King as seen through the introduction of regular hearth and land tax. But in return there was less conflict showing less impact e.g. the Acts to Preserve the Person of the King and the Praeminure.*

*Ultimately however, through the power of foreign policy Charles could accept subsidies of £150000 from Louis, showing that the relationship was not fully impacted as when combined with £1.4 million in customs it gave him the financial elasticity to fund personal rule albeit with the consequence of a change in relationship due to finance of gaining the speaker.*

*In James's reign finance was unimportant as the £1.9 million annual settlement meant he had to call parliament but this had already been assessed. However the financial elasticity aided by trade in the New World, colonial trade and a weak Triennial Act meant he could impact the relationship by causing conflict through his use of suspending and dispensing power, suggesting clashes over foreign policy didn't have the greatest impact.*

*William's reign was one in which finance was limited to foreign policy suggesting that it was also important. He didn't have the power to raise £5.5 million for war and so had to impact the relationship, the Coronation oath meant he had to govern by the statutes of parliament whilst the coronation oath meant he had to give up prerogative taxes as well as altering the relationship via losing control of the judges contrary to how James I could use Judge Jefferies. The relationship was ultimately impacted very significantly by finance as the Bank of England civil list and national debt ultimately put parliament at the upper hand in finance whilst the commission of public accounts shows this was important as the monarch is now under scrutiny from parliament contrary to Charles I who could spend lavishly on mistresses and sport. The clashes over finance ultimately left the crown at the mercy of parliament, showing new important that finance was in impacting the relationship.*

*The depth to which the relationship has been impacted is seen clearly in Anne's reign. There was much less conflict than in previous reign for example the Book of Rates in Charles I's reign was incompatible with Anne's acceptance of a civil list. Furthermore, it is clear finance had a large impact as it was now a party issue with Anne Totally relying on ministers like Harley to keep the Whigs at Bay, And the set up of the South Sea Company acting a rival to the Tory Lloyd's coffee house. Parliament's 556 members were in very regular meeting, contrasted with Charles I's 11 year personal rule, showing that finance clearly had a large impact on the relationship.*

*Therefore, foreign policy in the earlier reigns certainly did not have the greatest impact on the relationship, as finance took precedence.*

*Religion was another factor that contributed hugely to the relationship.*

*Again, initially the crown was dominant, seen through Laud, the Beauty of Holiness, the continuation of convocation and the et cetera oath, However clashes were more about the perception of religion and fears of arbitrary government than religion itself for example the impeachment of Laud and Strafford was causing conflict and impacting the relationship because of fears of absolutism. the religion wouldn't have a huge impact for example the use of prerogative courts like Star Chamber to silence opponents like Burton Bastwick and Prynne meant parliament had no say, Although it did lead to the rise of the Puritan leadership of Pym and his Junto. However, it was ultimately not as important as finance as the execution was seen as a major religion*

change but the vote of No Address and the execution was carried out by the 59 member rump parliament and did little to change the monarchy itself of the relationship as people disliked the Puritan demise.

In Charles I's reign it became more of an issue. There was consternation on both sides about the influence of Puritans and so the Savoy and Worcester confidants stopped conflict by aligning the crown and Parliament's causes. Furthermore Breda stopped conflict as it was saying Parliament's rule would be more defined. However Charles surrendered control of religion to Parliament in the Clarendon code, the Acts of Uniformity Quarter Act. Act of Uniformity and Five Mile Act showed religion was had the greatest impact on relationship as it was now in parliamentary control and the relationship improved. However although the relationship improved there was conflict, e.g. over the Declaration of Indulgence and the response the Test Acts. However Parliament did still remain out of complete control as Charles was able to use his prerogative to defeat the exclusion of Catholic James, suggesting that the relationship would have been impacted more by clashes over religion if Charles had less prerogatives. Overall the rule of religion in his reign is exaggerated is causing changing the relationship, and clashes over foreign policy were perhaps important.

However in James' reign it was clashes over religion that were most important. James had no foreign policy so parliament had no power of the purse to counteract his suspending and dispensing power to promote Catholics eg the President of Magdalen College and II to the Privy Council, and two Declarations of Indulgence. It is clear this had the greatest impact as the prerogative courts being re-established eg Ecclesiastical Commission when viewed in the sinister context of Louis XIV and the revocation of the Edict of Nantes caused a great concern in Parliament. This shown how important religion is in the cross party letter of 'deliver us' to William whose banner as 'to defend the liberties of the Protestant faith' aided by a 'Protestant wind'. However in hindsight this may be seen as an attack on an individual not impacting the relationship with the monarchy itself.

William's personal religion didn't cause conflict showing how foreign policy had a greater impact. he was a Protestant whose position as Stadholder holder of the Netherlands lessened the religious policy impact. However it did still alter the Balance of Power as the Test Acts and Toleration Act did put religion firmly in Parliament's hand and they secured the role in the succession, contrary as they hadn't been able to in Charles II's reign. However there was much less conflict showing it didn't have the greatest impact there was a unity of purpose absent in the earlier reigns eg the Bishops war due to religion.

The relationship was completely altered by Anne's reign. It was new a party issue with Anne as a female having next to no say eg the schism Act showed high Tory influence, contrary to James' influence in the directions to preachers. Furthermore Sacheverell's case showed conflict was new between Parliament not involving the crown, showing religion did impact as this was contrary to Montague in Charles I's reign as parliament and the Lords put Sacheverell on trial. Occasional conformity showed the scale of religion's impact as the Crown had no say and the Parliamentary parties were able to organise along Whig and Tory lines adversarial politics became underhand and there was organisation in and there was organisation in clubs Therefore religion had an impact but not until after finance was sorted.

*Lastly, foreign policy had a huge impact on the relationship but not until later as it only caused conflict.*

*In Charles I's reign he very much held the power in foreign policy eg through Buckingham and La Rochelle, which although evoked criticism and conflict (Eliot 'our honour is ruined our ships are sunk by those we trust') the clashes didn't impact the relationship in terms of power as parliament had to be very radical – the assassination of Buckingham by Felton showed this. Furthermore, Parliament couldn't gain by means of foreign policy as peace with Spain and France in the Treaties of Susa and Madrid meant he could rule without parliament for 11 years, and no change was enacted.*

*Charles II maintained all rights in foreign policy – he could negotiate marriage treaties such as Catherine of Braganza. (However this suggested religion was more important as conflict came through the catholic threat to the Dynasty.) He ultimately held complete control suggesting it didn't create a huge impact as although the Treaty of Dover caused conflict it was more due to religion and suspicion of Charles being 'pro French'. Furthermore, foreign policy meant that he gained New Amsterdam and New York and Navigation Aids curbed Dutch trade so foreign policy gains can be used to finance personal rule, so the relationship can be impacted through conflict but not through shifts of balance of power showing it to be less important and a lesser impact on the relationship than finance, as although it came at the cost of ministers like Clarendon, it was not as effective as attacks on finance.*

*Foreign policy certainly didn't have the greatest impact on James' reign. He had no European entanglements and enjoyed expanded customs (up to 1.4 million) and colonial trade meaning he could pursue his policies in multiple kingdoms like Tyrconnell in Ireland practically unopposed.*

*It was William's reign where foreign policy grew important. He was pre-occupied with the war with Louis meaning that he was often away so parliament are left developing a cabinet government. The conflict was lessened as he was vehemently anti-French and England joined the Grand Alliance meaning the relationship was very positively impacted due to the common cause made by foreign policy. His need for £1.5 million for funding war also meant the relationship could be transformed by parliamentary gaining of power, for example the Crown appointees could no longer be MPs, the monarch couldn't leave without consent and no wars in foreign opinions. this was contrary to James I who had fled to France. Furthermore William set a precedent for parliamentary ratification of treaties like Westminister and Ryswick used thereafter, which was contrary to Charles I's reign showing in this reign foreign policy did have the greatest impact.*

*Anne's reign showed this. Parliament now ratified all treaties for example the Barrier Treaty and the Aliens Act. In fact Anne had only one say in the veto of the Scottish Militia Bill across any areas contrary to Charles I who held power in all areas showing foreign policy had a huge impact. The relationship was very positively affected the Treaty of Utrecht saw Britain's emergence as a major European power and Marlboroughs victories like Ramilles gave the Crown and Parliament a unity of purpose contrary to La Rochelle, showing it had a great impact.*

*In conclusion, finance was initially most important, but foreign policy was of great importance in later reign showing its great impact, more so than religion at this stage.*

### Examiner's comments

The response presents a well-written analysis of the period with a sustained focus on the question. The proposition is confidently addressed with excellent use of supporting evidence throughout. The answer covers a very wide range of issues and events yet retains a focus on the key issues throughout.

The introduction directly addresses the question, arguing that the period began with finance having the 'greatest impact' than religion, before foreign policy 'began to be important'.

This candidate chooses to initially focus on the importance of finance and presents an in-depth analysis of the financial conflicts during the reigns of the monarchs of this period. Where major clashes are identified, e.g. Constitutional Revolution, the response analyses the importance of the impact of this issue. Throughout this analysis of financial conflict, the response consistently refers to the impact upon the relationship between Crown and Parliament. As the answer develops the candidate introduces foreign policy issues connected to finance, most notably in William's willingness to 'govern by the statutes of Parliament' in order to raise the funds for his European war. The section on financial conflict concludes with a confident explanation of the changing financial arrangements under William and how the reign of Anne saw 'much less conflict'. The candidate argues that finance had a 'large impact' on the relationship and therefore foreign policy 'certainly did not have the greatest impact'.

The response then addresses the impact of religion upon the relationship between Crown and Parliament in the period. Arguing that initially the Crown was 'dominant', however Laudian changes to the church created significant opposition especially due to fears of absolutism. The response goes on to address the limited impact of clashes over religion during Charles II's reign before noting that it was during the reign of James II that clashes over religion were 'most important'. His pro-Catholic policies are identified as directly causing his downfall. The candidate argues that during the reign of William and Mary religion was not as important as foreign policy. The conflict in Anne's reign is analysed as inter-party rather than between Crown and Parliament.

The next section of the response focuses on the proposition and directly addresses the 'huge impact' of foreign policy. The reigns of Charles I, Charles II and James II are briefly and confidently assessed, with foreign policy recognised to be a cause of conflict but not as significant as finance. The candidate then explains how during the reign of William 'foreign policy grew important', outlining how the relationship with Parliament was 'transformed' as a result. These changes were then displayed in the reign of Anne. While the final section of the response is a little hurried, it retains a high level of understanding, good use of supporting evidence and a focus on the key issues.

The response concludes with a re-assertion of its main line of argument, that finance was 'initially most important' but that by the end of the period in question foreign policy had a 'great impact'.

The response was assessed as mid-Level 4 and awarded 35 out of 40.

## Option 2 Ireland under the Union 1800–1900

**Q1** “In the period 1800–1900 unionists and constitutional nationalists in Ireland only experienced success when they enjoyed popular support.” How far would you agree with this statement? [40]

### Student’s response

*Constitutional nationalists and unionists enjoyed numerous successes throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Nationalists enjoyed the success of Catholic Emancipation, reform, Land Acts in 1870 and 1881 and the introduction of Home Rule. Unionists were successful in achieving their main aim which was the maintenance of the union with Britain. However there are other contributing factors which were pivotal in their success, such as, the strength of the British Government, the effectiveness of their leaders, support of their respective churches and the economic climate. However it can be argued that the main factor of their success was popular support.*

*From 1800-1815, Ireland was enjoying economic prosperity due to the or ongoing wars in France. This led to a demand in Irish agricultural produce. The main issue for constitutional nationalists at this time was Catholic Emancipation, which was suppose to be included with the Act of Union. This campaign was led by Grattan who proved a poor leader. He was not able to gain church support or mobilise mass support with Irish Nationalists. Therefore it is argued that due to poor leadership and the lack of popular support, Nationalism did not enjoy any success in this period. However, the British Government were strong under Lord Liverpool also. In 1823, Daniel O’Connell began his campaign for catholic emancipation. He established the Catholic Association in order to gain support. He created a mass movement by gaining the support of the catholic church. The catholic priests and Bishops, used this stance to promote the Catholic Association. O’Connell also created the Catholic Rent which Bishop Doyle openly supported. This funded the Association and the campaign.*

*O’Connell also used parliamentary means to achieve his aims. He further mobilised popular support through campaigning in elections. The 40 shilling freeholders had a resounding victory in 1826 when 4 Pro-Emancipation MPs were elected. In 1828, O’Connell campaigned against the popular Vessy Fitzgerald in the Clare – by – election. O’Connell won an impressive victory, furthering his support base. With all of this, the British Government passed Catholic Emancipation in 1829, as a result of the popular support for it in Ireland. However it must be noted that the support of the church was also crucial to O’Connells success. Ireland was also suffering a post war slip and severe economic hardship after the Napoleonic Wars which also contributed to the need for catholic emancipation, as many catholics felt it would improve their financial situation. The British Government at this stage were also weak and were not resilient in their opposition.*

*In 1835, O’Connell formed an alliance with the Whig Government under Melbourne and formed the Lichfield House Compact (LHC). During this alliance, several reforms were passed for Ireland, Municipal Co-operative Act 1840, Poor Law 1838*

and the Title Act 1838. The Title Act was significant as it reduced the tithe by 25% that had to be paid to the established Church of Ireland.

However the success of these reforms can not be attributed to popular support. It is due to the strong leadership of O'Connell to enter an alliance with the Whigs to push for Irish reforms. However, the Whig government under Melbourne was weak and needed an alliance with the Irish MPs as well as radical MPs in Britain to form a government. Therefore popular support did not affect these achievements.

In the 1840s, O'Connell was striving for repeal, his ultimate political goal according to Lyons. O'Connell founded the Repeal Association and the Repeal rent, similar to his Catholic Emancipation campaign. He formed an alliance with the Young Ireland movement which formed a propaganda machine for O'Connell. He generated mass support through their newspaper the 'Nation' as well as monster meetings. He gained much support, however he failed to gain much middle class support and Bishop support, as they were happy to maintain the union from their economic situation. However the Repeal Movement ultimately failed, not due to their lack of support, but O'Connell's decline and the strength of the British Government. Despite holding monster meetings such as Tara where 1 million people attended, British Prime Minister Peel managed to destroy the movement.

Peel called O'Connell out on his policy of brinkmanship on the eve of the Clontarf meeting in 1843. In response O'Connell cancelled the meeting leading to his decline and the demise of the repeal movement.

O'Connell also lost his alliance with the Young Irelanders (YI) due to Peel's reforms in Ireland, such as The Charitable Bequests Acts and the Maynooth Michael Davitt of YI was particularly supportive of the Queens Colleges Act in Belfast, Galway and Cork, which O'Connell were critical of. This led to the fall in their alliance. Overall, the failure of repeal was due to the strength of the British Government, as O'Connell had mobilised popular support.

The 1840-1860 period was characterised by the famine and as a result no Nationalist political movement emerged bar the Tenant Right Movement. However they failed to mobilise popular support as most people in Ireland was concentrated on economic and social recovery.

In the 1870s, constitutional Nationalists were focused on Land Reform. While Gladstone passed in 1870 Land Act which legalised the Ulster Custom, many Nationalists felt it was limited. In 1877, Ireland faced a great depression which resulted in the Land War 1879-1892. This triggered the founding of the Land League which appealed for land reform. Parnell became leader and he was able to mobilise popular support through the New Departure, established in 1879. The New Departure brought together The Land League, IPP, and the Fenians. Every strand of Nationalism brought together to mobilise mass support. This was achieved and in 1881, the Second Land Act was passed by Gladstone. It established the 3 Fs – Fair Rent, Free Sale and Fixity of Tenure. This Nationalist achievement was due to popular support, but also had to be attributed to the economic climate and the quality of Parnell's leadership.

*In the 1880s, Constitutional Nationalism was successful, particularly in 1885 General Election. The Irish Parliamentary Party (IPP) won 86 seats, all southern seats bar Trinity College. In Ulster Nationalists won 17/33 seats. Therefore Nationalists held the balance of power. They entered into an alliance with the Liberals and the following year a Home Rule Bid was introduced. This success was due to Parnell's ability to mobilise mass support during his election campaign and propaganda, but also through the New Departure and his stance on the Land Issue. However the introduction of the 1886 Home Rule Bill was also due to the weak Liberal government which needed Irish support to form a government.*

*In 1890s Home Rule was introduced in 1893, but failed as the first Bill did in government. However the rest of the decade was unsuccessful as the IPP split after Parnell's divorce scandal. The British Government were strong and adapted a policy of killing Home Rule with kindness. The IPP had no effective leader and therefore were not able to mobilise support. Therefore they were unsuccessful in this period.*

*Unionism was successful throughout the century due to their ability to mobilise popular support. In 1834, Reverend Henry Cooke organised a rally in opposition to repeal at Hillsborough which 40,000 people attended. He called for Protestants of all denominations to unite in opposition. This success can also be attributed to church support as well.*

*In the 1850s and 1860s William Johnston gathered popular support after his defiance of the party processions Act 1850 which banned all orange marches. On his release from prison he stood for election in Belfast in 1868 election. He gained much Unionist support particularly among the working class and held this seat till his death. His success was mainly down to his ability to mobilise support.*

*After the shocking defeat in Ulster of the 1885 General Election, many Unionist groups were established such as the Ulster Loyal and Patriotic Union, Unionist Loyal Anti-Repeal Union and the Ulster Alliance. These groups worked to gain support to oppose Home Rule. They were successful in their aim as both 1886 Home Rule Bill and 1893 Home Rule Bill failed.*

*In 1892, Unionist Support was again mobilised at the Ulster Convention in Botanic Gardens in Belfast organised by Thomas St Clair where 12 000 delegates attended to oppose Home Rule. In 1893, Unionist leader Colonel Edward Saunderson who was key in the emerging Ulster Party at Westminster and first leader of the Unionist party established Unionist club.*

*The Orange Order in existence from 1795 help to mobilise support with over 220,000 members.*

*Overall mass support was key in the success of Nationalism and Unionism, but support of the Church, economic climate and quality of leadership were also factors.*

## Examiner's comments

In this response there is a detailed introduction which establishes some of the main events and arguments that will be employed by the candidate. Whilst the introduction does not need to be this long, it is nevertheless a sign of the organisation and the logic of this answer.

The candidate goes on to discuss the role of Grattan and to disagree with the proposition showing other reasons why Grattan failed. The candidate then turns to Daniel O'Connell and the campaign for Catholic Emancipation, making clear links to the question regarding how O'Connell's success was caused by both popular support as well as a variety of other factors. This is a very impressive section of the answer, in particular the analysis of the weakness of Wellington's Government. The answer then progresses to discuss the period of the Lichfield House Compact, again rejecting the proposition and offering valid other reasons for the success of the reforms. At this point there could have been some discussion of the failure of O'Connell overall in this period and how he saw his public support erode at this time. The next section on the failure of the Repeal campaign lacks a little focus in places and whilst the response does assess the failure of the movement, the analysis could have been more closely linked to the question.

The answer next addresses the era of Gladstone and Parnell, which it does very well. Parnell's role in building popular support is particularly well covered and there are good links to the proposition. Other relevant factors are also selected, and solid arguments made as to how they contributed to Parnell's success in this period. There is some very impressive analysis about the ultimate failure of Home Rule with clear links to the question again. Having dealt well with the constitutional nationalism aspect of the question, the candidate now moves on to assess unionism.

There is an immediate reference to the ability of unionism to mobilise mass support and the example of Henry Cooke is cited and argued well. There is also a good attempt to assess the activities of unionism in the 1850s and 1860s, giving evidence of how unionism was consistently able to mobilise mass support. The answer tends to focus on the mass events organised by unionism such as the Ulster Convention at Botanic Gardens but there is always an attempt to link these events to the question and comment upon how popular support was linked to success. This is where the main shortcoming of the answer becomes evident; there is no real attempt to differentiate between Ulster and Southern unionists and the extent to which they enjoyed differing degrees of popular support and therefore success. The answer would have needed to develop the experience of Southern unionists in particular.

Overall, this was a very competent response, achieving 36 out of 40. The use of knowledge was accurate, relevant and drawn from across the entire period. The answer spent perhaps a little too long on Grattan and O'Connell which meant that the end section on unionism was under-developed as a result. The candidate did, however, make a sustained effort to select relevant knowledge and link it clearly to the proposition, at times accepting and at times challenging the question in a skillful way.

**Q2** “The Act of Union determined political events in Ireland in the first half of the nineteenth century, while the Famine determined political developments between 1850 and 1900.” To what extent would you accept this verdict? [40]

### Student's response

*In many ways I accept this verdict. The events of the first half of the century for Constitutional Nationalists was focussed around implementing the emancipation of Catholic's that Pitt had failed to provide in the Act of Union and then repealing the bill they resented. The unionist aims of this period were heavy focused on maintaining the religious, political and ecomic gains they received in the act. The Famine however controlled later years greatly as the famine created anti British sentiment among nationalists that heavy controlled 1850-1900. However for unionism the act of Union still determinded many political events.*

*Despite Pitts wishes the Act of Union had failed to provide the Catholic Emancipation that he had desired to include, due to the Kings refusal. This issue fuelled Constitutional Nationalism causes of the early half of the 50 year period. Dianial O'Connel began the Catholic Association in 1823 and introduced Catholic Rent. He aligned this cause to the Church and raised £10,000 in just 9 months. It was due to the Act of Union that this issue arose and gained such strong popular support in the 1826 election the long held Waterford seat was changed to a Pro-emancipation candalit showing the government the extent to which the Act of Union was causing discontent. In 1828 O'Connel challenged the Co Claire seat and was forcing Wellington and Peel to grant emancaplion. This political event was fully caused by the failure of the Act of Union to grant the needs of the Irish people. Despite many reforms passed by the British government in the 1830'S due to the 1835 Lichfield House Compact, the Act of Union continued to fuel issues for the Irish people causing the Repeal campaign. O'Connel aim in this was to Repeal the Act of Union, showing the extent to which this issue shaped the first half of the century. He formed the Repeal association and sent in 1840 which had more limited success that those of Catholic Emancipation. He also held large monster meetings with many exceeding 300,000 atendentents. This shows that hatred of the act of union was a huge issue in the minds of the Irish people during this period. However Repeal failed after Peel banned the Monster meeting at Clontarf on 7<sup>th</sup> October 1843.*

*Many of the political stances taken by the Unionist community from 1800-1850 were also fuelled by the act of union. Under the Act they received religious protection as the Church of Ireland was the established church which all people had to tithe to. When this was threatened the formed in 1827 Bruswick clubs and later the Pan Protestant alliance in an attempt to uphold this aspect of the act of union. The Act of Union had gained unionists especially in the North, many advantages, so when Repeal threatened this then polilical response was large. In 1831 the Cooke challenged O'Connel to rome to Belfast and see the improvements of the Act of Union and still believe in the Repeal cause. Tennent highlight to the Commons that the Act had allowed Belfast population to grow from 20,000 – 53,000 and expand to become the worlds larges linnen produces. A meeting was held in Hillsborough in 1834 to fight repeal with 40,000 in attendance. This response to the threat of the union bgan a strong unionist tradition of these meetings that would continue throughout and past the century. The unionist seats increased from 30 in 1836 to 40*

in 1841. This shows how the Act of Union and its support changed the political make up of politics in Ireland.

However the Reform Campaign of Ireland was not heavily determined by the Act of Union. In 1838 both the Poor Law and the Tithe Act were passed provide Irish People with economic relief by reducing tithes and providing 130 work house. Introduction of Primary Education Nation wide and introduction of Catholics into the police were huge political step for Ireland in 1800-1850 that were not shaped by the Act of Union.

In many ways the political events of 1850-1900 were heavily shaped by Famine and the British governments failure to change it. The famine had reduced the Irish population from 8 million to 6 million in just five years. As a result farm sizes had increased and people had grown to see the value in owning their own land after many land lords had failed to act to provide relief during the famine. Tenant moves had existed since the 1850's but grew into a strong political power in 1879 when Davitt formed the land league. This organisation grew to 200,000 members , showing the strength of the effects of the famine on Irish political mindset. The New Departure was centered around improving land conditions for farmers after the famine. It united both politics, land and revolutionary by including Davitt, Devoy and Parnell. They demanded fixed rent, Fixity of Tenure and free sale in an attempt to alter peoples right in regards to land as the famine had highlighted land issues. During the 1879-81 land war the Irish people engaged in violence, refusal of rent and boycotting in an attempt to achieve land reform. Post famine people want land gratuities and this was given by Gladstone 1870 and 1881 land Acts The land reform issue shaped this tone of Irish political events for the 30 years after the famine and was heavily influenced by the famine of Ireland.

In many ways Constitutional Nationalist Home Rule campaign was also heavily influenced by the Famine. During the famine relief had been poor. Peel's government gave money to begin Public works that could pay subsistence level wages. These employed  $\frac{3}{4}$  million but were later closed. Similar outcome occurred from soup kitchens which closed in 1847 after only 4 months, despite feeding 3 million people. Lord John Russel's attitude was 'we can not just feed the people. The British governments attitude was viewed as English solutions to Irish problems with only 130 work houses provided for the whole country which only housed 200,000. This laissez-faire attitude resulted in anti british sentiment in Ireland with many believing 'The potato's brought the blight, but the British brought the famine'. This began a view that the Irish should govern themselves and formed a political event of Home Rule. Isaac Butt formed the Home Rule party in 1870 which Parnell took over in 1880. The National league formed in support of Home Rule in 1882 and grew to over 1000 branches. The IPP gained 86 MP's in 1835 showing the power of the Home Rule movement. Gladstone put forward the 1886 bill which failed by only 30 votes. In 1892 bill passed the commons but failed the Lords. The Home Rule cause was a huge political event which was largely shaped by the famine causing Irish citizens to lose faith in British government rule.

*To an extent the unionist policy's of 1850-1900 were reactionist to those of Constitutional Nationalists, so were in turn heavily shaped by the famine. The ILPU formed in 1885 to oppose land reform by southern unionists. Despite having 114 Irish aligned MPs in the House and publishing Notes from Ireland to express these views this group was unsuccessful in opposing land reform. Unionists' biggest political movement of 1850-1900 was the anti Home Rule campaign. In response to Constitutional Nationalist policy they argued for London Rule. They did this by Saunders' leadership of the unionist party formed in 1885 and through a large 12,000 person unionist convention in Botanic in 1892. Here Sinclair said Ulster would ignore a Home Rule Government if formed. The unionists also began a unionist club which grew to over 200 by 1893. Churchill also provided his support at a 1886 meeting where he declared 'Ulster will fight and Ulster will be right' In the 2<sup>nd</sup> half of the century it is clear that unionist political events were heavily influenced by Constitutional Nationalist Campaigns. As a result these events too were heavily influenced by the Famine.*

*Revolutionary Nationalism in the period I believe was continually influenced by the Act of Union throughout the entire century. Robert Emmet's 1803 revolts, Young Ireland's 1848 revolution and the Fenians' revolutionary action were all with the aim of removing the Act of Union. Even in the second half of the century the Fenians were dedicated and influenced by the Act. Young Ireland news paper 'The Nation' was focused on spreading Irish culture and ideas in Ireland to its 14 million readership. This focus on Irish culture was as a result of the British influence that the Act of Union has developed in Ireland. The Fenians too aimed to remove the Act and went as far as to attack on British soil in the Manchester Martyrs attack. Later in the century they also focused on reforming Irish Catholics to an Act of Union dominated country by forming the GAA in 1884 and the Gaelic League 1893. Some would argue however that Gladstone had a huge influence on 1850-1900 Irish political events than the Famine. He stated that his aim was to 'Pacify Ireland' As a result he made of a personal commitment to Ireland after being inspired by the Manchester Martyrs. He introduced the 1860 Land Act before the Land League was organised. He also continued the Home Rule policy after Parnell was removed from the party in 1890 for the O'Shea divorce scandal. Clearly he had a large influence on defining political events in Ireland from 1850-1900.*

*Overall I accept this verdict. I believe that the flaws in the Act of Union were the heavy focus of 1800-1850 Irish politics. However after the atrocity of the Famine politics became more focused on the land that had caused damage during the famine and reducing the powers of the government that had let down the Irish people during the Famine. The majority of political events were shaped this way but revolutionary nationalism remained focused on the Act of Union throughout the whole century.*

## Examiner's comments

This answer starts off with an impressive and yet concise introduction that clearly shows the candidate linking some of the key events of the century to the two elements identified in the question, the Act of Union and the Famine. This provides a sound basis for the rest of the answer.

The candidate starts by assessing the way in which the Act of Union influenced the career of Daniel O'Connell, making relevant observations on Catholic Emancipation, the Lichfield House Compact and the Repeal campaign. The strength of this section is that rather than give a blow by blow narrative account of these events, the candidate is instead very selective with their knowledge, clearly linking each aspect to the Act of Union.

There follows a very impressive section on unionism in its early stages up to 1840. The candidate again makes good use of their knowledge in selecting relevant facts and events to back up their central argument. There is impressive detail on Cooke, the Brunswick Clubs, unionist reaction to the threat of Repeal and the growing parliamentary strength of unionism. All these aspects are clearly linked to the Act of Union in what is a very strong argument. Before moving on to the latter half of the period, the candidate then puts forward a solid counter-argument regarding reform in the 1840s. There is a missed opportunity at this point in the answer to introduce the revolutionary nationalists such as Emmet and the Young Irelanders and link their efforts to the Act of Union.

Turning attention to the second part of the question, the candidate starts off with a discussion of the Famine and in particular British Government shortcomings in dealing with it. This is then used as a strong basis to show how the ensuing events of the century were linked inextricably to the Famine. There is a detailed breakdown in this section of the answer about how the Famine can be claimed to have led to the drive for Home Rule and even the reforms of Gladstone.

The answer then goes on to offer a very original analysis of unionism in the latter half of the century and how it was dominated by reactions to the constitutional nationalist struggle that had in turn been influenced by the Famine. This is a particularly impressive argument which the candidate again backs up well with a selective use of relevant knowledge. One small shortcoming of the answer at this level would be the lack of consideration given to Southern unionists and how the Famine had affected them in their campaign to defeat Home Rule.

The final section of the answer then moves on to deal with revolutionary nationalism. There is a good attempt to link the Act of Union to the rebellions of 1803 and 1848. The Fenian rebellion of 1867 is also discussed but there is again a missed opportunity here to link this to the events of the Famine and the changes that event had caused in Ireland. A good counter-argument regarding Gladstone's reforms is offered just before the conclusion that is both original and well-argued.

The conclusion is logical and sums up the arguments well, making their argument on revolutionary nationalism a little clearer than had been the case in the main body of the answer. This was worthy of credit. Overall, this was a very competent and original response, achieving a high Level 4. The use of knowledge was accurate, relevant and drawn from across the entire period. The answer's major strength is the selective use of knowledge employed throughout by the candidate. The knowledge is used effectively to illustrate the arguments put forward rather than the approach employed by many candidates where they use vast amounts of knowledge to try to develop an argument. This was an original response that showed a very skillful approach to this kind of extended essay answer and was awarded 37 out of 40 marks.

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

**Q1** “German ambition was the cause of nearly all the wars fought in Europe between 1848 and 1945.” To what extent would you accept this judgement?  
[40]

#### Student’s response

*I believe German Ambition was a core factor in engineering several wars, most significantly the wars of unification, as well as world war 1 and world war 2.*

*In 1848, the Frankfurt Parliament aimed to unify Germany but was unsuccessful. When Bismarck became Minister of Prussia in 1862, he strongly believed in a ‘blood and iron ideology’ which involved achieving a unified Germany through militaristic means rather than diplomatic means. Bismarck’s ambition to achieve ‘Kleindeutschland’ a unified Germany under Prussia caused him to engineer three wars, including the Danish War in 1864 where Prussia and Austria annexed Schleswig and Holstein under the Convention of Gastein. Furthermore, in 1866, Bismarck accused Austria of contravening the Convention of Gastein resulting in the Austro-Prussian War in 1866 lasting 7 weeks. The Treaty of Prague furthered Bismarck’s achievements as Prussia established itself as a powerful economic and military state and Austrian weakness had been exposed. Bismarck formed the North German Confederation of 22 states, and the Franco-Prussian War in 1871 completed Bismarck’s aims by gaining the remaining for independent states and completing German unification.*

*However from 1871-90, Germany was a ‘satisfied power’ and Bismarck’s ambition post 1871 was to stop conflict arising. He did this by constructing a complex web of alliances in which he aimed to keep France isolated and prevent Austria-Hungary and Russia from getting too close. His ambitions aimed to mitigate conflict, through the first Dreikaiserbund 1873, followed by the Dual Alliance in 1879 and the Second Dreikaiserbund in 1881, which aimed to improve German-Russian and Austro-Russian relations after the Russo-Turkish War in 1877 and Bismarck’s role as the ‘honest broker’ which caused Russia to become wary of Bismarck after taking the side of the Allies in the Treaty of Berlin (1878). Furthermore, the Reinsurance Treaty in 1887 aimed to further improve German-Russian relations. Through this period it can be seen that Bismarck’s ambition of preventing encirclement, caused a lasting period of peace, rather than war.*

*The Kaiser’s ambition since he acceded in 1888 was a primary factor in WW1 as the Great Powers agreed in the Treaty of Versailles in Article 231 which was the war guilt clause. The Kaiser followed the trend at the time that ‘war was good for all nations’, and his ‘weltpolitik’ policy in 1897 caused conflict, particularly, with Britain and France in the years preceding WW1.*

*The Kaisers visit to London in 1891 stimulated the Franco-Russian Alliance of 1894, bring the two great powers closer. Furthermore, in 1896, the Kaiser sent the Kruger telegram, congratulating the Boers on their success after the British Jameson Raid in 1895. From 1898-1911, the Kaiser pursued a naval race with Britain, with Four Fleet Acts between 1898 and 1902 and the aim to produced 60 battleships a year. Also, with the development of the Dreadnought in 1906, this put increased pressure on Britain as the rest of the fleet was rendered useless. This greatly heightened tensions between the powers as the navy was Britain's pride for over 100 years and it was perceived as a threat.*

*Furthermore in 1905 and 1911 the Kaiser had the opportunity to launch a diplomatic triumph but instead by supporting Moroccan independence and sending in a gunboat 'panther' to the Port of Agadir, relationships between France and Britain were strengthened and relationships deteriorated with Germany. Possibly most, significantly on the 5<sup>th</sup> July, the Kaiser produced a 'Blank Cheque' to Austria-Hungary, providing unconditional support in the event of war. This prompted A-H to produce such a harsh ultimatum to Serbia, and declare war on the 25<sup>th</sup> July. Austria-Hungary alone would not have acquired the resources to fight a major European War, but with Germany's backing they felt confident. This shows how the Kaiser's ambition for war and territory resulted in a small domestic conflict into a major European war in 1914.*

*It can be argued to sole cause of world war 2, was due to Adolf Hitler, who became Chancellor in 1933. His aggressive foreign policy, also adopted by other Great Powers, such as Mussolini's Fascist aims and Japan's authoritarian regime caused the outbreak of World War 2 in 1939. Hitler wanted war from his appointment as Chancellor, aiming to undo the 'diktat' that was the Treaty of Versailles which resulted in the loss of 13% of territory and 12% of the population including the resource rich Alsace-Lorraine. This and the sum of 132 million gold marks caused Hitler to seek revenge in war and restore German Greatness prior to WW1. He began rearming in 1933, and the Luftwaffe has 17,000 airplanes in the first year. Conscription was reintroduced in 1933 and Germany left the League of Nations and Disarmament Conference in 1933. He began on a Four Year Plan in 1936 heading by Goering to prepare Germany for war, by 1940. In 1936 he remilitarised the Rhineland and invaded Czechoslovakia in 1938, which was part of his aim of Lebensraum, which included uniting all German speaking peoples and creating a 'living space' by invading towards the East. He wanted grossdeutschland in contrast to Bismarck. It was Hitler's invasion of Poland in 1939 that forced Britain and France to intervene after following a policy of appeasement throughout the 1930s, and declare war on the 1<sup>st</sup> September. This shows how Hitler's ambition resulted in the second Major European War.*

*While German ambition was a significant factor in major wars, other countries had a part to play in escalating conflict. In the Crimean War of 1853, it was Russia ambition of a warm water port in the East, that caused an end to the 'Concert of Europe' which last from 1815. Britain intervened to preserve trades routes along the Straits and Dardanelles. In the North Italian War of 1859, it was Cavour's ambition of Italian unification under Piedmont that escalated conflict, as he aimed to achieve the wealthy states of Lombardy and Venetia. The Russo-Turkish War in 1877 was due to Russian duties to protect the Orthodox Christians and increase their influence*

*of Pan Slavism in the Balkans. Furthermore, in the lead up to World War 1, all countries participated in imperialist adventures which escalated tension, and in the short term, Russia mobilised first and were very keen to back Serbia. France was also belligerent in the years up to 1914, with a feeling of 'outrance à offence' prevalent between 1906-11 as well as revanism after the loss of Alsace Lorraine. While Germany was the core aggressor in World War 2, as a result of Hitler's ambitions, all countries believed the Treaty of Versailles was too harsh, and there was a general trend towards rearmament, as well as countries such as Britain following a policy of 'imperial preference' to protect trade. Streseman's policy of 'fulfillment' 1924-29 also aimed to mitigate conflict (eg Locarno Treaties 1925) In conclusion, I agree to an extent with this statement, as the wars of unification (1864-71) as well as world war 1 and 2 were caused primarily by German ambition, whether through Bismarck's aim of Kleindeutschland, Kaiser's ambition for a 'place in the sun' or Hitler's ambition of gross Deutschland. However other factors must be considered, as without other countries ambitions the conditions for war would have not been so easily created.*

### Examiner's comments

The first paragraph of this response offers an opinion on the proposition, citing the German Wars of Unification as an example of German blame. This sets the stage for succeeding paragraphs, concerned, in the first two thirds of the essay, with the question of German responsibility.

The second paragraph accurately summarises the causes, course and results of the three wars fought to achieve German unification in the period 1864–71. Bismarck is seen as “engineering” these wars, utilising a “blood and iron” policy and seeking Prussian hegemony over a united Germany. Specific reference to the proposition might have been made here.

The third paragraph deals, in some detail, with the system of alliances engineered by Bismarck, “to stop conflict arising.” His aims are described as the isolation of France, and the balancing act of preventing an Austro-Russian alliance while seeking to stay on good terms with both countries. The paragraph drifts away from the proposition somewhat, although at its conclusion it does claim that Bismarck/Germany, after 1870, helped to produce a period of peace rather than war, implicitly challenging the proposition.

The response goes on to describe the role of Germany, and particularly William II, in bringing about the First World War, with a reference to the “war guilt clause” of 1919. The Kaiser is blamed for scaring France and Russia into an alliance, antagonising Britain by the Kruger Telegram, and heightening tension by indulging in the naval race with Britain. The Moroccan crises of 1905 and 1911 are well described, and seen as leading to “deteriorating relationships.” The final section of this paragraph is an accurate and perceptive view of the July Crisis of 1914, showing how German support for Austria-Hungary was the key factor, not only in giving the latter the confidence to present an obviously unacceptable ultimatum to Serbia, but also in the escalation of “a small domestic (sic) conflict into a major European War.”

The fifth paragraph links its predecessor's reference to "the Kaiser's ambition for war" to Hitler's "aggressive foreign policy." It refers to and explains his determination to undo the Treaty of Versailles (although the cross-party nature of anti-Versailles feeling within Germany might have been mentioned) and details some of the rearmament measures of the 1930s. The response asserts that Hitler "wanted war" from 1933, but without further argument or supporting evidence. An interesting reference to Hitler's desire for a Grossdeutschland, in contrast to Bismarck's more limited vision of Germany, is unfortunately not followed through with an account of the Anschluss, but Czechoslovakia and Poland, the latter resulting in World War II. Hitler, rather than "Germany" is blamed throughout the paragraph.

The candidate goes on to consider wars which do not necessarily support the proposition, offering a wide range of other "causes of.... wars." The Crimean War is blamed on the Russian ambition to gain a warm water port on the Mediterranean, and resultant British concerns, while Piedmontese economic and territorial ambitions are seen as the cause of the 1859 war in northern Italy. Cultural reasons are cited as the reason for the Russo-Turkish War, 1877–78, and imperial rivalries are seen as stoking up tension in the years before the First World War. Returning to the July Crisis, the response condemns Russian readiness to mobilise in support of Serbia, while French vengefulness over the loss of Alsace-Lorraine is seen as a background to the poisonous atmosphere leading up to 1914. Causes of World War II other than German aggression are mentioned: an acceptance of the harshness of Versailles in Britain and France (probably to explain appeasement, but this is not made clear,) and trade rivalries. Brief mention is made of Stresemann's policy of "fulfilment," presumably contradicting the proposition. This paragraph is followed by a sound summary and concluding paragraph.

This response is generally well argued, with strong focus on the proposition, although Paragraph 3 tends towards digression, and some missed opportunities have been referred to above. Contextual knowledge is sound, and "other causes" range admirably widely. The response was assessed as mid-Level 4 and a mark out of 36 was awarded.

**Q2** "Fear of rivals was a more important cause of war among the great powers than aggression." How far would you agree with this assessment of the outbreak of wars in Europe in the period 1848–1945? [40]

**The above question could not be exemplified as the candidate's permission could not be obtained.**

## Option 4 The American Presidency 1901–2000

**Q1** “American presidential power increased during wartime but decreased during peacetime.” To what extent would you accept this verdict on how the American presidency developed in the period 1901–2000? [40]

### Student’s response

*The power of the American Presidency significantly increased from 1901 to 2000, exchanging 19<sup>th</sup> century isolation for a more inward looking foreign policy and becoming much more heavily involved in domestic policy. This is arguably solely to do with the war, increasing only when Wilson entered into World War One, F.D. Roosevelt (FDR) in WW2, the Imperial Presidents and the Cold War as well as Johnson during the Vietnam War, and Reagan in ending the Cold War. However, key turning points is the increase in Presidential Power also came in peacetime, with Roosevelt’s (TR’s) influential presidency FDR’s role in the Depression, Reagan’s key role in restoring faith in the Office, and Nixons failure during Watergate. These factors will now be examined to ascertain whether American Presidential power increased during wartime, but decreased during peace time.*

*Wilson’s entry into WW1 marked a significant increase in presidential power as it massively increased the scope for growth for the Presidency consolidated the removal of isolationism and turned Wilson into not only an American leader but a World leader. The entry into WW1 in 1917 and Wilson’s subsequent drafting of 3 million men into the army, as well as his nine month sojourn in Paris (the first and longest President to be out of power) further reversed the isolationist trend of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Furthermore the role the US played in allied victory, his 14 points at Versailles deciding the new world borders, and the League of Nations pushed the office outside the parameters of the US, making Wilson into a world leader and international statesman who appealed beyond the borders of the US. This all massively increased presidential power on an international scene, and therefore during wartime power was increased.*

*Additional evidence to the proposition is that WW2, and FDR’s entry into it in 1942 was a massive increase in Presidential power, firstly in his capacity as Commander in Chief of the army, and war as element of foreign policy, increased the scope to grow for the office + presidential power as Congress took a more detailed role in Domestic Policy. The key decisions for the war were made in the Whitehouse, with US involvement fundamentally helping the win, contributing two thirds manpower, role in D-Day landings as well as against Japan in the Pacific and Africa all contributed to FDR as a world leader and made the USA into a superpower, increasing presidential power. Also the war made the US economy into an economic powerhouse with GDP rising from \$191 billion in 1939 to \$166 billion in 1944, making the USA a superpower. Also the war increased presidential power as it gave him more control of the lives of Americans with rationing, conscriptions, recruitment of workers and government control of wages and prices. Therefore during wartime, there was a massive increase in Presidential Powers.*

*Again we see an increase in Presidential power in the Cold War and the Imperial Presidency. Any President who was in power during the Cold War (Truman, Eisenhower & JFK) could see unprecedented power in their hands as the President became vital not just to the USA but to the free world as containing of communism from Soviet expansion. As commander in chief of in a nuclear age, the President could see massive amounts of power, so much so that they became known as the Imperial Presidents. For example the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution 1967 gave Johnson essentially a blank check in regards to his policy in Vietnam. In a nuclear age decisions had to be made quickly without time to debate or consult congress, and so it was the President who had to make the decisions in the Whitehouse. The decisions that had to be made were of utmost importance for example dropping the atomic bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Also the Presidents had direct involvement in policies such as the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Aid, which were staple of US Foreign policy for the next 25 years. Also the cold war the establishment of a defence and intelligence community – Trumans National Security Act 1945 which furnished the President with unprecedented power to respond to the Soviet Threat. Therefore during the Cold War there was a massive increase in Presidential power therefore supporting the proposition*

*Reagans response to the Cold War also was a key increase in Presidential power, as trust in the office had begun to weaken, and the role he played through the Cold War played a massive part in restoring American confidence in the Presidency and so increasing Presidential Power. Reagan tried to win the Cold War by first intensifying it and then ending it. He set up 500 Intermediate range missiles in Europe (Cruise and Pershing) as well as built up the ICBMS and his Star Wars Programme (SDI) Then he brought back Nixon's Détente policy to soften relations, with the USSR, as well as China in his summit meeting with Gorbachev, INF Treaty, and Salt II. Therefore Reagan's role in the Cold War (War Time) increased Presidential power as it returned faith in the Presidency after the failure of the Vietnam War. However during the War Time although there was change in Presidential power it was a massive decrease. LBJ (Johnsons) role in the Vietnam War massively decreased his popularity so much so that he didn't try for a second term. Americans were angry and humiliated that they had been defeated in an undeclared war by a third world country. The Tet Offensive of 1968, hardened his reputation further, and led to American's questioning if the President had too much power. Therefore this wartime led to a decrease in Presidential power as trust in the office began to erode, overshadowing LBJ's immense domestic achievements such as Civil Rights Act, Voting Rights Act and the Great Society.*

*However Presidential power did not only increase in war time but also in peace time, especially under TR. Teddy Roosevelt marked a stark departure from the 19<sup>th</sup> century presidents. He realised the vast potential of the office was unused and recognised the opportunity to take advantage of a constitution which said so little about the office, and create a Presidency with more power. He did so in foreign policy where he wanted to make the USA into a world power and show so on the world stage which he did in building up a strong navy and dispatching the Great / White Fleet, building the Panama Canal + the corollary to the Monroe Doctrine. Also he won the Nobel Peace Prize for mediating the Russo-Japanese War making his into international statesman. This marked a sharp departure from isolationism + / George Washingtons' advice to not get involved in foreign entanglements. This was*

a turning point from the 19<sup>th</sup> century the predecessors who had prioritised slavery, westward expansion + a policy of isolationism, whilst TR saw the USA as a rising power and wanted to demonstrate so and the world stage taking its place amongst the Imperial Powers of the Earth. He also increased presidential power namely in his domestic policy, where as contradictory to a + Republican President he had a progressive programme and got much more involved as he was a President who took care of the material welfare of the nation by being involved in the day to day economic issues which was groundbreaking + new. He did this through his involvement in industrial disputes. Eg Anthracite Coal Strike 1902, as well his Square Deal balancing the reorganisation of trade unions with the need for big business He was also the First Conservative President. Therefore his increased involvement in everyday American lives increased Presidential power (peacetime).

Also FDR during the 30's and his handling of the depression counters the statement and it increases Presidential Power. His New Deal, belief in big government and extension of the federal government through the alphabet agencies firmly established the government could + should help people in times of hardship unlike the passive President belief and created a precedent for future Presidents to follow as he fundamentally changed the way American viewed the President creating the expectation that the government would help in times of need and helping giving birth to a semi- welfare state. Therefore FDR's handling of the depression during peace not war time massively increased the power of the President.

Reagan during peacetime his role on the domestic affairs massively increased Presidential power as he as afformentioned restored faith in the American Presidency and breathe new life into the office after four faith consecutive Presidents LBJ, and the Vietnam War. Nixon and Watergate, Fords weakness + Carter + the Iran Hostage Crisis. He convinced Congress through a number of reform and economic measures to bring the US out of a recession in lowering taxes and a budget reduction as well as curbing inflation and reducing unemployment and as well as increased in defence spending (\$1.5 trillion) Bringing the US out of a recession he retained faith in the Presidency and therefore increased its power.

However Nixon is not contrary to the statement as during peacetime he massively weakened + showed limits to the office and Presidential power when he abused his constitutional authority in the Watergate Scandal resulting in 1974 to avoid impeachment and the disillusionment of Americans about the Presidency. There was a new determination to enforce limits on what the President could do such as the War Powers Act 1973 Congressional Budget Act and Elections Campaigns Act 1974. Therefore this peace time action of Nixon in the Watergate affair did lead to the decrease of Presidential power as Americans had no trust in the office.

Therefore clearly American presidential power did increase presidential power in wartime, with the Cold War, WW1 and WW2 and the presidential handling of them (Wilson's policy of Neutrality meant only the demands of war increased the foreign power). Yet in some cases it did have detrimental effects on the power. Peacetime however mostly meant an increase in Presidential power and I believe – Teddy Roosevelt's Presidential time won the biggest increase as he broke the 19<sup>th</sup> Century limited role of the President + office and let the precedent for the Presidents to follow. Therefore I somewhat accept this verdict but believe another more strongly.

## Examiner's comments

The introduction to the answer gives an overview of the subject matter that is both detailed and balanced. Attention is drawn initially, and importantly, to the contrast in presidential power between the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, particularly in the field of foreign policy, but extending also to domestic affairs. In terms of the augmentation of presidential power in wartime, the key conflicts (the world wars, the Cold War and Vietnam War) and key presidents (Wilson, FDR, the "imperial" presidents, etc.) are noted. However, the candidate also challenges the proposition with reference to the actions of the two Roosevelts in peacetime.

The first of the wartime presidents Woodrow Wilson is well handled, noting the break with America's isolationist past and the elevation of the US president to the status of a world leader for the first time. Wilson's particular contribution to the peacemaking process is acknowledged with reference to the 14 Points and promotion of the League of Nations, but so too are his actions as Commander-in-Chief, with the drafting of a massive army that tipped the balance in favour of the Allies on the Western Front. In a question that is wide-ranging, this is a near-perfect section.

The answer then moves on to World War II and the presidency of FDR, though the candidate mistakenly dates America's entry into the conflict to 1942, when in fact the US declared war in December 1941. Despite this slip, this is another strong section, dealing not just with the military contribution of the US, such as in the great Pacific war and the D-Day landings, but also noting presidential control of wages and prices and, as the candidate puts it, "the lives of Americans". This is very impressive analysis.

Moving into the Cold War period and the era of the imperial presidents, the candidate makes the important observation that because of the (perceived) communist threat, the US presidency now takes on the role of leadership of the Free World. As Commander-in-Chief in the nuclear age, the president now wields unprecedented military power, and because decisions now have to be taken quickly as the candidate puts, "without time to debate or consult Congress" the president becomes the equivalent of a Roman emperor. The example of the dropping of the atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki is cited in support of this argument; so too is the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, though less convincingly (the Resolution is also misdated to 1967 – it was 1964). The candidate makes reference to the significance of the National Security Act in providing the president with a "defence and intelligence community", though again we are given the wrong date (it was passed in 1947, not 1945). The section is strong in terms of the headline points, but there are some flaws in detail.

The next section, on Ronald Reagan and the winning of the Cold War, produces solid analysis, noting key elements in the process such as the deployment of ICBMs to Europe, the SDI programme and the INF Treaty. This section also concludes the candidate's argument in support of the proposition.

A challenge to the proposition is now presented in relation to LBJ's handling of the Vietnam War, arguing convincingly that in the wake of events such as the Tet Offensive of 1968, "trust in the office [of president] began to erode". Therefore, presidential power began to *decrease* in wartime, despite LBJ's "domestic achievements" in relation to Civil Rights, etc.

A different challenge to the proposition is argued in the next paragraph, when the presidency of Teddy Roosevelt is cited as an example of presidential power *increasing in peacetime*. The candidate argues that TR exploited the vagueness of the US Constitution on the office of president to pursue his own vision of America as a world power, evidenced in the Great White Fleet, the building of the Panama Canal, the Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine, etc. The contrast with George Washington's view is well made. The candidate expands their argument by then considering TR's progressive domestic agenda, which dovetails nicely with the analysis of FDR's handling of the Depression that follows. The central argument here is that the New Deal fundamentally changes how people saw the presidency and alters their expectations of government. Reagan's presidency is also analysed in terms of increasing or in this case, restoring presidential power after the damage done to the institution by Vietnam, Watergate, etc. The argument is substantiated in terms of rebuilding the economy and restoring faith in the office of president.

A final confirmation of the proposition is related to Richard Nixon who reduces presidential power in peacetime due to his handling of the Watergate affair. This is correctly linked to the War Powers Act of 1973, which arguably had much less to do with the lessons of Vietnam than it did with Congress's attitude to Richard Nixon. The Nixon paragraph is followed by some concluding observation.

While errors in detail – and there are a few – preclude a mark at the top of the level for this answer, it is nonetheless an impressive essay, particularly in its structure and the sustained thrust of its argument. The candidate and their teacher should be proud of this piece of work. A mid-Level 4 mark of 35 out of 40 was awarded.

**Q2** “The most significant American presidents of the twentieth century were also those who most abused the office.” How far would you agree with this statement? [40]

**The above question could not be exemplified as the candidate's permission could not be obtained.**

## Option 5 Clash of Ideologies in Europe 1900–2000

- Q1** “Relations between the Soviet Union and Western governments in the period 1917–1991 were primarily characterised by co-existence rather than conflict.”  
To what extent would you accept this verdict? [40]

### Student’s response

*Relations between the Soviet Union and Western governments saw much change in the period 1917-1991, there were certainly elements of co-existence and conflict in this time.*

*When the Bolsheviks took power in Russia in 1917, the West were suspicious and wary of the new regime, the first conflict occurred in the 1918 Treaty of Brest Litovsk. The Soviet Union had removed themselves from the First World War, keen to restart the Eastern front against Germany a number of the Western powers made a series of small scale involvements against the Bolsheviks in the civil war. Certainly at this time the Soviet Union and the Western governments were at direct conflict with one another.*

*The West were suspicious of Lenin who was said to be ‘primarily a revolutionary’ and was driven by an ideology that strived for worldwide revolution. The West will have been prepared for this likely conflict, however after failing to take Krasnow in the 1920 Russo-Polish war, Lenin was forced to adopt a policy of peaceful co-existence while the Soviet Union strengthened. Co-existence was the policy for both sides for the ensuing years with instances such as the 1921 Anglo Soviet trade agreement, the 1922 Treaty of Rapallo between the Soviets and Germany and the recognition of the Soviet Union by Germany, Britain and the USA in 1922, 1924 and 1933 respectively. The period of co-existence was enhanced when in 1924, new Soviet leader Josef Stalin began to pursue ‘Socialism in one country’, Stalin believed that ‘One Soviet tractor is worth ten foreign communists’. Stalin reaffirmed links with Germany in the 1926 Treaty of Berlin. The 1929 Wall Street Crash turned the attentions of Western governments inward and away from any potential ideological battle. Clearly the time period from after the Russo-Polish war in 1920 to the Nazis taking power in 1933 was dominated by co-existence rather than conflict, with neither side seeming at all interested with conflict on their opposing ideology.*

*When the Nazis took power in January 1933, Stalin immediately altered policy to avoid future conflict, highlighting his distain for conflict at this time. Stalin set up a ‘popular front’ within comintern to defend from Facism Aggression. Stalin also reached out to Britain and France to secure a form of ‘Collective Security’ against facism, however no deal could be reached. Conflict came in 1936 when the Soviets intervened in the Spanish Civil War, supplying 650 planes and 1800 machine guns. Clearly the Soviet Union were startled by Nazism and Facism and seemed to be in direct conflict with them. In 1934 the Soviets joined the League of Nations, a testament to the peaceful co-existence between them and the western powers, with Lenin previously calling the League ‘the robbers den’. However in 1939, the Soviets signed the Nazi-Soviet pact with the Nazis, while the pact was sensible in terms of security, it was an ‘ideological summer sciult’. This ushered in a short lived period of*

co-existence with Germany, however it indirectly left them at conflict with Britain and France who had declared war on Nazi Germany. Clearly the Soviets altered their policy of co-existence in response to the Nazis and were now left in indirect conflict with the Western governments.

In June 1941, when the Nazis launched Operation Barbarossa or the invasion of the Soviet Union, the Soviets were forced into the war and became a part of the 'Grand Alliance' against Nazi Germany however this was always viewed as a 'marriage of convenience' with Britain and France. The Soviets bore the greatest loss in the war with 26.6 million men dying. Nonetheless the Grand Alliance fought together and defeated Nazi Germany. Perhaps ironically the Soviet Union and Western powers were at the peak of co-existence during the Second World War, despite their mutual distrust.

Conflict would soon follow after the war. Firstly in the Yalta and Potsdam conferences. The Soviets had bore great loss and so were adamant on harsh reparations to be paid to them and seemed set on crushing Germany. Britain, USA and France were not as keen on this idea. A frustrated Truman lamented 'force is all the Soviets understand', clearly showing signs of conflict. The Soviet Union also were keen to hold the block of Eastern Europe they had 'liberated' after the war, set on a 'what we have, we hold' attitude. The Western governments were very scornful of this, with Churchill declaring in 1946 that an 'Iron Curtain had descended across the continent' which was warmly received by Truman. In 1947 the USA took up the policy of containment in the Truman doctrine, and also offered financial aid to European countries for post-war reconstruction in the Marshall plan. Stalin denounced this as 'covert American imperialism' and set up Comecon in response. The years following the war, the Soviet Union and the Western governments were clearly at conflict due to the Soviet Unions aggressive expansion in the period.

Hope for co-existence was born again in 1956 when Khrushchev replaced Stalin, denouncing many of his policies, destroying his image of infallibility and promising a return to socialist legality. However in 1958, when the Soviets crushed the Hungarian uprising it was clear they were determined to hold straight jacket control over the region. This was fundamentally at conflict with the Western Powers. The arms race also began in Khrushchev's tenure, with it being estimated that over 20 million Americans could die in a Soviet attack. The arms race brought about great pressure for agreement between the Soviet Union and United States and agreement came with the Partial Test Ban Treaty in 1963, the Strategic Arms Limit action talks in 1972 and the Helsinki agreement in 1975. Again ironically it was the severity of the looming potential conflict which brought about a period of relatively very good relations and co-existence. The arms race caused co-existence, rather than the conflict it would be expected to bring. Such was the period of co-existence that it was labelled *Détente*.

This period of *Détente* was abruptly ended however when the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan in Christmas Day 1979. The USA responded by ending the Wheat deal, boycotting the 1980 Moscow Olympics and secretly funding the Mujahidin. The Soviet Union and USA were once again at direct conflict when the hardline Ronald Reagan came to office. In 1983 Reagan called the Soviet Union an 'evil empire', more than tripled defence spending and declared that 'Freedom and democracy will

*leave Marxism in the ash heap of history'. This period known as Cold War II seemed sure to lead to violent conflict before the arrival of Gorbachev as the leader of the Soviet Union. Gorbachev was determined to achieve a 'new model of socialism' and brought in the policies of Glasnost and Perestroika to achieve such. Crucially Gorbachev had put an end to the nasty period of conflict and was determined to achieve co-existence, as he knew the Soviet Union couldn't compete with the West any longer.*

*In Iceland in 1986 it was agreed neither side would test any more weapons and the Soviets would leave Afghanistan. In Geneva in 1987 both agreed to cut offensive weapons by 50%. 1989 became known as the year of revolutions with many countries breaking from Soviet control and in December Bush and Gorbachev declared the Cold War over. Co-existence was now the dominant policy and was now to last.*

*To Conclude, I agree with the interpretation that relations were primarily co-existence rather than conflict. Periods such as Détente and Gorbachevs rule were more prominent than conflict such as the Cold War.*

### Examiner's comments

This response demonstrates a comprehensive and accurate recall of knowledge, substantiated analysis and clear focus on the question throughout the entire period of 1917–1991. The introduction addresses the question posed, although it could be further developed.

The period of 1917–24 is a well-balanced analysis, considering both conflict and co-existence regarding relations between the Soviet Union and Western governments. Reference is made to the conflict arising due to the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, the Russian Civil War and the Russo-Polish War. The response astutely highlights a move towards greater co-existence in the early 1920s and deploys knowledge including the Anglo-Soviet Trade Agreement and the Treaty of Rapallo to substantiate these assertions. The next section of the response looks at how Stalin furthered relations with the West and observes that the period 1924–1933 was primarily characterised by co-existence and provides evidence such as 'Socialism in one Country' and the Treaty of Berlin in 1926.

The foreign policy of Western democratic governments and Fascist governments in relation to Soviet foreign policy is considered in detail in the 1930s. Reference is made to examples of co-existence such as Collective Security and the Nazi-Soviet Pact in 1939. The 1936 Spanish Civil War is examined as evidence of relations characterised by conflict. World War II and its significance re relations between the Soviet government and Western governments is also discussed. Relevant substantiated judgments are evident throughout this period of analysis.

The next section of this response considers the 1940s and the conflict arising from Stalin's demands at the 1945 Conferences and his establishment of the buffer zone. Western government responses in the shape of Truman and Churchill are

highlighted and once again there is a clear focus on the question as the response concludes that the period of 1940–1945 is characterised by conflict.

The next part of the response considers both the co-existence and conflict that arises during the 1950s. Analysis of Khrushchev's actions is evident but there are a few minor lapses and inaccuracies at this juncture. An opportunity is perhaps missed to discuss the deterioration in relations in 1961.

Following Khrushchev, the response turns to analysis of co-existence and the period of détente in the 1960s and the 1970s. Supporting evidence such as the SALT talks of 1972 and the Helsinki agreements are accurately recalled, and a valid judgement is reached, commenting on the very good relations and the co-existence which was evident at this stage. The response then turns its attention to the conflict ensuing from Afghanistan and the Western response – the boycott of the Moscow Olympics. Reference is then made to the beginning of the 'Second Cold War.'

The penultimate section of this response analyses relations between Soviet and Western governments under Gorbachev's tenure. A range of evidence, including conferences in Iceland and Geneva are highlighted to provide evidence that co-existence once more characterised their relations. Finally, the candidate puts forth a conclusion, reaching a somewhat substantiated judgement and ensuring that the question has been answered.

Overall, this is a good response which covers the entire period and draws together knowledge and skills to demonstrate historical understanding. Links and comparisons between eras are also well-developed. Substantiated judgments are evident throughout. Intermittently, there are minor lapses in precision and depth. Despite this, there remains a superb focus on the question and analysis is well-substantiated and of a high quality. This response was assessed as a mid-Level 4 and awarded a mark of 35.

**Q2** "Fascist and communist governments adopted aggressive foreign policies, while democratic governments pursued peaceful and conciliatory policies." How far would you agree with this assessment of the foreign policies of the Soviet Union and Western governments in the period 1917–1991? [40]

### Student's response

*I would agree to a certain extent with the assessment of foreign policies that 'Fascist and communist governments adopted aggressive foreign policies, while democratic governments pursued peaceful and conciliatory policies'. Both ideologies used both aggressive and peaceful means in an attempt to remain economically and ideologically secure.*

*After the communist uprising in 1917, Lenin used aggressive foreign policies to try and expand communism throughout Europe. He established the Comintern in 1919 and placed Zinoviev in charge. Its' purpose was to encourage uprising, such as the Munich March, in Germany, Italy, Poland and Hungary. In response to this, the democratic governments did not pursue a peaceful or conciliatory policy but instead, angered by Russia's removal from the First World War, aggressively sent troops to*

aid the Whites in the Russian Civil War. Russia had left the war through Treaty of Brest-Litovsk and claimed, as a new government, they would not pay back debts to Western governments. However, both governments adaption of aggressive foreign policy failed, leading them to change their foreign policy.

Lenin realised Russia needed to adopt a more peaceful foreign policy if Russian communism was to survive. He began the New Economic Policy and claimed its' capitalist qualities were 'undeniably necessary'. He started trade alliances with the only other country considered a 'political pariah', establishing the Treaty of Rapallo in 1922. When Stalin replaced Lenin in power, he too continued the relationship with Germany with the Berlin Treaty in 1926 and other treaties from 1927 to 1931. He also began five year plans of industrialisation and collectivisation focusing on 'socialism in one country' claiming if Russia did not 'make up for 100 years in 10, we will be crushed'. The democratic governments also changed their aggressive policy to one of political isolation. They left Russia out of the Paris Peace Conference and the League of Nations. Churchill said 'strangle infant bolshevism in its' cradle'. What further disintegrated the relationship were the incidents of the Zinoviev Letter and the General Strike in Britain 1926. Despite these tender relationships, Britain diplomatically recognised Russia in 1926 and USA did in 1933. These change of foreign policies to peace and conciliatory began a development of a relationship between these two ideologies.

Throughout the 1930's, both governments changed their foreign policies to to be more security based as the rise of facism posed a threat to both ideologies. Stalin began a policy of Collective Security as Hitler had made it clear how much he hated communism and his desire to invade Russia. Stalin made Mutual Assisstant Pacts with France and Czechoslovakia and joined the League of Nations, Stalin further proved his desire for security when he did not send sufficient forces to aid a communist uprising in the Spanish Civil War 1936. The Western governments followed a foreign policy of peace and conciliatory as they were suffering from the Great Depression after the Wall Street Crash in 1929. They were also following a policy of appeasement towards Germany as they needed time to recover economically. However, this worried Stalin as he was unsure if the West would come to Russia's aid if Germany did invade. Therefore, in 1939 Stalin made the Nazi-Soviet Pact which some would call an 'ideological somersault'. Stalin claimed he had to 'bargain with the agressers' to maintain a peaceful foreign policy and security. Some Soviet scholars comment this was inevitable from the previous relationship Russia had estalished with Germany through 1920's trade treaties.

With Hitler in power in 1933, it is clear that this facist government did adopt an aggressive foreign policy as one of his aims was to unite all German speaking people and create more Lebensaurm, Hitler made pacts such as Anti-Comintern Pact 1936 and the Pact of Steel 1939. However, in 1941 Hitler showed a large amount of aggression when he launched Operation Barbarossa against Russia, sending 3 million German troops to invade. This aggressive foreign policy forced Stalin to entre a 'marriage of convinence' with Western governments in order to defeat Hitler.

After World War Two, Stalin made it very clear he wanted to establish greater security for Russia as his country had now been invaded 3 times in the past 40 years. Russia had lost 70,000 villages, 2,000 towns and 23 million people. Stalin made a Percentages Agreement in 1944 with Churchill allowing him a sphere of Influence in surrounding countries. Stalin then went about creating a Buffer Zone of communist countries bordering Russia by using aggression to rig elections. The West did not respond well to this spread of communism but initially did use peaceful means against it. Kenan sent a 'Long Telegram' and Churchill gave an 'Iron Curtain' speech in protest. President Truman established the Truman Doctrine stating what was happening was a Dominoe Theory. America was willing to help impoverished European countries through the Marshall Plan and Marshall Aid to stop them falling to communism. This also impacted Germany as the 3 segments run by France, Britain and the USA combined and established a new currency called Deutsmark. Russia had established their own form of Marshal Aid; Comeaform 1947 and Comecan 1948. However, Berlin was inside the Soviet segment and could see the benefits of capitalism. Stalin ordered a blockade to stop the allies reaching West Berlin. This carried on for a year until Stalin took down the blockade. Tensions remained cold as this was the first physical aggressive in the Cold War. Western Governments established NATO 1949 and relations remained hostile until Stalin's death in 1953.

With a new leader in Soviet Union, foreign policy changed from aggressive actions to achieve security to peaceful co-existence. In his secret speech, Krushchev said he wanted de-Stalinisation and even apologised to Yugislavia for their treatment. He established the Warsaw Pact in 1955 for communist countries and held Geneva summits with democratic governments. However, Poland had demanded some concessions, which were granted. But, when Hungary asked for some as well they also demanded to leave the Warsaw Pact. In 1956, there was an uprising that Krushchev responded with aggression, sending in troops that killed 30,000 Hungarians. This proved his attempt at peaceful foreign policy had failed and Russia had returned to aggression. This was further seen in the building of the Berlin Wall 1961 to stop the 'brain drain' moving into capitalism. The West responded with rhetorics such as Einsenhower's 'We are here for you' to the Hungarians and Kenedy's 'Ich bin ein Berliner' to East Berlin. However, their foreign policy of peace and conciliatory was mainly due to their distraction with the Korean War and the Cuban Missile Crisis. They did not have enough money to fight a physical war and so they fought a cultural one. USA set up 'Operation Gold' 1954-55 to spy on Russian intelligence and a U2 plane was shot down in Russia that was proved to be American. The West set up SEATO to protect South East Asia from communism but never entered inside the 'Iron Curtain' in risk of a nuclear war, therefore the Western foreign policy remained reletavly peaceful as they could not afford a physical war.

When Brezhnev came to power in 1960 he showed his similar aggressive policy for security by sending in 40,000 troops to Czechoslovakia after the Prague Springs demand for concessions and a civilian uprising. He claimed this was acceptable under the Brezhnev Doctrine. However, soon Russia was straining economically under the arms race as they had sent a satillite to space 1954 and the first Russian had already landed on the moon. They could not afford this and so a period of peaceful foreign policy known as Détente began. The USA was thankful as they too were struggling under the arms race and the war in Vietnam. Talks started such as

*Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (1968), SALT 1 (1972), Test Ban Treaty (1975) and the Helsinki Agreement (1975). However, Détente came to an end when the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan in 1979. The Western governments reacted with an aggressive foreign policy as under military direction from Brezizinki, USA sent military weapons and funds to support the Mujahedeen. He wanted to 'bleed the Soviets white' and give them 'there own Vietnam'.*

*This foreign policy of aggression was continued under President Carter with the Carter Doctrine that increased defence budgets, stopped sending grain to Soviet Union and boycotted the Olympics held in Russia. Reagan continued an aggressive policy by increasing defence budget and starting the SDI programme. This aggressive policy only changed in 1985 when Gorbachev came to power in the USSR. He aimed to improve relations, achieve security and remove the economic strain of the satilite states that spent 25% of USSR's economy. He told the United Nations in 1988 that he would end the Cold War and held 4 peace summits with the Demoncratic governments. The following year was known as the 'year of miracles' as under the Gorbachev Doctrine, satilite states were allowed to hold free elections. The Western governments reacted with peaceful foreign policies towards this change as they too were suffering economically under the SDI programme. Reagan called he called the USSR an 'evil empire' in 'another time, another era'.*

*Therefore, throughout the period of 1917-1991, not only did Facist and Communist governments adopt aggressive foreign policy, but so did democratic governments. All ideologies pragmatically changed their foreign policy dependent on the security of their country or their economic position.*

### **Examiner's comments**

This response deploys impressive and accurate knowledge that demonstrates its breadth of historical knowledge and understanding. Furthermore, this answer contains frequent links and substantiated judgements, indicating a very good understanding of the process of historical change.

In a concise introduction the candidate displays an understanding of the question posed and provides an initial judgement. The next section analyses the aggressive nature of the foreign policies of both the Western and Soviet governments. Supporting evidence, for example, cancellation of Tsarist debts, the establishment of the Comintern in 1919 and the sending of troops to aid the Whites in the Russian Civil War is deployed to support the candidate's line of argument.

The response then makes the pertinent point that from the early 1920s, Lenin shifts towards a more peaceful foreign policy, using the Treaty of Rapallo in 1922 as evidence. This line of argument is continued through Stalin's early role. Next, a switch by Western governments from an aggressive policy to one of political isolation is analysed and events such as exclusion from the Paris Peace Conference and the League of Nations are highlighted.

In the next section, the candidate considers the conciliatory nature of Stalin's foreign policy as evidenced by 'Collective Security', joining the league of Nations and limited intervention in the Spanish Civil War. Additionally, Fascist aggression in the 1930s is highlighted through various pacts. However, the unprecedented levels of aggression in Fascist foreign policy in the 1930s could be analysed in greater depth. The aggressive nature of World War II in the 1940s is also referenced. Post World War II, the response deploys a range of evidence to further the argument that Stalin pursued an aggressive foreign policy in the 1940s. The creation of a buffer zone, Cominform, Comecon and the Berlin Blockade are detailed, but judgments at times could be better substantiated. The responses by Western governments in the 1940s are well analysed at this juncture. Defensive measures such as the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan and the establishment of NATO are considered, and the argument is made that the Western governments used increasingly peaceful measures at this point.

The candidate then considers Khrushchev's early conciliatory policies in the mid 1950s, such as his de-stalinisation speech and minor concessions to Poland. Reference is then made to the aggressive policies deployed in Hungary in 1956 and Berlin in 1961, and the response relevantly notes that this signals a return to Soviet aggression.

Providing a good balance between Soviet and Western foreign policy, the next section considers the Western response in the 1950s and analyses peaceful policies under Eisenhower and Kennedy, putting forth the argument that these policies are peaceful as they have bigger concerns outside Europe to concern themselves with. The continuation of aggressive policies under Brezhnev is highlighted through the 1968 Prague Spring and the Brezhnev Doctrine. The candidate then remarks upon a significant change in Soviet foreign policy due to economic factors. Détente, the SALT agreements and the 1975 Helsinki Agreement are all considered as evidence of a period of conciliatory policies in the 1970s.

The next section of the response deals with the Western response in the 1980s due to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. An aggressive foreign policy through military support of the Mujahedeen is well explained and additional evidence such as the boycott of the 1980 Olympics and Reagan's aggressive policy is further used to supplement the candidate's argument. The penultimate part of this essay highlights the changes on both sides when Gorbachev comes to power in 1985. An ease of tensions is highlighted through his UN speech, the Gorbachev Doctrine and the break-up of the Soviet Union, 1988–1991. The response ends with a substantiated judgement that clearly answers and focuses on the question posed.

Overall, this response deploys substantial accurate knowledge which is drawn from across the whole period. There are detailed explanations provided, demonstrating very good understanding of change and some well-developed judgements. At times, judgements could have been better substantiated. This response was assessed as a mid-Level 4 and awarded a mark of 36.



**GCE: A2 History**

**AHY21: Historical Investigations and Interpretations**

**Grade: A Exemplar**



## Option 1: England 1558–1603

### Elizabeth I's relations with her Parliaments 1558–1603

#### Source 1

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

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

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

#### Source 2

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

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

**Q1a** Use Source 1 and Source 2 and your own knowledge of this period. Which of the sources would an historian value most as evidence in the study of Elizabeth I's relations with her Parliaments in the period 1558–1603? [15]

### Student's response

*Source 1 consists of Elizabeth's arguments against getting married. Source 2 is on behalf of the Queen, arguing against MPs acting on their own.*

*The first source was written in 1566, a time when there was great pressure from Parliament to persuade Elizabeth to marriage. Parliament was urging Elizabeth to marry a suitor. At this time, Charles of Austria was a prime candidate, who Elizabeth was opposed to marrying.*

*Elizabeth herself wrote this source. This suggests its usefulness because its content will be completely from her point of view. She writes how she will be tried by her own deeds. She therefore wants to describe to members in Parliament that it is only herself that will decide when to get married. Elizabeth as the author suggests usefulness because she has a first hand view of her relationship with Parliament.*

*Her motive in writing this source is to discourage Parliament from pressuring her into marriage. She writes, 'It is strange thing that Parliament should direct the monarch'. Here, she is trying to express her Royal Prerogative, in which she has the ultimate decision to make and Parliament cannot direct her. She derides Parliament by saying, 'I am your lawful and annointed Queen' and therefore argues that she has royal authority.*

*The tone of the source is very authoritative. She asserts her authority by proclaiming they should not, 'direct the monarch in such a grave cause'. The tone suggests that this is useful to historians because it paints a picture of Elizabeth's dominance of Parliament. She used her royal powers, such as dismissing Parliament to assert this Parliament was only called 13 times in 45 years.*

*Source 1 is limited in its usefulness in some ways. It was written in 1566, only 8 years into the reign. However, it cannot therefore give us an accurate view of Elizabeth's Parliamentary relationship later in the reign especially with the onset of much opposition to the Queen from the Puritan Choir.*

*In addition it does not give us a point of view from MPs, who may have an alternate view of relations.*

*Source 2 was written in 1601, almost at the end of the reign and at a time when Elizabeth's control of Parliament was slipping. This suggests that relations may have been different from Source 1's argument. It was from a speech by the Speaker, who would have been an appointee of Elizabeth's. As such, he would have taken a very pro-royal view, which will be seen in his speech to the Commons, regarding a bill Elizabeth opposed.*

*His motive in making the speech was to inform Parliament of her intended actions regarding the Monopolies bill. He aims to promote Elizabeth in a positive light by referring to her message as, 'gracious'. He also portrays her as a Queen who will, 'defend her people from all oppressions'. Again, this source consists of a very pro-Elizabeth message with relation to Parliament.*

*The tone used within the source is very accusing. He portrays Elizabeth as ignorant to the harm caused to her people by the laws but goes on to accuse Parliament of 'abusing' the laws in order to bring about harm. This suggest a tense relationship.*

*However, this source is also limited. It was written right at the end of the period in 1601 and fails to give use insight into relations with Parliament in the years between 1566, when Source 1 was written, and 1601.*

*It is also limited in that I too takes on a pro-Elizabeth view. It portrays her as 'gracious' but does not give us a Parliamentary point of view.*

*In conclusion, both sources would be useful to historians. However, the fact that Source 1 comes straight from Elizabeth means she dictated relations and understood what her relations with Parliament were like. Therefore, I believe, Source 1 is more useful than Source 2 for historians studying Elizabeth's relationship with Parliament.*

### **Examiner's comments**

This response gained 11 out of 15 marks which was a top Level 3 response. The first part of this response made a sustained assessment of the value of Source 1 followed by a sustained assessment of the value of Source 2 in the second part of their answer. When the candidate examined the value of both sources they used the content of both sources well to comment upon authorship, motive, tone, viewpoint and date. This was supported by the use of some relevant knowledge that enhanced their answer. However, the audience of Source 1 was somewhat neglected. There was some awareness of the limitations of both sources. This response would have achieved a higher reward with more use of relevant own knowledge such as the famous "golden speech" of Queen Elizabeth I which was made shortly after the speech in Source 2.

There was a brief conclusion at the end of this response where the candidate reached a clear verdict on which source they regarded as the most valuable as evidence on relations between Elizabeth I and her Parliaments in this period. This is essential for a high level award. Overall this response was well organised but needed a more sustained assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of both sources. Greater use of the source content supported by more use of relevant own knowledge would have resulted in a Level 4 award. Finally, the best responses to this question fully appreciated the significance of both sources, used within their historical context with critical analysis of value at all times.

**Q1b** Use Source 1 and Source 2 and other evidence you have studied.  
How far do the sources support the view that Elizabeth I had full control over her Parliaments between 1558 and 1603? [20]

### Student's response

*Elizabeth had a number of ways in which she was able to maintain her control Parliament. The Sources provide us with insight into how she was able to do this.*

*Elizabeth, as monarch, held a royal prerogative, with which it meant she held ultimate power. As such, Parliament could not override her wishes. This is displayed in Source 1, where she argues 'It is a strange thing Parliament should direct their monarch'.*

*She could control her Parliament by dissolving it whenever she looked to prevent Parliamentary opposition from growing. For example, in 1571, she vetoed William Strickland's bill to abolish the Book of Common Prayer established by the 1559 Religious Settlement. She promptly closed Parliament to prevent further discussion.*

*She would also imprison members of Parliament who she felt undermined her royal prerogative. This is seen in 1576, when she imprisoned Puritan Choir leader Peter Wentworth who was demanding freedom of speech for MPs. Fearing this would undermine her control of Parliament. Elizabeth had him imprisoned. This is supported by Source 1, 'I shall not be compelled... to do anything against my will'. She also had fellow Puritan MP Anthony Cope sent to the Tower in 1586.*

*It is also shown that Elizabeth had full control of her Parliaments through her power to vote bills that she did not support. 'She herself will present orders to reform laws'. For example, she was able to control Parliament and its opposition in 1584. When she vetoed Puritan MP Turner's bill, which aimed to establish a Presbyterian System in England.*

*Parliament was effectively controlled by Parliament because Elizabeth only called them whenever she needed them. In her 45 year reign, Parliament was only called 13 times. Furthermore, they didn't meet in one 26 year period. As they were prevented from meeting they were effectively controlled by Elizabeth because they could not mount opposition.*

*Elizabeth's ability to prevent certain contentious issues from being discussed was useful in helping her to control Parliament. Elizabeth was firmly opposed to calls from both Parliament and the Privy Council for her to get married. Therefore, in Source 1 she declares that, 'Marriage at present is not convenient'. By doing this, she prevented the discussion of her marriage, which enabled her to continue using her unwed status as a tool in creating a propaganda image of 'The Virgin Queen' among her people. She used this same tactic in 1559, upon the passing of the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity, establishing her Church Settlements. She forbade Parliamentary discussing of religion in order to prevent opposition, maintaining her control of Parliament.*

*Elizabeth planted political allies within Parliament, which would have assisted her in maintaining control and staying up-to-date with Parliamentary matters. This is seen in Source 2, which was from the speaker of the House, an appointee of Elizabeth. He goes on to defend Elizabeth's position on the Monopolies bill, maintaining her control. She also used this tactic with key members of the Privy Council. She made William Cecil Lord Treasurer in 1572, to allow him to sit in the House of Lords. Walsingham sat in the Commons. These insiders allowed for Elizabeth to maintain her control of Parliament, and pull key government legislation, such as the 1559 Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity.*

*In conclusion, both sources support the view that Elizabeth had full control of Parliament. They show her use of royal prerogative as well as her use of allies within Parliament. Both of these tactics helped her to maintain control of Parliament in the period 1558–1603.*

### **Examiner's comments**

This response gained 15 out of 20 marks which is a top Level 3. Throughout this response there was a strong focus on the question at all times. This demonstrated the skills of the candidate such as explanation, analysis, evaluation and substantiated judgements. However, in this response the candidate makes better use of Source 1 than Source 2. Also in this answer the candidate only used the content of both sources to agree with the proposition in the question. The quality of this response would have been enhanced if the candidate had challenged the proposition using one or both sources provided instead of just supporting the proposition which confined the quality of this answer.

The supporting knowledge provided by this candidate was very good, showing their ability to clearly select relevant knowledge with precision and accuracy from across the whole period from 1558 to 1603. This use of relevant own knowledge enhanced their line of argument and supported developed judgements made by the candidate in relation to this question. Another strength of this response was a brief conclusion. This response needed to engage more fully with the question with greater use of the content of both sources and Source 2 in particular to achieve a Level 4 award. Finally, the best responses to this question made sustained use of both sources supported by good use of relevant knowledge to support and challenge whether Elizabeth I had full control over her Parliaments between 1558 and 1603 or not.

## Elizabeth I's policy towards France

### Interpretation A

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

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

### Interpretation B

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

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

## Q2 Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B.

Using the interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of Elizabeth I's policy towards France do you find more convincing? [25]

### Student's response

*Doran's interpretation A argues that Elizabeth's policy towards France was a consistent one. On the other hand, Hammer's interpretation B argues that her policy towards France was inconsistent, in which she was indecisive in sending troops to France in 1589.*

*Doran's argues that Elizabeth's Foreign policy aims with France were, 'primarily defensive'. This is consistent with a large part of her foreign policy throughout her reign. Upon the breakdown of Anglo-Spanish relations in 1568 with the beginning of a policy of harassment, Elizabeth know she needed a European ally to defend England against her new Spanish enemy. Therefore, security was on her mind when she signed Treaty of Blois in 1572. As a defensive treaty that formed an alliance between England and France against Spain. This defensive motivation is again seen in 1589 when Spanish troops were in the North of France. They could easily invade from here, possibly a motivation for becoming involved on behalf of France. Doran's claim that her 'first Priority was security' supports Elizabeth's actions. Interpretation A goes on to claim that security was a motivation for using, 'Force keep the French out of Scotland'. This was a factor in Elizabeth's decision to send troops in 1560, leading to French withdrawal from Scotland under the 1560 Treaty of Edinburgh.*

*Doran goes on to argue how she gave money to Henry IV in 1589, to Fight Spain's Superior Forces and the French Catholic League.' She did not want the threat of a Spanish invasion, which would have contradicted her aims to keep England free from invasion. This is why she would have become involved on behalf of Henry IV.*

*However, I believe there are some limitations to Doran's argument. She argues that Elizabeth had, 'no dreams of expansionism in France'. This is not consistent with Elizabeth's actual foreign policy. In 1562, she was persuaded to send troops to defend the Protestant Huguenots from Catholic forces. Instead the English took control of Le Havre, and attempted to exchange it for Calais. This port had been lost by Mary I and Elizabeth's desire to win it back suggests that part of her motivation policy towards France was motivated by expansion.*

*Doran also claims that Elizabeth, 'tried to keep on good terms with both Spain and France'. However, it is seen that Spain remained an enemy of England from 1568, until 1603. There were very few, if any instances of good relations between, The 1572 Treaty of Blois virtually shows that Elizabeth wished to maintain good relations with France only against Spain.*

*Interpretation A also argues that Elizabeth was partially motivated by, 'the defence of European Protestantism'. The title of Protestant champion was one that Elizabeth worked hard to avoid. Her own Religious Settlement in England was a compromise.*

*While she did provide aid to Protestants, she wished to avoid committing troops and appearing as though she was defending Protestantism and aiding troops against a legitimate ruler.*

*Hammer's Interpretation B argues that, 'Elizabeth's aimed to avoid costly entanglement in European affairs'. This is shown by England's lack of resources with which they could fight a war. However, the threat of Spanish control of, 'French ports made ready for another Armada' was a threat to England's security. She could not afford to see a Spanish fleet and army so close to England. As a result, she became involved in 1589.*

*Hammer goes on, to reference how Elizabeth kept, 'changing her mind' with regards to committing English troops to France. This was a key feature of Elizabeth's reign and policy towards France. In 1560, indecision had almost led to her not signing the 'Treaty of Edinburgh with France.*

*Again, Hammer cites security as the reason Elizabeth re-sent English troops to France. Spanish troops had captured Calais in April 1596. Enemy forces that close was the reason for Elizabeth to keep focus on France. Interpretation B's argument that, 'Elizabeth provided money and men to France to counteract the Spanish threat'. This motivated Elizabeth to defeat Spain in France to maintain English security. Part of this motivated Elizabeth to enter a Triple Alliance with France and the Netherlands in 1597, to ensure common security.*

*However, Hammer is also limited in his arguments. He focuses solely on the period after 1589 with respect to Anglo-French relations and policy. He neglects to mention any other factors that may have motivated Elizabeth's policy towards France in the period 1578–1603, as Doran has done. He only argues that security was her motivation, and her fear of another Spanish invasion. While this was a major aim of Elizabeth's foreign policy, it fails to mention other interests, such as economic benefit, which motivated Elizabeth to become involved in the Netherlands in 1585, to free the major trading hub of Antwerp from complete Spanish control.*

*In conclusion, both interpretations provide compelling arguments of Elizabeth's policy towards France. However, I feel Doran's is very limited in that I believe Elizabeth had some motivation of expansionism, but did not want to be a Protestant Champion. Hammer focuses more on the security motivation. Therefore I believe Interpretation B is more convincing than Interpretation A of Elizabeth's policy towards France.*

### **Examiner's comments**

This response was awarded 21 out of 25 marks which was a low Level 4. There is a strong focus on the question throughout most of this answer with the candidate using the content of both interpretations to reach some sustained and developed judgements about Elizabeth I's policy towards France in this period. The candidate presented some very good analysis and evaluation of the two different interpretations supported by some sound use, in a selective manner, of relevant contextual knowledge as evidence to support the line of argument presented in this

answer. This response also displayed good analysis of the evidence on which both interpretations are based by both supporting and challenging both interpretations throughout the response in an effective and skillful manner.

In the first part of this response the candidate thoroughly examined the content of Interpretation A, by analysis of the evidence on which it was based. The candidate then enhanced their response by using some relevant contextual knowledge to present some developed judgements clearly linked to the question. This response then went on to discuss the content of Interpretation B, by analysis of the evidence on which it was based. The candidate skillfully supported their response with some good use of relevant contextual knowledge to make effective judgements that could have been more fully developed at times towards the end of this answer. The candidate attempted some comparisons between Interpretation A and Interpretation B, this demonstrated a high level of historical skill by presenting a clear line of analytical argument in this answer.

Finally this response has a brief and concise conclusion giving a clear verdict on which of the two interpretations provided was the most convincing in their opinion and why they have selected their chosen interpretation. For a high level award in this question candidates must reach a clear verdict which must be fully supported and illustrated by the candidate throughout their answer. This shows that the candidate has a very good understanding of the different ways in which the past has been interpreted by these historians, to support the developed judgements reached in their response to this question.

**Q3a** “Catholicism represented a significant threat to Elizabeth I in England between 1558 and 1603.” To what extent would you agree with this statement? [20]

### Student's response

*Throughout Elizabeth's reign, the Queen faced threats from a number of sources related to Catholicism. To a number of Catholics both in England and in Europe, her Religious Settlement of 1559 was unacceptable. However, the significance and seriousness of the threats posed from Catholicism can be challenged.*

*One of the most significant threats posed to Elizabeth come with the arrival of Mary, Queen of Scots in England in 1568. Mary was a serious candidate to succeed Elizabeth, who by this point had failed to produce an heir. To many influential Catholics in England, such as the Duke of Norfolk and Northern Earls, she was a figure who represented a Catholics alternative to the Settlement Elizabeth had implemented. As a result, she could be seen as significant threat, because Mary attracted popular support from the Catholic population in England (which was a majority) as well as gentry and major European powers. This undermined Elizabeth's support from her subjects.*

*In addition, while in England, Mary was at the centre of four major plots that aimed to overthrow Elizabeth and place her on the throne. In 1569, Mary plotted to Mary the Duke of Norfolk, in order to further her claims to the throne. When Elizabeth*

discovered this, Northern Earls came out in open rebellion against the Queen. While it was put down, the fact that it was clear influential gentry were opposed to Elizabeth's reign suggests that the Northern Rebellion of 1569 was a significant threat.

Mary was also involved with the Ridolfi Plot (1571), Throckmorton Plot (1583) and Babington Plot (1586), which all involved European powers such as Spain funding plots to put Mary on the throne and restoring Catholicism in England. Open plotting against Elizabeth suggests that Mary was a significant threat, because she inspired plots against the Queen.

Elizabeth felt that Mary was enough of a Catholic threat to keep her imprisoned for 19 years from 1568.

However, despite Mary's presence in England, the majority of Catholics in England saw her as too foreign to be their Queen. As a result, the majority remained loyal to Elizabeth, decreasing the significance of the Catholic threat posed by Mary.

In addition, each of the plots centred around Mary were uncovered in plenty of time by the government before they could be carried out. This led to legislation being passed to discourage any assassination attempts against Elizabeth. This included the 1584 Bond of Association, which meant that anyone with prior knowledge of Elizabeth's assassination would not benefit from it. In 1586 Mary was discovered plotting with Anthony Babington to dethrone Elizabeth. This discovery led to Mary being found guilty of treason in 1580 and hesitantly executed by Elizabeth in 1587. As a result, quick discovery of plots and the execution of Mary shows the Catholic threat posed by her was not so significant.

A Catholic threat was posed to Elizabeth in 1570 when Pope Pius V issued a Papal Bull, excommunicating Elizabeth from the Church. He also urged all English Catholics to disobey the Queen's orders and give up loyalty. This represented a great threat to Elizabeth, because it undermined her Royal Authority. Disobedience would threaten her position as Queen. However, the Pope issued this Papal Bull at too late a stage to do any real damage. In 1570, it had been 11 years since Elizabeth had implemented her Religious Settlement in England. As a result, it had a minimal impact on the majority of English Catholics, who remained loyal to the Queen over the Pope. This suggests that the Pope's influence was not a significant Catholic threat.

In addition, the government responded well to minimise the threat. In 1571, legislation was passed to make it treason for anyone to possess a copy of this Papal Bull. As a result, seminary priest Cuthbert Mayne was hanged in 1577 for carrying a Papal Bull. This also suggests that the Papal Bull was not a significant Catholic threat.

In 1580, Jesuit priests began arriving in England. They took their orders directly from Rome. They were a significant threat because their expressed motivation was to re-convert the English people back to Catholicism. This would undermine Elizabeth's settlement and royal authority.

*However, their threat was reduced by the response of the government. In 1581, legislation was passed making their actions treasonous. In addition, the 1586 'Act against seminary and Jesuit priests and other disobedient persons' worsened the consequences. Between 1581 and 1585, 64 Jesuits had been executed. This included influential leader of the Jesuits', Campion. The government's response was effective in reducing the threat because by 1603, only around 50 Jesuits remained in England. Furthermore, as Jesuits arrived, they settled in South-east England This severely reduced the significance of their threat because only 20% of reluctant Catholics lived here. As a result, a majority of English people wouldn't listen to their message. This suggests the Catholic threat they posed was insignificant.*

*Spain and its King Philip II posed a Catholic threat to Elizabeth. Philip wanted to see Catholicism restored in England. He then sponsored the Ridolfi Plot (1571) and Throckmorton Plot (1583) along with Papal money, to de-throne Elizabeth. These acts against Elizabeth suggest that Spain was a significant Catholic threat.*

*In addition, in 1588, he launched an attempted invasion of England, in order to restore Catholicism. England was very unprepared adding to the seriousness of the threat.*

*However, Spain's actual threat was minimal. All plots they sponsored were uncovered and the Spanish Armada was a failure. Francis Drake had ruined part of their Fleet in 1587, reducing their effectiveness. As a result, timing was inefficient and they were unable to defeat the English Fleet at the Battle of Gravelines in July 1588.*

*In conclusion, in theory, Elizabeth faced a number of significant threats from Catholics who opposed her Religious Settlement. However, government responses effectively ended them all before they could play out. After 1588, Mary was executed and Spain no longer was a threat after the defeat of the Armada. No Catholic threat appeared until after 1603. Therefore, I believe that Catholicism did not pose a threat to Elizabeth in the period 1558–1603.*

### **Examiner's comments**

This response to the essay question gained full marks. Throughout this excellent response the candidate had a clear and strong focus on the question at all times in a very well-organised answer. This response had a comprehensive analysis of the question with direct references to the wording of the question throughout their answer demonstrating a very high level of historical skill and ability. This candidate successfully selected and used a most appropriate form and style of writing using relevant material which is organised with clarity and coherence. This candidate had widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary which was well presented using a very high standard of spelling, punctuation and grammar.

In this response the candidate presented a sustained assessment of the question selected using relevant knowledge to both agree and disagree with the proposition. The response contained clear and developed judgements that were supported by a wide range of historical evidence that was both precise and accurate. This fully

supported their line of argument which was of very good quality and always clear, concise and coherent.

The candidate started their response with a brief introduction. The answer then started to discuss and examine the threat posed by Mary Queen of Scots to Elizabeth I from 1568 onwards. This answer went to assess the role of Mary Queen of Scots in a series of Catholic plots from 1569 to 1586 in England. The candidate made some impressive observations about the loyalty of English Catholics to Elizabeth I and how her government took effective action to deal with threats posed by Mary Queen of Scots which led to her execution in 1587.

This candidate discussed and assessed the threat posed to Elizabeth I from a wide range of other relevant factors. They dealt well with the threat posed by the Pope and how the English government effectively responded to the threat from the Papacy from 1570 onwards. The response discussed and evaluated the threat of the Jesuit priests in England and how the government acted to eliminate this threat in the 1580s. Finally the candidate examined in depth the threat of Spain in this period which was finally defeated with the failure of the Spanish Armada in 1588.

This candidate completed their response with a strong and concise conclusion that was clearly linked to the question.

**Q3b** “Economic developments in England in the period 1558–1603 were characterised by change rather than continuity.” How far would you accept this verdict? [20]

**Question not selected by Examiner.**

## Option 2: Ireland 1685–1714

### The Causes of the Glorious Revolution

#### Source 1

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

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

#### Source 2

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

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

**Q1a Use Source 1 and Source 2 and your knowledge of this period.**

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

**The above question could not be exemplified as the candidate's permission could not be obtained.**

**Q1b Use Source 1 and Source 2 and other evidence you have studied.**

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

**The above question could not be exemplified as the candidate's permission could not be obtained.**

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

### Interpretation A

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

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

### Interpretation B

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

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

**Q2 Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B.**

Using the interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of the reasons for the failure of the Siege of Derry do you find more convincing? [25]

**The above question could not be exemplified as the candidate's permission could not be obtained.**

**Q3a** To what extent was the Earl of Tyrconnell responsible for the problems James II encountered in Ireland in the period 1685–1688? [20]

**Question not selected by Examiner.**

**Q3b** “The motivation for the introduction of the Penal Laws was primarily political rather than religious.” How far would you agree with this statement? [20]

**The above question could not be exemplified as the candidate's permission could not be obtained.**

## Option 3: Ireland 1778–1803

### The Catholic Question 1789–1798

#### Source 1

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

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

#### Source 2

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

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

**Q1a Use Source 1 and Source 2 and your knowledge of this period.**

Which of the sources would an historian value most as evidence in a study of the Catholic Question in the period 1789–1798? [15]

**Student's response**

*Source 1 was written by Wolfe Tone, who was a keen supporter of the fight for Full Catholic Emancipation as seen in his role as secretary for the Catholic Committee. This is valuable to a historian as it gives a first hand account from someone directly involved in finding an answer to the Catholic Question.*

*Source 2 was written by Reverend John Cleland who was a Church of Ireland minister in Newtownards. This is not valuable to a historian as although it gives a perspective of someone outside of the Catholic Question, he was not directly involved in the fight for Catholic Emancipation.*

*Source 1 was written in 1791 in the lead up to the 1798 Rebellion. It is a primary source and is useful for a historian as it was written during the debate of the Catholic question and helped influence many people of Ireland's opinion of Catholic's deserving the vote. Source 2 is also a primary source and therefore useful. However, it was written in April 1795 whereas Earl Fitzwilliam was recalled in February 1795. Therefore, there is the danger of some facts being misremembered. Despite this, the recall of Earl Fitzwilliam was the "last straw" for many Catholics so it is useful for a historian to gain knowledge from the aftermath and impact of Fitzwilliam's dismissal.*

*Within Source 2, Tone is arguing in his pamphlet 'An Argument on Behalf of the Catholics of Ireland' that Catholics are indeed "fit for liberty". Tone references the injustice and discrimination the Catholics have faced since the "Penal statutes". This is useful as it shows the restrictions Catholics have been living with such as not owning land, having to pay tithes to the Protestant church and not having the vote. Another argument Tone makes is that the Catholics would be less ignorant if they were allowed education, "They are excluded by law from the possibility of education." Tone is arguing if "the cruel injustice of Protestant bigotry" was removed, Catholics would become productive within society. This is useful for a historian studying the Catholic Question as it explains what the demands of the Catholics were and shows how people were of the opinion that these were acceptable.*

*On the other hand source 2 is discussing the impact the recall of Earl Fitzwilliam had on the Irish Parliament and the Catholic Question. In 1793 Catholics were granted the right to vote but were still baned from sitting in Parliament. When the Whigs made an alliance with Pitt, it was hoped they would influence full emancipation. However, that hope faded with Fitzwilliam's dismissal, "...missed an opportunity to introduce the sensible policy of Catholic Emancipation..." This is useful as it shows the disheartened reaction of those in favour of full emancipation. However, Source 2 additionally gives the reaction from those in opposition to emancipation such as Mr Robert Stewart "made to believe that the Catholic Question must be addressed urgently... acted prematurely..." This is useful as it shows reactions of those in favour and against full Catholic emancipation.*

*Source 1 is a public pamphlet that was intended to unite all religions within Ireland and to show Catholics deserved liberty. However, this detracts from its' usefulness as the tone is persuasive and uses techniques such as a rhetorical question.*

*Source 2 is a letter intended for the author's brother James Cleland which improves the utility as it will be honest and factual as it is more personal. Its' purpose is to inform and therefore useful.*

*Both sources have limitations. Source 1 does not mention the relief act of 1778 by Gardiner which was intended to relieve the Catholics of some penal laws.*

*Furthermore, Source 2 does not expand on the reasons why Catholic emancipation was causing such a large issue such as the increase in sectarian violence between the Peep O Day boys and the Defenders.*

*To conclude, I believe Source 2 is more useful to a historian studying the Catholic Question as it has an honest tone and shows both opinions. Whereas, Source 1 is intended to persuade and provoke emotion.*

### Examiner's comments

This response begins by providing good knowledge about the author of Source 1, Theobald Wolfe Tone. The authorship adds value to the source, given Tone's position within the Catholic Committee, which raised the status of the Catholic Question at the start of the 1790s. The candidate also linked the debate in the Irish Parliament in Source 2 to the controversial recall of Viceroy Fitzwilliam in February 1795, providing relevant own knowledge to the effect that his recall was a turning point as far as the Catholic issue was concerned. As the answer develops, the content of Source 1 is deployed effectively as the candidate highlights Tone's assessment of Catholics in his famous pamphlet "An Argument on Behalf of the Catholics of Ireland". Good knowledge is provided on the impact of the Penal Laws on Catholics. The discussion of Source 1 ends with a comment on the value of Source 1's content in a study of the Catholic Question. There could, however, have been an acknowledgement of Tone's *Argument* being significant in its ability to persuade northern Presbyterians that Catholics were "fit for liberty" and, therefore, potential allies in the cause of reform.

Source 2 refers to a debate in the Irish Parliament in April 1795, when the political ramifications of Fitzwilliam's dismissal were still being felt. There is some good own knowledge here as the candidate acknowledges the fact that the Catholic Relief of April 1793 had granted the vote to Catholic males on the same terms as Protestants, although the measure had stopped short of Catholic Emancipation. There was scope for the response to recognise that Cleland was passing on his observations of a debate in the Irish Commons, during which the contrasting positions of Henry Grattan and Robert Stewart were presented. The candidate misses an opportunity to discuss explicitly Stewart's cautious outlook on Catholics in 1795. Later, as Lord Castlereagh, Stewart's political conservatism was underlined by his opposition to the rebellion and his support for the Union (although he later revealed more optimism about the political role of Catholics).

The answer makes some useful reference to the mode, audience and motive of the sources and links these to their value. The candidate also attempts to consider the limitations that undermine the value of Sources 1 and 2. There is also an attempt to reach firm conclusions on which of the sources was of more value and why.

Overall, the response is technically sound. The content is explored and there is a solid attempt to consider value in terms of the information contained, the limitations and the origins of the two sources. The candidate never loses sight of the fact that value is being assessed. The response was considered to be a low Level 4, with 12 marks being awarded.

### **Q1b Use Source 1 and Source 2 and other evidence you have studied.**

How far do the sources support the view that the Catholic Question dominated Irish politics in the period 1789–1798? [20]

#### **Student's response**

*Both source 1 and 2 support, to a large extent, the view that the Catholic Question dominated Irish politics in the period 1789–1798. However, the debate over the Catholic Question impact and stirred Irish politics which lead to other factors dominating such as the United Irishmen, 1798 Rebellion, Sectarian violence and government suppression.*

*The Catholic Question dominated Irish politics as at the same time, the ideas of the French Revolution and the 'age of Enlightenment' spread through Europe causing many in Ireland to question the treatment of Catholics. The main beliefs were liberty, equality and fraternity which are referenced in source 1, "every Irishman has a right to demand" and "let them be citizens, let them be men." Wolfe Tone, the author of source 1, was hugely in favour of full Catholic Emancipation. He even accepted the job of secretary when the Catholic Committee was established. Irish politics remained dominated by the Catholic question when Earl Fitzwilliam became Lord Luitenant of Ireland in January 1795. Due to his political views as a Whig, many within Irish parliament expected him to pass emancipation. Source 2 states, "Mr Grattan and his party, and made to believe that the Catholic Question must be addressed urgently." Grattan saw this as an opportunity to pass emancipation and so he and Fitzwilliam wrote up a reform bill. However, when the Troika informed Pitt what they planned, Fitzwilliam was recalled. As source 2 says, "Fitzwilliam and then acted premeturly, justifying his recall."*

*However, a topic that dominated Irish politics that neither source mentions is the United Irishmen. William Drennan, whose 'brain child' is the United Irishmen, desired to form a political reform group. He wrote to William Bruce in 1785 but it wasn't until August 1796 that they had there first meeting with 2 Anglicans, 9 Presbyterians and Samnuel McTier as their chairman. They establish the Northern Star, a political newspaper, edited by Samuel Neilson to educate the population of Ireland about other political situations around the world. Britain and the Irish government were very weary of this movement as they could not afford Ireland being*

*disable during the war in France. Therefore, the United Irishmen also dominated Irish politics during 1789–1798.*

*A huge event that dominated Irish politics that was effected by the Catholic question but not mentioned by either source is the rising sectarian violence and the 1798 Rebellion. A group named the Peep O Day Boys formed to raid Catholic houses in Armagh during economic competition between land and wearing jobs. They would smash Catholics weaving machines and steal their weapons which were from Volunteer movements however illegal under the Penal laws. As authorities would not stop this, Catholics formed a group called the Defenders. Sectarian violence continued to escalate between the two groups with examples in Newtowncastle in 1796 and Tangadee in 1797. This violence climaxed at the Battle of Diamond where 30 Defenders were killed but no Peep O Day Boys were prosecuted. As a result, the Orange Order were formed and the Defenders joined the United Irishmen thus radicalising the movement and becoming involved in the politics of Ireland.*

*Furthermore, the Rebellion of 1798 dominated Irish politics as this was an attempt to reform the corrupt parliament in Ireland and to win full emancipation for Ireland. The build up to the rebellion was influenced by Government suppression, not only on the Catholics, but also on revolutionaries of any religion. Source 1 does mention this “cruel injustice of Protestant bigotry.” Lord Camden’s attempt at suppression affected all of Ireland. He did this through suspending Habeus Corpus, a Militia Act and an Insurrection act. Source 2 also comments on government suppression when is sates “reform a corrupt Irish government.” Therefore, the sources also support government use of suppression in the period of 1789–1798 against all organisations and people intent on reform.*

*In conclusion, the sources mainly support the view that the Catholic Question dominated Ireland’s politics but acknowledge governments suppression through political means also this does not deay the fact that Catholic Question affected/impacted other events in Ireland that the sources did not mention such as the United Irishmen, sectarian violence and the 1798 Rebellion.*

### **Examiner’s comments**

This question required candidates to deploy the source content and wider knowledge to respond to the proposition in the question that the Catholic Question dominated Irish politics in the period between 1789 and 1798. The answer begins with a direct linkage to the wording of the question (good practice for candidates) and this connectivity and relevance is maintained throughout. The candidate is at pains to point out that other factors were also important in Irish politics during this period and their own knowledge is used effectively throughout the response.

The answer goes on to explain how the Catholic Question became increasingly relevant since the position of Irish Catholics seemed increasingly out of step with the age of Enlightenment, using their own knowledge effectively. The candidate employs Source 1 to highlight Tone’s call for Catholics to be politically empowered. There is reference to Tone’s key role as secretary to the Catholic Committee and the influence of the French Revolution is acknowledged even though the importance of

Tone's influential pamphlet could have been developed, especially how it persuaded many Presbyterians that Catholics could, in fact, become allies in the cause of reform. Reference could have been made to the government's attempt to win over Catholics to the constitution by the granting of relief in 1793. The centrality of the Catholic Question was still a dominating issue in Irish politics in 1795, and the answer uses Source 2 and their own knowledge to discuss the appointment of Fitzwilliam and how this raised the expectations of reformers such as Grattan, and also the Catholics, before his sudden recall dashed these hopes. The candidate needed to explore more fully the nature of Source 2: Cleland was reporting Grattan's view that an opportunity to enact "the sensible policy of Catholic Emancipation had been missed" and with it, a chance to reform the nature of Irish politics. Cleland went on to report the view of Robert Stewart and the administration that Fitzwilliam had been forced unnecessarily into adopting a position in relation to Catholics that went beyond the intentions of government policy and this led to his recall. There was greater scope for the candidate to analyse and evaluate the source content rather more and this prevented a higher mark being awarded. However, the assertion in the response to 1(b) that Irish politics 'remained dominated' by the Catholic Question links the sources together and shows a good level of understanding of the period.

The answer's main strength is in its deployment of relevant own knowledge to both support and challenge the proposition that the Catholic Question dominated Irish politics. The importance of the Society of United Irishmen, increased levels of sectarianism and the outbreak of rebellion were all issues that dominated Irish politics, albeit ones that were not unrelated to the centrality of the Catholic Question. The candidate also makes reference to the war with France, something that is hinted at in Source 2, where Cleland refers to Stewart's allusion to the need for "the country to rally around its King and his government at this very critical period." There are further references to Sources 1 and 2 later in the response. The "cruel injustice of Protestant bigotry" links government policy to the neglect of the Catholic Question, while repressive policies were a feature of the period.

The final paragraph makes effective linkage with the proposition and asserts that the sources mainly support the view that the Catholic Question dominated Irish politics. The candidate also notes that the Catholic Question was pertinent to other important issues such as the emergence and development of the United Irishmen, the increase in sectarianism, government policy, and the outbreak of rebellion. Overall, the answer organised and communicated historical knowledge in a relevant manner, reaching substantiated judgements with reference to the sources and the wider historical context. A low Level 4 mark of 16 was awarded.

## The Act of Union 1800

### Interpretation A

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

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

### Interpretation B

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

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

## Q2 Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B.

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

### Student's response

*Interpretation A, written by Michael J. Turner, argues that the introduction of the Act of Union was essential to the security of both Britain and Ireland. Interpretation B, written by Anthony Malcolmson, argues the introduction of the Act of Union was due to the weaknesses with previous constitutional agreements. I will be arguing that interpretation A is more convincing.*

*Interpretation B stages, "one constitutional settlement of 1782 and 1783... left the connection between the two kingdoms dangerously vague and imprecise. "Although the Constitution of 1782 was seen as a huge victory for Ireland, it had been written in haste to pressurise Britain whilst she was occupied with the American War of Independence. Therefore, there were many limitations left within the constitution such as the executive still under British control, a Lord Luitenant still chosen by Britain, rule through patronage and management and 2 independent legislatures under 1 crown. This resulted the regency crisis "Although the British and Irish Parliaments both names the Prince Wales as Regent, the Irish Parliament appointed him regent on different terms. This only added to the tension that had previously been created by Pitt's commercial negotiations. Malcolmson states, "In 1785 the British government made an attempt to make the connection tighter... " Pitt wrote up 10 commercial negotiations all to benefit Ireland bar 1.*

*This 1 stated surplus from Ireland would be given to the British navy. Grattan objected arguing there was no need during a time of peace. Ireland sent over 11, now modified negotiations, British merchants were outraged at none of these benefited their services and so a modified 20 were returned to Ireland with some suggesting Ireland would have to give up her new independence. Thus relations became bitter. These constitutional issues are interpretation B's argument of why the Act of Union was brought about.*

*However, there are weaknesses in interpretation B. Malcolmson focuses on the negatives that constitutional reasons brought but neglects the positives that influenced the Act of Union. The union between Scotland and England was beneficial to both countrys' economy in 1707. Pitt acknowledged the negatives of many constructional factors in the past but also used this example with Scotland as an incentive. Malcolmson leaves this out of his argument. Furthermore, he states, "The defect of the Irish Parliament, in the British government's view, was not that its loyalty to Britain was suspect." Ireland had just had a period of rising sectarian violence that climaxed in the rebellion of 1798. Ireland wanted nothing to do with Britain and even John Foster was against the Act of Union as he believed the Irish Parliament would flourish without the interference of Britain. Therefore this is a major weakness in Interpretation B's argument.*

*Interpretation A also has weaknesses in their argument. Turner states, the need for “Britain’s security and international position...” However, he neglects to mention the Protestant Ascendancy’s desire for security. The rebellion had shaken their confidence which resulted in them further refusing Catholic emancipation. If Britain and Ireland united, Pitt was determined to solve the unrest by granting Catholics the right to sit in Parliament but also reassuring Protestants as Catholics would never gain a majority in British Parliament whereas they may have in Irish Parliament as they outnumbered Protestants 4:1.*

*Despite this weakness in interpretation A’s argument, Turner includes many relevant motives as to why the Act of Union was introduced. “Although the United Irish Rebellion of 1798 was an organisational and military failure, it confirmed Pitt in his opinion...” Pitt had also had the political goal to unite Ireland and Britain after the disaster of the commercial negotiations. This had also been mentioned and desired by figures of the past such as Molyneux and Buckinghamshire. “Instability in Ireland had encouraged French intervention...” Especially due to the fact that Britain was at war with France who could use Ireland as a weak link, Pitt had been concerned at the success of French ships landing in Bantry Bay by the influence of Tone. The British Navy had been caught off guard and it took them 9 days to gather and prepare a fleet for defence. This further built up the need for a union to give full security. The Rebellion of 1798 as acknowledged by Turner, gave Pitt the excuse to pass a union. Without this event, it could never have been passed.*

*Therefore, interpretation A is the more convincing on why the Act of Union was introduced as it gives the cause and the build up reason, which was the desire of security.*

## Examiner’s comments

In this answer, the candidate ably analyses and evaluates the ways in which the past has been interpreted by historians. The motives for the introduction of the Act of Union, as discussed by Turner and Malcolmson, are discussed well with reference to the candidate’s contextual knowledge. This answer shows how a Level 4 mark can be awarded by using a structure that deals fully with the strengths and weaknesses of one interpretation before assessing those of the rival interpretation.

A good understanding of the differing interpretations of the motives behind the Union are set out in the introduction and a line of argument is established. The discussion of Malcolmson’s interpretation places an emphasis on the longer term factors that convinced Pitt that a Union was desirable. The perceived imperfections of the 1782 Constitution rendered Ireland’s status “dangerously vague and imprecise.” The candidate’s contextual knowledge adds substance to this statement by noting that at various stages, the nature of the Anglo-Irish relationship was placed under scrutiny. The Irish Parliament resisted London’s attempt to challenge the gains of 1782 by opposing Pitt’s commercial propositions in 1785, while the Regency Crisis saw the Lord Lieutenant refuse to transmit the Irish Parliament’s offer to the Prince of Wales to become Regent during the King’s incapacitation. These crises made the prospects of a political union appealing to Pitt. While the candidate accepts Malcolmson’s interpretation that the Union was in consideration for some time,

Interpretation B is challenged for not acknowledging the potential of the Union in economic terms. Interpretation A asserts that the Union was proposed in the light of short term factors, namely the political instability that led to the 1798 Rebellion and the reality of French intervention, which posed a significant security risk for Britain. The candidate challenges Turner's interpretation for not discussing the Ascendancy's opposition to Catholic Emancipation as a factor influencing Pitt and his allies in the plans for a Union between Britain and Ireland. The candidate uses Interpretation A and contextual knowledge to support Turner's view that the rebellion was a close-run thing as far as Britain's security was concerned and makes an excellent point in asserting that the rebellion 'gave Pitt the excuse' to pass the Union. The urgency of the situation in 1798-9 cannot be denied, but the candidate shows an understanding of a longer term objective. This suggests that the rebellion and French intervention was the occasion as much as the cause of the Act of Union. There is a clear understanding that there had been a long-standing desire for the Union and the idea was not simply invented after the suppression of the rebellion.

The answer is strong in terms of its use of contextual knowledge and its handling of the two interpretations. While Interpretation A is deemed to be the more convincing, Turner's view is challenged for not acknowledging the longstanding desire for a Union. Interpretation B's strengths are considered, but the view expressed is also challenged, albeit not wholly convincingly. A final judgement is reached in the light of the rival interpretations and wider knowledge of the period. A Level 4 mark of 22 was awarded.

**Q3a** "The decline of the Volunteers after 1782 was mainly a result of the personal and political rivalry between Henry Flood and Henry Grattan."  
How far would you agree with this assessment? [20]

### Student's response

*Although the decline of the Volunteers after 1782 was mainly a result of the personal and political rivalry between Henry Flood and Henry Grattan, other factors such as the end of the American War of Independence and Government policies also affected the movements decline.*

*In 1775, when the chances of reform seemed unlikely from outside of Irish Parliament, Henry Flood accepted the position of vice-treasurer from Lord Harcourt as a means to make changes from the inside. However, this made him look like a traitor. Henry Grattan replaced Flood as a key leader within the movement which ended up succeeding in its aims. Flood was incredibly jealous as Grattan received a £5000 reward. He said "Who is that with a metaphor in their mouth and £5000 in their pocket", showing the bitterness he felt. In an attempt to regain his authority and a hero-like status, Flood claimed Britain needed to present a signed copy of legislative independence to prove they meant it. Grattan disagreed claiming they'd achieved what they'd aimed to which was the first disagreement that began to divide and decline the Volunteer movement.*

*Henry Grattan and Henry Flood further disagreed over the Catholic Question. Grattan believed the Catholics were entitled to full emancipation however Flood disagreed. Furthermore, Flood did not want the movement to end and so claimed they must continue to be the “guardians of the constitution.” He believed parliament should reform and whilst Grattan agreed with him on this, he believed that it should be left in the hands of the Irish Parliament. Flood refused to step back and held a Grand Convention in 1783 in Rotunda where they drew up further political reforms. Flood preceded to march into parliament in his Volunteer uniform and present them with his reforms. However, the Patriots no longer required an “out of doors force” and therefore their reform bill was rejected.*

*Opposing opinions on the renunciation crisis and the Catholic Question divided the Volunteer’s themselves. Some had allowed Catholics to join whilst other had refused thus dividing the overall opinion. What further divided the movement was radical opinions. These began to diminish the members so by 1784 it had declined from 45,000 to 20,000.*

*The decline of the Volunteers was also impacted by the end of the American War of Independence. Now that the regular troops were home and there was no threat of an invasion from France, there was no need for the Volunteers. This was further shown by the creation of the Militia in 1784 and the Yeomanry in 1786.. Militia was used for fighting when normal troops were away for example the West Indies, whilst the Yeomanry were used to quell sectarian unrest within Ireland. With the creation of these Fencibles with correct military discipline, there was no need for the Volunteers which therefore added to their decline.*

*The final factor that added to the decline of the Volunteer movement was the government policies put in place. Acts such as the insurrection act, the gunpowder act and the convention act were all passed.*

*These were the governments ways of stopping further reform groups trying to encourage insurrection. Therefore this repression added to the decline of the Volunteer movement after 1782.*

*In conclusion, although Ireland had a long history for Volunteering, due to the political and personally rivarly between Flood and Grattan, but equally the end of the American War of Independence and Government repressive policies, the Volunteer movement went into decline after 1782.*

### **Examiner’s comments**

The candidate’s introduction immediately acknowledges that the personal rivalry between Henry Grattan and Henry Flood was a significant factor in explaining the decline of the Volunteers after 1782, but also highlights additional causal factors that move beyond the proposition offered in the question.

At the outset, the candidate recognises that the personal rivalry had roots that went back to Flood’s acceptance of a government position in 1775 (although Grattan’s famous reference to Flood’s perceived betrayal of the Patriot cause is incorrectly

attributed to Flood). The answer goes on to highlight the differences between the two men in terms of how legislative independence was to be interpreted. Flood's criticism of Grattan's finest hour contributed to the creation of fissures among the Patriots in parliament and also the Volunteers, although the Renunciation dispute could have been developed more explicitly. The disagreements between Flood and Grattan over both the Catholic issue and the question of further reforms are discussed, and Flood's humiliating experience when Parliament rejected the Volunteer Bill that originated in the Dublin Convention of late 1783 is convincing. The candidate acknowledges that the Irish Parliament no longer felt the need to have backing from the Volunteers, with the implication that MPs were opposed to being held to ransom by an alternative assembly of men.

The candidate also notes that the divisions in the Patriot faction were mirrored in the Volunteers. The admission of some Catholics into a number of Volunteer companies was a cause of some controversy, with the result that the numbers of Volunteers declined significantly from the heady days of 1782. The answer would have been enhanced by reference to the fact that some Volunteer companies agreed with Flood's assessment of the 1782 Constitution (for example, the Belfast First Volunteer Company) while others remained loyal to Grattan's analysis of the situation. While the division between Flood and Grattan exposed weaknesses in the Patriot faction and the Volunteers, the answer also acknowledges that the end of the war in the American colonies (the British defeat at Yorktown in 1781 was significant) meant that the Volunteers' decline would be as dramatic as their emergence in 1778. The Volunteer moment had indeed passed. Government concerns about the development of the movement contributed to talk of a more official and accountable supplementary fencible force being formed and this divided opinion within the Volunteers, since their proud independence would be compromised by government sponsorship. Credit was given for this reference, although the answer became confused at this stage. The candidate discussed the militia and yeomanry (creations of the 1790s which lay beyond the scope of the question) and also measures that clamped down on the Volunteers after their revival in the early 1790s, again beyond the scope of the question.

Overall, the candidate was able to demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge effectively and made substantiated judgements that revealed a clear understanding of cause and consequence. A Level 4 mark of 17 was awarded. While there were some errors and omissions, the response discussed the personal and political rivalries between Flood and Grattan and the ways these impacted on the Volunteers. Additional causal factors that challenged the proposition were also discussed.

**Q3b** To what extent was the failure of the 1798 Rebellion due to the shortcomings of its leaders? [20]

**Question not selected by Examiner.**

## Option 4: Partition of Ireland 1900–1925

### The Causes of the Easter Rising of 1916

#### Source 1

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

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

#### Source 2

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

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

**Q1a Use Source 1 and Source 2 and your knowledge of this period.**

Which of the sources would an historian value most as evidence in a study of the causes of the Easter Rising of 1916? [15]

**Student's response**

*Both sources are valuable to an historian in the study of the Easter Rising. I argue that Source 2 is more valuable.*

*Source 1 was authored by Patrick Pearse who was a leading commandant of the Easter Rising, this adds value to this source as he knew the exact motives behind the rising and his insight allows an historian to gain an understanding in his particular draw towards a rebellion in which appears to be Carsonism. Being published almost three years before the rebellion adds 'further' value to the source in proving that the idea of rebellion was considered for a long time before it happened perhaps suggesting it was a result of the accumulation of discontent faced by the rebels it attracted. The date being so early limits the source as there is no indication as to whether the rising occurs or the outcomes of it. The tone of the source is accusation of the nationalist's weakness in striking for freedom this is useful because it proves to an historian that a rebellion would likely not have been popular among many nationalists. This is an extract from an article which adds value in suggesting how the rebels distributed their call for unity on their cause however the mode may limit the source as an historian can fail to receive a true sense of the passion felt by Pearse perhaps more evident in a spoken speech but none the less Pearse's power of persuasion shines through as the main purpose of this article.*

*Source 2 is written also by a leading commandant of the source providing value in his motive behind the rebellion and how motives varied between the rebels. This source was written only a few months before the rebellion thus its date is valuable in explaining the 'trigger' factors for the rebellion in this case an unpopular war. The date, again, limits the source in that there is no indication of the outcomes. Perhaps the true value in the source is Connolly's passionate and aggravated tone towards the English – he uses inflammatory language 'slaughter'. This tone perhaps suggests the passion of the rebels as they try to rally support for their cause. It also proves his eloquence reinforcing the idea that this was a rebellion of intellectuals. The purpose of this extract to readily attract a further push of nationalist support through its tone of passion and perhaps desperation is valuable to an historian as it highlights the struggle the rebels faced in gaining public support. The date limits the source again as an historian cannot gain insight into how much the Easter Rising caused annoyance towards the rebels as little supported their cause until weeks after the rebellion despite such desperate pleas.*

*To conclude I argue Source 2 is more valuable to an historian as it allows them to further understand the passion.*

## Examiner's comments

This response was awarded a Level 3 mark of 9 out of 15.

The candidate offers a sustained assessment of the value of both sources, providing a valid and competent discussion of date, author, mode, motive, audience and tone. There is some analysis present in this discussion, for example, in the way the candidate comments on the mode of Source 1. Focusing on the question, the answer immediately identifies the key causes behind the Easter Rising contained in each source: for Source 1, the key cause is Carsonism, for Source 2, it is the First World War. The language and tone of Source 2 is analysed in a competent manner, as the candidate highlights a tone of 'passion' and 'inflammatory' words used by Connolly such as 'slaughter', and suggests reasons and motivations behind such language choices: the planned Rising was imminent and Connolly was 'desperate' to gain public support. In contrast, while the candidate argues that Pearse in Source 1 is 'persuasive', they do not provide examples to illustrate this point. Cognisant of limitations, the answer suggests that Source 1's early date partly limits its value. Their argument that Source 2's date is limiting is less convincing. The conclusion is rather weak as the reasons given for selecting Source 2 as the most valuable source are truncated.

While there is a good focus on value, the response would have achieved a higher mark if there had been more focus on the content of the sources and greater use of relevant own knowledge.

### **Q1b Use Source 1 and Source 2 and other evidence you have studied.**

How far do the sources support the view that Ulster resistance to Home Rule was the main cause of the Easter Rising of 1916? [20]

## Student's response

*Source 1 partially rejects and mostly accepts the Ulster resistance to Home Rule was the cause of the Easter Rising whilst Source 2 partially accepts but mostly rejects.*

*Source 1 argues that it was the campaign or Ulster resistance that inspired the formation of the Irish volunteers who would eventually be infiltrated and used in the rising by the Irish Republican Brotherhood. This source was published the very month in which the Irish volunteers were established. The source highlights that at this point 'nationalists' were not only 'unfamiliar' with weapons but also "hates" those who use weapons. The Gaelic League had inspired a new mento nationalism by encouraging Irish culture peacefully bur many believed it had served its purpose. This movement had inspired a more radical strain of 'New Nationalism' which provided the atmosphere for revolt and therefore the source partially rejects the view that the main cause was Ulster resistance. The source accepts the view when Pearse recognises Ulster resistance as the 'Orangeman' and accuses their 'readiness' to fight for their belief not to be a point of ridicule and to ridicule the use of arms and revolution would be 'wrong'. The source further accepts the view that*

*Ulster resistance caused the Easter Rising and Pearce, as a leader for the revolt, believes that a man should be 'respected for his willingness to fight for his belief.' Being a Romantic who believed in blood sacrifice as a way of cleansing the earth, seeing the UVF under Carson being formed to fight against Home Rule inspired the rebellion – a movement called Carsonism. The formation of the UVF established Ulster's will to use violence allowing justification for Pearce to use violence in the form of a rebellion. Pearce further agrees with the viewpoint as he justifies the fear that the rebellion will likely fail and lead to maximum blood shed by claiming that the 'Orangeman' is 'foolish' to believe in his 'personal freedom' to be detrimented by Home Rule but it is 'common sense' and his duty' to protect his freedom. Pearce knows that a rebellion is unlikely to end up establishing a Republic but argues that like an orangeman the Irishman has a duty to himself and all of those who fought for a Republic before him to at least try to strike for freedom. The source further agrees that the Ulster Resistance inspired the army of the rebels for rebellion as Pearce specifically highlights that due to the Orangeman having a 'rifle' so too should a nationalist and therefore directly links the rebellion to the Ulster resistance.*

*Source 2 argues that the Ulster unionist resistance had a small role in the rebellion but it was mostly the IPP and the association of war that caused it. This source was published only a few months prior to the rebellion by one of its leaders.*

*The source agrees that the Unionists had "outwitted and bulldozed" the 'IPP' and therefore led to its failure to gain Home Rule for all of Ireland. The Unionist resistance had ruined any changes of gaining a Republic or any form of independence by constitutional means which left the option of a rebellion much more appealing. The source also agrees by mentioning that the Unionists 'Orang military gang' and the threat of violence employed during the Home Rule crisis, had caused the IPP to surrender every 'advantage' in terms of gaining Home Rule for all of Ireland – a crucial step towards independence and therefore a rebellion was needed. The source goes on to disagree with the viewpoint by highlighting that the IPP behaving 'cowardly and treacherous' in the agreement to join the British forces and promote the war. 'War had created a political vacuum which the gave people time to become disillusioned by the conditions of Home Rule and therefore begin to desire an alternative – the inspiration come to strike for a Republic. The source further disagree by highlighting the 'slaughter' of Irish men. Unpredicted Irish tragedies had angered the Irish further at the IPP encouraging them to look for an alternative which came in the form of a Republic - the war provided timing for the rebellion as the British were distracted. The source, again, disagrees by pointing out another cause for the rebellion – a bid to remove the 'English' from Ireland due to their lack of regard for Irish soldiers – the war office disrespected them. The source disagrees with the view that it was the Ulster resistance that inspired the rebellion and argues instead that it was a bid to remove the Ireland from an oppressive 'empire' who are unwilling to provide them 'freedom' and also a consequence of the War.*

*The Easter rebellion was also inspired by the role of the IRB who planned, recruited and armed the rebels as well as infiltrate the GAA and the Irish volunteers in order to carry out the rebellion. It was also inspired by the role of individuals like Tom Clarke who marked a connection to the Old Fenian Tradition and the two sources authors who were passionate about creating a Republic.*

*To conclude, Source 1 partially rejects and mostly accepts the view whilst source 2 partially accepts and mostly rejects the viewpoint.*

### Examiner's comments

This response was awarded a Level 4 mark of 17 out of 20.

This answer sustains a strong focus on the proposition throughout, with the content of the sources used to both agree and disagree with the proposition.

There is some astute analysis, for example in Source 1 the answer adroitly compares the Orangemen's 'duty' to protect themselves by bearing arms with Nationalists' motivations for taking up arms. In Source 2, the candidate provides a sound discussion of the impact of unionism in the Home Rule crisis: the failure of the IPP to secure Home Rule or, as the candidate puts it, 'any form of independence' 'by constitutional means' was a key factor behind the Rising. Equally, the candidate summarises how the 'Orange military gang' successfully used the threat of violence to force the IPP to 'surrender every advantage'. In their discussion of Source 2, the candidate challenges the proposition by demonstrating how the source blames the IPP for supporting the war, and how this led to a political vacuum, disillusionment and the desire for an alternative to Home Rule. The war theme is further developed as the answer explores the concept of the war providing distraction for the British government and good 'timing' for the Rebellion. Using their own knowledge, the candidate develops the war theme by pointing out that the war office treated nationalist soldiers with disrespect, arguing that this was a further reason for Ireland to break from 'an oppressive Empire'.

In the final part of their answer, the candidate introduces other factors behind the Rising, such as the role of the IRB and their infiltration of the GAA, and the role of individuals such as Fenian, Thomas Clarke.

This is a well-organised response which utilises the sources very effectively indeed. Any historical knowledge is communicated relevantly, clearly and effectively.

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

### **Interpretation A**

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

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

### **Interpretation B**

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

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

## Q2 Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B.

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

### Student's response

*Interpretation A by Patricia Jalland argues that Asquith's handling of the Home Rule Crisis could have been different by offering an earlier compromise solution whilst B by Roy Jenkins argues that although Asquith exasperated the crisis it was unlikely that he could have brought an end to the crisis in 1912–1914. I will now conclude that Interpretation B is more convincing.*

*Interpretation A argues that Asquith could have dealt with the crisis in 'two possible ways'. The government at this time was a Liberal coalition with the IPP. In order for the Liberals to have gained power they promised the IPP a third Home Rule Bill. Jalland argues that they could have given "Home Rule to the whole of Ireland". This would have immediately satisfied the IPP as this is what they wanted and the Liberal party traditionally supported Home Rule so would satisfy their aim too. Jalland then suggests that they could then 'deal firmly with any resistance from North-East Ulster'. The source highlights that Jalland is aware of one of the main struggles that Asquith faced in the handling of the Home Rule Crisis being the resistance the Ulster Unionists had created. The attention to dealing with this opposition is a key element to how Home Rule would be passed as Asquith could not avoid the opposition realities. Jalland argues that Asquith could have handled the crisis by providing some "form of Ulster exclusion". This was suggested earlier on in the crisis by the Agar- Robartes amendment or the suggestion of a county-option scheme which went unheeded and ignored by Asquith. Jalland points out that it might have been 'wiser' to engage in this type of agreement early on before the crisis had really developed. The Government choosing to proceed at threatening to impose Home Rule on Ireland was a mishandling by Asquith as his unwillingness to accept the extent of Ulster resistance only escalated the situation. Jalland highlights that it was only a year into the crisis that the Government revealed the 'seriousness of the Ulster situation'. This again proved Asquith to be a poor leader as by this point 'Autumn 1913' the Ulster resistance had formed their own paramilitary organisation, the UVF, and illegal the UUF had made plans for an illegal provisional Government. Asquith's inability to take the initiative and realising the extent of the Ulster resistance instead of believing it to be bluff intensified the crisis hugely. Jalland recognises that as a result of the spiralling Ulster resistance Asquith had put his government at a 'disadvantage' as there would now always be a threat of violence. Jalland also points out Asquith's 'wait and see' attitude at trying to 'keep his options open' greatly exacerbated the crisis as he lacked making any decisive choices. Asquith's, inability to recognise the extent of opposition also meant he eventually lost the support of the British army in March 1914 with the Curragh Military meaning he could no longer 'use the army to enforce Home Rule' and he was under further pressure to 'compromise'.*

*I argue that this source is not as convincing as Interpretation B because it only mentions the pressures Asquith felt from the Ulster Unionists and does not discuss other opposition groups – like the Conservatives who influenced his mishandling. I argue that this source does not thoroughly discuss how Asquith mishandled many situations within these vital two years and therefore I argue it is too narrow minded to be fully convincing.*

*Interpretation B argues that Asquith failed in many aspects of his handling – for example Jenkins points out that, Asquith was ‘aware’ of the developing crisis but did ‘little to resolve it’. Asquith had allowed the UVF to be formed as well as witnessed Conservative speeches encouraging the Ulster Unionist resistance to ‘use all means necessary’. The clear implication of threat in the formation of an army and the signing of 470,000 people in the Solman league and Covenant both of which promoted the use of force should have set off alarm bells for Asquith and his failure to do anything about it proved he mishandled and worsened the crisis. Jenkins points out also that he watched events ‘calmly’ before he saw an opportunity to ‘intervene’ but there was ‘no such events’ in this time period. This is more convincing than A because Jenkins points out that Asquith did not have the opportunity to agree on some form of exclusion or weigh up ‘two’ possible ways to deal with crisis. The Liberals were also under pressure due to the impending global crisis and the suffragette movement so perhaps Asquith’s influence on the crisis was limited. The source convincingly reminds an historian that ‘Liberals’ and the IPP would not support ‘any compromise’. The IPP held the balance of power under the conditions that Home Rule would be passed for all of Ireland and for the Liberals were traditionally a pro-Home Rule party so Asquith could not have handled the crisis by exclusion at this point. Again Jenkins highlights that at this point no form of exclusion would have even satisfied the resistance as at this point Unionist leaders wanted to smash Home Rule for all of Ireland further making Jalland’s interpretation of handling Home Rule this way more unviable. The source also highlights that the Unionists that were ‘English’ were more interested in the southern Unionists who shared considerable influence in the Conservative party and that Bonar Law was only interested in ‘destroying the Liberal government’, reuniting their party and gaining power so if Asquith handled the crisis by exclusion at his early point it would not have stopped the crisis at all.*

*This source is more convincing because it evaluates the struggles of Asquith in greater depth than A and therefore gives a more realistic conclusion on what influenced his handling of the crisis. Jenkins defends Asquith in a way that accuses Jalland’s viewpoint to be too simplistic for the true extent of the pressures at play.*

*To conclude, Interpretation b is more convincing than interpretation A.*

## Examiner's comments

This response was awarded a high Level 4 mark of 24 out of 25. It is characterised by close analysis and evaluation of the Interpretations and sustained and developed judgements about Asquith's handling of the Home Rule crisis.

The introduction shows a clear understanding of the interpretations by providing a concise summary of the contrasting arguments put forward by the two historians. Interpretation B is selected as the most convincing.

The main part of the answer begins with a sustained evaluation of Interpretation A, in which the candidate consistently supports and substantiates the points made by Jalland. Throughout the answer, the candidate successfully integrates their own contextual knowledge into their analysis, demonstrating a very secure understanding of the historical context. For example, 'Ulster exclusion' in Interpretation A is explained by referencing the Agar-Robartes amendment of 1912, which was rejected by Asquith and the government. The 'seriousness' of the situation in Ulster is exemplified by reference to the UVF and the illegal provisional government. The candidate successfully interprets the reference to 'March 1914' as the Curragh Mutiny, and explains how this incident denied Asquith the option of using the army to enforce Home Rule, putting increased pressure on the Prime Minister to compromise. The answer then mounts a reasonable challenge to Interpretation A by suggesting that it is narrower in its focus than Interpretation B.

In their evaluation of Interpretation B, the candidate methodically supports each point made by Jenkins, while consistently drawing contrasts with Interpretation A. Good focus on the question, and on the key issue of how Asquith handled the crisis, is maintained throughout.

In their conclusion, the candidate summarises the judgement reached, that Interpretation B is the most convincing one and once again provides evidence to support it.

**Q3a** "The failure of British Government policies in Ireland in the period 1916–1918 was mainly responsible for the success of Sinn Féin in the General Election of 1918." To what extent would you accept this verdict? [20]

## Student's response

*The General election of 1918 saw a landslide victory for the new and vibrant Sinn Fein Party against the Irish Parliament Party or the IPP. Prior to this period, Sinn Fein was not a well-known party which leaves many to questions what exactly brought them to undeniable national prominence in 1918. There are a number of factors including British Government failures, however, I argue the most important factor that was responsible for their success was Sinn Fein's own contribution.*

*The British Government made a number of key mistakes leading up to 1918. They had introduced martial law as a result of the Easter rising. People believed everyone was punished through often it applied etc when it was only a 'minority of a minority'*

*involved in the rising. The 'pin-pricking coercion' after the Rising of 1916 which saw hundreds of innocent people arrested and perhaps rearrested disillusioned the Irish people further and compounded by the long drawn out execution of 15 men. British Government had established a firmly anti-British feeling throughout Ireland. The British government has also been responsible for the deaths of Thomas Pohe – a Nationalist Hunger striker and Fiánas Sheehy-Skeffington – a pacifist journalist. These men had provided Sinn Fein martyrs for their cause. John Dillon – a representative of Britain – accused the British government of manufacturing Sinn Feiners especially by sending so many nationalists to prisons which were labelled 'in revolutionary institutions' as many left with a much more radicalised nationalist view point than they arrived with. The British also labelled the Easter Rising – 'the Sinn Fein Rising' incorrectly so when popular opinion for the Rising came about Sinn Fein lapped up all of the praise. The British Government had also falsely arrested Sinn Fein leader through the 'German plot' and the suggestion of conscription on Ireland all were explored by Sinn Fein – helping them to use to power.*

*Another group which contributed to the success of Sinn Fein was the IPP. The IPP under Redmond had been strongly associated with the unpopular British Government at this time as well as an extremely unpopular war – Redmond's Woodenbridge speech saw him encouraging the Irish to join in the fight. This war had become very unpopular not only due to the colossal amounts of Irish casualties but also because it had gone on much longer than expected. The IPP had come stagnate and their party machinery had begun to struggle against a vibrant new party. They lacked constituents candidates for 25 constituencies allowing Sinn Fein to easily replace them. The IPP's association with the British Government and Redmond's decision not to take a seat in the wartime coalition government had disillusioned the Irish people and Sinn Fein's promise not to let Britain become involved in Irish politics greatly appealed to many. Redmond's accidental acceptance of permanent partition in the Lloyd George talks of summer 1916 confirmed people's doubts that he was no a competent leader.*

*The IPP had also experienced some misfortune which contributed to their decline and the consequent rise of Sinn Fein. They believed the war would be over in '8' weeks and this going on longer contributed to their decline in support. John Edmond suffered a personal loss with his brother dying in war and this greatly detrimented his ability as a leader. Redmond's health so began to decline and so he offered little derisive relationship just prior to his death.*

*I argue that Sinn Fein were the masters of their own success. They came up with a vague manifest to which guaranteed the support of all shades of Nationalist opinion from constitutional to Republican. This wide appeal satisfied the electorate. They were new and vigorously campaigned for the General Election and every by-election including North Roscommon when IPP candidate Count Plunkett easily defeated the IPP candidate. This vibrance was greatly received by the youthful and biggest electorate yet as women had gained the right to vote. There had not been an election for eight years hence why the electorate was young Sinn Fein promised to abstain from Westminster and not allow British involvement – this provided a contrast to Redmond which was well received. Sinn Fein Leader Eamonn De Valera drafted the anti-conscription pledge which allowed Sinn Fein to appear as the soul defenders against conscription despite the reality that all nationalist parties opposed.*

*The exploited both the mistakes of the British like the ‘German plot’ and the mistakes of Redmond and the IPP to appear the best option for voters in 1918 and did so effectively.*

*They refused to participate in the Irish Convention whilst the IPP did proving they were serious about their non-involvement.*

*To conclude, although the mistakes of the British Government was a key element to the use of Sinn Féin, I argue that Sinn Féin being able to manipulate such mistakes into gaining electoral support of the public was the main factor in their success.*

### Examiner’s comments

This response merited a low Level 4 mark of 16 out of 20.

The response begins with a strong introduction which poses a question, references the proposition and introduces the candidate’s main argument.

In the first part of the essay the candidate focuses on the proposition, providing relevant and appropriate evidence to illustrate the failure of British Government policies in Ireland after 1916. This material is presented in a cogent and effective manner.

The candidate then develops the discussion by focusing on other factors behind Sinn Féin’s success. These include the ineptitude and mistakes of the IPP and its leader Redmond, as well as the misfortunes experienced by the Nationalist party. Finally, the candidate’s key argument that Sinn Féin were ‘masters of their own success’ is presented. Evidence is marshalled to substantiate this argument, including the party’s manifesto, its by-election successes and the anti-conscription campaign. A sustained contrast between Sinn Féin and the IPP enhances the analysis in this section.

In a succinct conclusion, the candidate neatly summarises their main argument and refers back to the proposition.

Throughout this answer the candidate maintains a clear and strong focus on the question. Overall, the response provides a comprehensive analysis of the question. The form and style of writing is appropriate and material is organised with clarity and coherence. However, greater focus on the proposition would have resulted in an even higher Level 4 mark.

**Q3b** “The poor military tactics of the Anti-Treaty forces led to their defeat by the Free State Army in the Irish Civil War of 1922–1923.” How far would you agree with this verdict? [20]

**Question not selected by Examiner.**



INVESTORS  
IN PEOPLE

