

GCE A2

History

January 2010

Mark Schemes

Issued: April 2010

**NORTHERN IRELAND GENERAL CERTIFICATE OF SECONDARY EDUCATION (GCSE)
AND NORTHERN IRELAND GENERAL CERTIFICATE OF EDUCATION (GCE)**

MARK SCHEMES (2010)

Foreword

Introduction

Mark Schemes are published to assist teachers and students in their preparation for examinations. Through the mark schemes teachers and students will be able to see what examiners are looking for in response to questions and exactly where the marks have been awarded. The publishing of the mark schemes may help to show that examiners are not concerned about finding out what a student does not know but rather with rewarding students for what they do know.

The Purpose of Mark Schemes

Examination papers are set and revised by teams of examiners and revisers appointed by the Council. The teams of examiners and revisers include experienced teachers who are familiar with the level and standards expected of 16- and 18-year-old students in schools and colleges. The job of the examiners is to set the questions and the mark schemes; and the job of the revisers is to review the questions and mark schemes commenting on a large range of issues about which they must be satisfied before the question papers and mark schemes are finalised.

The questions and the mark schemes are developed in association with each other so that the issues of differentiation and positive achievement can be addressed right from the start. Mark schemes therefore are regarded as a part of an integral process which begins with the setting of questions and ends with the marking of the examination.

The main purpose of the mark scheme is to provide a uniform basis for the marking process so that all the markers are following exactly the same instructions and making the same judgements in so far as this is possible. Before marking begins a standardising meeting is held where all the markers are briefed using the mark scheme and samples of the students' work in the form of scripts. Consideration is also given at this stage to any comments on the operational papers received from teachers and their organisations. During this meeting, and up to and including the end of the marking, there is provision for amendments to be made to the mark scheme. What is published represents this final form of the mark scheme.

It is important to recognise that in some cases there may well be other correct responses which are equally acceptable to those published: the mark scheme can only cover those responses which emerged in the examination. There may also be instances where certain judgements may have to be left to the experience of the examiner, for example, where there is no absolute correct response – all teachers will be familiar with making such judgements.

The Council hopes that the mark schemes will be viewed and used in a constructive way as a further support to the teaching and learning processes.

CONTENTS

	Page
A2 1: Module 4	1
A2 2: Module 5	35
A2 3: Module 6	59



Rewarding Learning

ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education
January 2010

History

Assessment Unit A2 1

assessing

Module 4

[A2H11]

THURSDAY 14 JANUARY, AFTERNOON

MARK SCHEME

Level of response mark grid

This level of response grid has been developed as a general basis for marking candidates' work, according to the following assessment objectives:

- AO1a** recall, select and deploy historical knowledge accurately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner;
- AO1b** present historical explanations, showing understanding of appropriate concepts, and arrive at substantiated judgements;
- AO2** In relation to historical context:
- interpret, evaluate and use a range of source material;
 - explain and evaluate interpretations of historical events and topics studied.

The grid should be used in conjunction with the information on indicative content outlined for each assessment unit.

Level	Assessment Objective 1a	Assessment Objective 1b	Assessment Objective 2
	Answers at this level will:	Answers at this level will:	Answers at this level will
1	recall, select and deploy some accurate factual knowledge and communicate limited understanding in narrative form. There will be evidence of an attempt to structure and present answers in a coherent manner.	display a basic understanding of the topic; some comments may be relevant, but general and there may be assertions and judgements which require supporting evidence.	limited recognition of the possibility of debate surrounding an event or topic.
2	be quite accurate, contain some detail and show understanding through a mainly narrative approach. Communication may have occasional lapses of clarity and/or coherence.	display general understanding of the topic and its associated concepts and offer explanations which are mostly relevant, although there may be limited analysis and a tendency to digress. There will be some supporting evidence for assertions and judgements.	an attempt to explain different approaches to and interpretations of the event or topic. Evaluation may be limited.
3	contain appropriate examples with illustrative and supportive factual evidence and show understanding and ability to engage with the issues raised by the question in a clear and coherent manner.	display good breadth of understanding of the topic and its associated concepts. Analysis is generally informed and suitably illustrated to support explanations and judgements.	there will be an ability to present and evaluate different arguments for and against particular interpretations of an event or topic.
4	be accurate and well-informed and show ability to engage fully with the demands of the question. Knowledge and understanding will be expressed with clarity and precision.	display breadth and depth of understanding of the topic and its associated concepts. Explanations will be well-informed with arguments and judgements well-substantiated, illustrated and informed by factual evidence.	there will be appropriate explanation, insightful interpretation and well-argued evaluation of particular interpretations of an event or topic.

(Answer **two** questions)

1 This question targets:

- (i) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations, show understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantial judgements.
- (ii) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

Indicative content:

Level 1 AO1b ([1]–[5]), AO1a ([1]–[2])

Level 1 answers may know only basic points about Philip II's policy towards the Church in Spain, referring perhaps to his fear of heresy, support for the Inquisition or efforts to control the Church. Answers may contain some superficiality and generalisations. They will be characterised throughout by defects in accuracy, organisation, a limited vocabulary, poor spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

Level 2 AO1b ([6]–[11]), AO1a ([3]–[4])

Level 2 answers will make a number of relevant points but there will be gaps in knowledge. They may display knowledge of Philip's policy towards the Church but fail to assess its success. Answers may note that the discovery of "Protestant" communities in Seville and Valladolid in 1557 and 1558, with links to Geneva, was met with a stern response. In fact, the leaders were executed, the importation of foreign books was banned and all books had in future to be licensed. In 1559 Spanish students were forbidden to study abroad and a new index of banned books was issued. Answers at this level may also discuss Philip's attempts to control the church. For example, he attempted to exploit the financial and political resources of the Church, while the Inquisition was reduced to being a department of the state. Philip appropriated the enormous revenues of the see of Toledo and maintained Crown influence in ecclesiastical jurisdiction and episcopal appointments and could veto papal decrees. Answers will have frequent lapses in accuracy, the use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

Level 3 AO1b ([12]–[17]), AO1a ([5]–[6])

Level 3 answers will begin to assess the extent to which Philip II's policy towards the Church in Spain can be viewed as a success. The measures of 1558–1559 were harsh and not only imposed restrictions on theological and devotional writings but also affected wider aspects of cultural life in Spain, partly closing it to outside ideas and undermining the confidence of Spanish artists and writers. Philip's rivalry with the Pope served only to weaken the forces of the Counter-Reformation, despite the fact that both Philip and the Pope needed each other. Philip's policies towards the Church, especially the pragmatic of 1566–1567, provoked the revolt of the Moriscos and his dispersal of the Granada Moriscos only complicated the problem for the future. His vigorous actions against perceived Huguenot influences in Catalonia deepened divisions between Catalonia and Castile. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility, though there may be occasional lapses (AO1a).

Level 4 AO1b ([18]–[22]), AO1a ([7]–[8])

Answers at this level will be very well informed and display clarity of argument. They will discuss the various aspects of Philip’s policy towards the Church and reach a clear, reasoned conclusion about his success. Answers at this level might be aware that Philip encouraged reform movements within the religious orders and in his reign a great impetus was given to the creation of charitable foundations such as hospitals and alms houses. Very good answers may be more discriminating in their appreciation of the impact of Philip’s religious policy. The replacement of Valdes as Inquisitor General by Cardinal Espinosa in 1566 and, again under Cardinal Quirigo after 1573, led to some modifications of earlier severity and there remained close cultural links between Spain and Flanders and Italy. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, consistently very good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

AO1b

[22]

AO1a

[8]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

30

2 This question targets:

- (i) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations, show understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantial judgements.
- (ii) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

Indicative content:**Level 1 AO1b ([1]–[5]), AO1a ([1]–[2])**

Level 1 answers may provide an incomplete description of the Spain's economic and financial problems in this period or of Philip's economic policies. Answers may contain some superficiality and generalisations. They will be characterised throughout by defects in accuracy, organisation, a limited vocabulary, poor spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

Level 2 AO1b ([6]–[11]), AO1a ([3]–[4])

Level 2 answers will make a number of relevant points but there will be gaps in knowledge. They will begin to assess the effectiveness of Philip II's response to Spain's economic and financial problems but there will be limited analysis of the issue raised in the question. Answers may point out that Philip encouraged the injection of gold and silver from the Americas and this caused an unhealthy over-reliance on bullion which stifled economic creativity. Too much bullion permitted Spain to pay for foreign goods brought to the country by foreigners rather than produced in Spain, thus allowing the overseas trade to be dominated and exploited by other countries. The rest of the American wealth enabled Philip to pursue an active foreign policy, with much of the bullion destined for the Spanish army in the Netherlands. Philip's main concern was to avoid bankruptcy and even in this he was unsuccessful as the Crown was declared bankrupt in 1557 and 1575. Answers will have frequent lapses in accuracy, the use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

Level 3 AO1b ([12]–[17]), AO1a ([5]–[6])

Level 3 answers will make a more detailed assessment of the effectiveness of Philip's response to the economic and financial problems Spain experienced in the period 1556–1592. They may argue that some of the factors responsible for Spain's economic problems were beyond Philip's control but his policies aggravated the country's difficult financial and economic situation. These difficulties became worse as Philip's reign progressed and eventually Spain's debt totalled 85.5 million ducats, while Spain's annual income was just 9.7 million ducats. Answers may refer to some of the problems which handicapped agriculture in Spain. Much of the country was infertile and the more fertile land close to the Mediterranean Sea was not worked due to the fear of pirates. There was a lack of investment in industry which caused serious problems in the later years of Philip's reign. Many foreign competitors seized the monopoly Spain had once enjoyed in trade with America because they sold their goods at lower prices. The increase in the price of Spanish goods was closely linked to the huge increase in American bullion entering the country during the latter years of Philip's reign. In short, Spain's economy depended too heavily on foreign investment. However, Philip II's policies aggravated these problems, especially his ambitious foreign policy and the expense incurred by the wars. Spain had an empire to defend but most of it (Sicily, Naples, Milan and the Low Countries) was unwilling to pay for its own defence. In fact,

even in Spain only Castile made substantial contributions. This not only resulted in heavy taxation for craftsmen and merchants but also cut off Spanish wool from the Antwerp markets. Answers at this level should also discuss Philip's tax policies, his weakness for grandiose projects and the problems brought about by government regulations. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility, though there may be occasional lapses (AO1a).

Level 4 AO1b ([18]–[22]), AO1a ([7]–[8])

Answers at this level will be very well informed and display clarity of argument. They will provide a clear and coherent argument about the extent to which Philip II's response to Spain's economic and financial problems during this period was effective. Answers may argue that Philip did his best personally by his austere lifestyle and his arrangements to pay his creditors in juros, government bonds issued by his Genoese bankers, rather than in gold. However, answers should show the negative impact on the Spanish economy of the wars in which Spain became involved. The Armada, for example, cost 10 million ducats. Philip was paying 100,000 men in 1587 and the wars did not bring the economic benefits he expected. More than 80,000 ducats were sent to the Netherlands between 1567 and 1600 and, in addition, the wages Spanish troops received were not spent in Spain but the countries where they were based (Italy, France and the Netherlands). Philip financed these wars partly by high taxation which placed a burden on the economy. In fact, tax increased by 430 per cent between 1559 and 1598. Castile was hit especially hard and financed many of Philip's policies. The tax burden fell disproportionately on those engaged in trade, commerce and industry. Philip's weakness for grandiose projects also put Spain into serious economic difficulties. A further problem was that industry was over-burdened by government regulations. The dispersal of the Moriscos from Granada also had a serious economic effects, particularly in the region it affected. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, consistently very good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

AO1b

[22]

AO1a

[8]

30

3 This question targets:

- (i) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations, show understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantial judgements.
- (ii) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

Indicative content:**Level 1 AO1b ([1]–[5]), AO1a ([1]–[2])**

Level 1 answers may provide a general outline of Anglo-Spanish relations in the period 1556–1592 or provide a description of the war between the two countries. Answers may contain some superficiality and generalisations. They will be characterised throughout by defects in accuracy, organisation, a limited vocabulary, poor spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility.

Level 2 AO1b ([6]–[11]), AO1a ([3]–[4])

Level 2 answers will make a number of relevant points but there will be gaps in knowledge. They may focus on the influence of religious factors on Anglo-Spanish relations but fail to relate them to the outbreak of war between England and Spain in 1585. Answers will have frequent lapses in accuracy, the use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

Level 3 AO1b ([12]–[17]), AO1a ([5]–[6])

Level 3 answers will make a detailed analysis of the importance of religion on Spanish foreign policy and discuss the importance of religious considerations in bringing about the outbreak of war with England in 1585. They may evaluate how Spain, a Catholic country, saw the rebellion of Protestant rebels in the northern Netherlands as a religious revolt, while England, a Protestant country, sympathised with the rebels. Elizabeth's support for the Dutch in the Treaty of Nonsuch (1585) was the trigger for the war between England and Spain. There is no doubt that Philip II had very strong views on the religious policies to be implemented in the Netherlands and was unwilling to change the heresy laws. However, it was not just religious considerations which brought about war between England and Spain in 1585 and answers at this level should begin to discuss the importance of security, dynastic and economic issues. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility, though there may be occasional lapses (AO1a).

Level 4 AO1b ([18]–[22]), AO1a ([7]–[8])

Answers at this level will be very well informed and display clarity of argument. They will compare the importance of religious considerations in bringing about the outbreak of war between England and Spain in relation to other factors and justify their conclusions. Security considerations were of particular importance for England. Whoever controlled the Netherlands was of interest to England because it was the natural invasion route from the continent. The ports of the Netherlands were, after all, only a day's sailing from England. Therefore England preferred the Netherlands to be largely self-governing and Spain's increasing military presence in the Netherlands from the 1560s onwards posed a threat to England's national security. Economic considerations were also important. The Netherlands was crucial for England's overseas trade. It was a market for English exports. Antwerp was the European base for the merchant adventurers who controlled the vital

woollen trade. At the same time, answers may argue that the Netherlands was one of Spain's most prized possessions and represented the economically innovative part of Philip II's inheritance. In addition, England and Spain also clashed in the New World for economic reasons – colonies, bullion and trade to the Far East. There were also dynastic reasons for the war. Philip had been married to Mary and wanted to marry Elizabeth but she rejected his offer of marriage. Philip then supported Mary Queen of Scots in a quest to overthrow the throne of Elizabeth, involving himself in the Revolt of the Northern Earls, as well as the Ridolfi and Babington plots. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, consistently very good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

AO1b

[22]

AO1a

[8]

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

30

Option 1

60

(Answer **two** questions)

1 This question targets:

- (i) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations, show understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantial judgements.
- (ii) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

Indicative content:

Level 1 AO1b ([1]–[5]), AO1a ([1]–[2])

Level 1 answers will provide little more than a narrative of events leading up to the War of the League of Augsburg in 1689. These answers will be generalised (AO1b). The answers will be characterised throughout by defects in accuracy, organisation, a limited vocabulary, poor spelling, grammar and punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

Level 2 AO1b ([6]–[11]), AO1a ([3]–[4])

Level 2 answers will have difficulty consistently engaging with the question on its own terms, providing a general account of the actions of Louis XIV and the reaction of his opponents at the time of the outbreak of the war. Answers at this level may communicate some knowledge of how Louis XIV was annoyed that the archbishopric of Cologne was granted by the Pope to the brother of the Elector of Bavaria and that, prior to this, he had been thwarted by the Diet of the Holy Roman Empire when it granted the Electorate of the Palatinate to William of Neuberg. The war began when French troops crossed and devastated the Palatinate. The reactions of some of the following powers will be considered: Austria, Spain, German rulers such as the Electors of Bavaria and the Palatinate, and England (AO1b). The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy, organisation, the use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

Level 3 AO1b ([12]–[17]), AO1a ([5]–[6])

Level 3 answers will be able to show that the war concerned the appointment of the Archbishop of Cologne and, through it, the control of the Bishopric of Liege. There were religious as well as strategic and dynastic factors at work. The pre-war tension was the product of a long standing French quarrel with the Papacy that had preceded these appointments and, before this, Louis had seized the papal state of Avignon. England and the Dutch were alarmed at the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 and 250 000 Huguenots had emigrated bringing reports of religious persecution. England was also concerned at how Louis XIV had welcomed the exiled Catholic King of England, James II, and supported his recovery of the English throne with a campaign in Catholic Ireland. Answers at this level may not make all these points about religion but there will be some attempt to identify some religious reasons why the war as well as strategic and dynastic considerations. Most of the answer will document concerns of France's neighbours about Louis XIV's expansionist policies and how they impinged on the interests of Austria, Spain, England, the United Provinces, Brandenburg, Saxony and Bavaria (AO1b). The answer will be characterised by accuracy, good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, punctuation and legibility though there may be occasional lapses (AO1a).

Level 4 AO1b ([18]–[22]), AO1a ([7]–[8])

Level 4 answers will cover the points mentioned in Level 3 and reach relevant conclusions about the causes of the war of the League of Augsburg in 1689. The war was a result of a long build up of anger and fear about France’s policy of steady expansion and a number of circumstances came together in 1688 and 1689 which provoked and enabled France’s opponents to make a united stand to resist French expansion. The answer will be well informed about to what extent France was responsible for the outbreak of war in 1689 (AO1b). The answer will be characterised by accuracy, consistently very good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

AO1b

[22]

AO1a

[8]

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

30

2 This question targets:

- (i) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations, show understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantial judgements.
- (ii) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

Indicative content:**Level 1 AO1b ([1]–[5]), AO1a ([1]–[2])**

Level 1 answers may present an incomplete narrative of Marlborough's military campaigns (AO1b). The answer will be characterised throughout by defects in accuracy, organisation, a limited vocabulary, poor spelling, grammar and punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

Level 2 AO1b ([6]–[11]), AO1a ([3]–[4])

Answers at this level will have more detail and focus solely on either his battle tactics or else on his more limited success after 1708 and know some of the reasons for this. There will be an awareness of the links between his tactics and his relative lack of success but these links are not fully analysed or developed (AO1b). The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy, the use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

Level 3 AO1b ([12]–[17]), AO1a ([5]–[6])

Level 3 answers will explain that Marlborough's tactics were repeated in three of his four major battles. He pressed hard on each flank of the enemy's formations causing his opponents to withdraw troops from the centre in order to prevent Marlborough's forces breaking through and encircling them. He then ordered an attack through the weakened centre. The French anticipated this in his fourth battle, Malplaquet: they created strong defences of earthworks in the centre and retained their cavalry behind the centre to supervise an orderly retreat. Answers at the top of this level should demonstrate an awareness of other reasons for Marlborough's more limited success after 1708 (AO1b). The answer will be characterised by accuracy, good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, punctuation and legibility though there may be occasional lapses (AO1a).

Level 4 AO1b ([18]–[22]), AO1a ([7]–[8])

Level 4 answers should fully assess the extent to which the more limited success of Marlborough after 1708 was explained by his predicable tactics. It is true that his tactics at Malplaquet were a repetition of Blenheim and Ramillies but this was not the only reason for his lack of success in this battle. Marlborough had been criticised for waiting an extra day for the arrival of General Withers (who played little significant part in the battle) and this gave the French more time to prepare. Much havoc was wreaked on the troops under the command of the Prince of Orange by a concealed battery of 20 cannons and Marlborough had been criticised for not calling off this assault sooner. The French were well led by Villars and there was unity at the top and no mistakes were made in his dispositions or conduct of the battle. Also, it must be appreciated that Marlborough's involvement in the war went on until the end of the 1711 campaign. The lack of success was caused by a change in Marlborough's overall strategy. He avoided large-scale battles, settling instead for a lengthy war of attrition, taking fortresses on France's northern frontiers. This would never yield dramatic results. Also, there was a change in opinion in England. High food prices and heavy taxes combined with war

weariness led to a change in government. The Tory-backed government led by Harley looked for a way to end the war. Answers at this level may challenge the assumption in the question and point out Marlborough experienced no success in 1703, 1705 or 1707, while his 1709–1711 campaigns yielded a string of fortresses and the famous ‘Ne Plus Ultra’ campaign of which Marlborough was personally most proud (AO1b). The answer will be characterised by accuracy, consistently very good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

AO1b

[22]

AO1a

[8]

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

30

3 This question targets:

- (i) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations, show understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantial judgements.
- (ii) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

Indicative content:**Level 1 AO1b ([1]–[5]), AO1a ([1]–[2])**

Level 1 answers may offer an incomplete and generalised description of either the fortunes of France during the war by describing some of the campaigns, or a description of military situation by the end of the war, or some of the terms of the Peace of Utrecht. These answers will be unable to relate the description to the demands of the question. These answers may be inaccurate and offer only basic knowledge and limited understanding (AO1b). The answer will be characterised throughout by defects in accuracy, organisation, a limited vocabulary, poor spelling, grammar and punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

Level 2 AO1b ([6]–[11]), AO1a ([3]–[4])

Level 2 answers may know more about the French performance during the war or the military stalemate that had been reached by about 1712 or more of the terms of the Peace and make some attempt to relate their knowledge to the question. Answers at this level may focus on either the war or the Peace. Answers will make limited references about to what extent the power of France in Europe had been reduced by 1713 (AO1b). The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy, the use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

Level 3 AO1b ([12]–[17]), AO1a ([5]–[6])

Level 3 answers may argue for one point of view that either the power of France had been reduced or that it still remained powerful. For example, if they argue that France lost the war, they might show how France had been pushed away from the United Provinces in 1702, defeated on the Danube in 1704, lost most of the Spanish Netherlands in 1706 and by 1712 faced the Duke of Marlborough on the northern frontiers of France. The ascendancy of France based on its military superiority had ended. France was able to do little more than defend its borders. For example, if they argue that France did not indeed "lose the peace", they might show that France did lose much of its European and colonial gains in north and south America to its enemies. The Dutch were granted a sizeable "Barrier" in towns in the Spanish Netherlands and many lands in Germany were returned to their former owners. America, Britain and Portugal gained from French losses. France was exhausted from the long years of war. France had been checked militarily. Also its ally in the war, Spain, was much reduced, losing Gelderland, Gibraltar, Minorca, Naples, Sardinia and the Spanish Netherlands to France's opponents. All these territories went to the powers of the Grand Alliance, especially Britain and Austria, which were correspondingly strengthened (AO1b). The answer will be characterised by accuracy, good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, punctuation and legibility though there may be occasional lapses (AO1a).

Level 4 AO1b ([18]–[22]), AO1a ([7]–[8])

Level 4 answers will be well informed and will be able to finely judge to what extent the power of France had been reduced by 1713. Answers at this level may point out that there had been no serious incursions into France and there was little prospect of a successful invasion which might have brought the war to a triumphant conclusion for the Grand Alliance. French forces had done well in Italy, and Spain did, after all, retain its Bourbon monarch and its overseas empire. Although all the powers of the Grand Alliance had gained something, they had fallen out over the peace process and all of them, particularly the Dutch, had been weakened by war (AO1b). The answer will be characterised by accuracy, consistently very good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

AO1b

[22]

AO1a

[8]

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

30

Option 2

60

(Answer **two** questions)

1 This question targets:

- (i) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations, showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements.
- (ii) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

Indicative content:

Level 1 AO1b ([1]–[5]), AO1a ([1]–[2])

Level 1 answers will provide little more than a narrative of economic problems and the 1789 revolution (AO1b). The answers will be characterised throughout by defects in accuracy, organisation and grammar (AO1a).

Level 2 AO1b ([6]–[11]), AO1a ([3]–[4])

Level 2 answers will have more relevant detail and will start to assess to what extent economic problems were to blame for the 1789 revolution. Candidates may also refer to other causes of the revolution such as political unrest. They could also refer to some of the actions of Louis XVI, e.g. calling the Estates-General in 1789 (AO1b). The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy, organisation, the use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

Level 3 AO1b ([12]–[17]), AO1a ([5]–[6])

Level 3 answers will examine the extent to which economic problems were to blame for the 1789 revolution in relation to other relevant factors. Candidates could refer to some of the following points: mistakes made by the King, unpopular ministers, royal finances and the role of the Third Estates. By 1789 France was on the verge of bankruptcy which was linked to the failure to modernise the ancient regime. Candidates could also refer to the role of Necker and Compte Rendu which, along with the taxation problems, forced the King to summons the Estates General in 1789. They could also refer to the influence of the Enlightenment and the growing demands for political reforms and a Constitution which contributed to the crisis of 1789 (AO1b). The answer will be characterised by accuracy, good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, punctuation and legibility though there may be occasional lapses (AO1a).

Level 4 AO1b ([18]–[22]), AO1a ([7]–[8])

Level 4 answers should assess whether economic problems were solely responsible for the revolution of 1789. Good answers at this level will be able to compare how economic problems helped to bring about the 1789 revolution in relation to other relevant factors. Good responses could refer to growing opposition from the nobility from 1789 onwards which increased pressure upon the King and his government to take effective action. By 1788 the French treasury was in crisis whilst France was hit by poor harvests and this, along with the poor taxation system, forced Louis XVI to recall the Estates-General. The meeting of the Estates-General in May 1789 led quickly to the Tennis Court Oath, the National Assembly and the dismissal of Necker. The authority of the King had been weakened and his poor decisions contributed to his downfall by July 1789.

The King's role as an absolute monarch and his actions undermined support for his regime by 1789. Finally, good candidates could point out how the financial problems of Louis XVI combined with growing economic problems such as poor harvests led to the growing political unrest across many sections of French society by 1789. By 1789 France was in a major financial crisis and faced bankruptcy which along with the social crisis and political condition of France contributed to the crisis of 1789 (AO1b). The answer will be characterised by accuracy, consistently very good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

AO1b

[22]

AO1a

[8]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

30

2 This question targets:

- (i) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations, showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements.
- (ii) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

Indicative content:**Level 1 AO1b ([1]–[5]), AO1a ([1]–[2])**

Level 1 answers will provide little more than a narrative of the failure of the constitutional monarchy by 1793 (AO1b). The answer will be characterised by defects in accuracy, organisation and grammar (AO1a).

Level 2 AO1b ([6]–[11]), AO1a ([3]–[4])

Answers at this level will have more relevant detail and will start to discuss how the actions of Louis XVI led to the failure of the constitutional monarchy in this period. They could start to refer to other causes of failure such as the role of Louis XVI and revolutionary divisions (AO1b). The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy, the use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

Level 3 AO1b ([12]–[17]), AO1a ([5]–[6])

Level 3 answers will examine to what extent the actions of Louis XVI were responsible for the failure of the constitutional monarchy in France by 1793. The King was forced to accept the Civil Constitution of the Clergy in 1790 and in 1791 the Pope declared against the Civil Constitution which divided France politically. Louis XVI lost more support when the Legislative Assembly passed new laws against refractory priests and the émigrés which were vetoed by the King which made him unpopular. France had been suspicious of the King since his attempted flight to Varennes after the opposition of the Pope made opposition to the monarchy legitimate. However, candidates should be aware of other causes of the failure of the constitutional monarchy by 1793. They could refer to some of the following points: the émigré threat, the impact of war, the economic crisis and the collapse of revolutionary consensus after Varennes. The role of the monarchy was a major issue as not everyone was satisfied with the 1791 Constitution and the issue of the royal veto divided the Assembly. By 1792 political unrest was growing and royal power was weakening as radical demands increased. In August 1792 the King was arrested and new elections called to a National Convention which abolished the monarchy making France a Republic. In January 1793 Louis XVI was executed but religious reasons were only one factor in his downfall (AO1b). The answer will be characterised by accuracy, good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, punctuation and legibility though there may be occasional lapses (AO1a).

Level 4 AO1b ([18]–[22]), AO1a ([7]–[8])

Answers at this level will be more comprehensive and will discuss the actions of Louis XVI and whether they were solely responsible for the failure of the constitutional monarchy. They will show a good awareness of other issues which were responsible for the failure of the constitutional monarchy. By the time war broke out the revolutionaries were becoming more divided between the moderates who supported Louis XVI and the radicals who wanted him deposed. The

government seemed unable to deal with France's economic problems and the actions of the Pope divided France and weakened royal authority. Constitutional monarchy had failed for many reasons but the actions of Louis XVI certainly contributed to its failure (AO1b). The answer will be characterised by accuracy, consistently very good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

AO1b

[22]

AO1a

[8]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

30

3 This question targets:

- (i) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations, showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements.
- (ii) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

Indicative content:

Level 1 AO1b ([1]–[5]), AO1a ([1]–[2])

Level 1 answers will provide little more than a narrative about Napoleon and his domestic policies between 1799 and 1814 (AO1b). The answer will be characterised throughout by defects in accuracy, organisation and grammar (AO1a).

Level 2 AO1b ([6]–[11]), AO1a ([3]–[4])

Answers at this level will have more relevant detail and will start to discuss the success or failure of Napoleon's domestic policies in this period. Candidates could start to identify some examples of success such as administrative reforms, education and legal reforms. They may refer in general terms to some examples of failure such as poor relations with the Church after 1806. Answers will have gaps and lack balance (AO1b). The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy, the use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

Level 3 AO1b ([12]–[17]), AO1a ([5]–[6])

Level 3 answers will examine to what extent Napoleon I enjoyed more successes than failures in his domestic policy between 1799 and 1814. In many areas his policies were successful at first before becoming less successful in the later years of his regime, such as taxation and relations with the Catholic Church. The 1799 Constitution gave political stability to France. Napoleon made significant administrative changes to how France was governed with centralised and more effective government helped by Prefects and the police. He also introduced major legal changes with the new Civil Code of 1804 and judges were now appointed for life. Napoleon's economic policies also appeared to be successful with a Central Treasury from 1800 that improved and reorganised the taxation system linked to a new national bank, the Bank of France. His education reforms could also be regarded as successful but they did not apply to women or the working class. Candidates should also be aware of some examples of what can be regarded as failures such as poor relations with the Church after 1806, compared with the Concordat of 1801. After 1806, due to war and increased military expenditure, taxes started to rise and the French economy was in severe difficulties by 1810. Good responses could refer to some of the points above and start to assess success/failure with some gaps and a lack of balance at times (AO1b). The answer will be characterised by accuracy, good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

Level 4 AO1b ([18]–[22]), AO1a ([7]–[8])

Answers at this level will be more comprehensive and will discuss many of the points outlined above in more depth and detail. They may refer to how Napoleon's foreign policy led to growing economic problems in France from 1806 onwards. France had failed to expand industrially and due to the war it had lost colonial markets. Overall candidates could argue that Napoleon's domestic policies were more successful up to 1806 (AO1b).

The answer will be characterised by accuracy, consistently very good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

AO1b

[22]

AO1a

[8]

Option 3

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

30

60

(Answer **two** questions)**1 This question targets:**

- (i) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations, show understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantial judgements.
- (ii) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

Indicative content:**Level 1 AO1b ([1]–[5]), AO1a ([1]–[2])**

Level 1 answers may provide a narrative about the Austro-Prussian War of 1866, making little reference to the issue raised in the question. Answers may contain some superficiality and generalisations. They will be characterised throughout by defects in accuracy, organisation, a limited vocabulary, poor spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

Level 2 AO1b ([6]–[11]), AO1a ([3]–[4])

Level 2 answers will make a number of relevant points but there will be gaps in knowledge. They will begin to assess to what extent Prussia's victory in the Austro-Prussian War was due to economic reasons but the answer will lack depth and make little or no reference to the other factors which contributed to Prussia's victory. Answers will have frequent lapses in accuracy, the use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

Level 3 AO1b ([12]–[17]), AO1a ([5]–[6])

Level 3 answers will make a more detailed analysis of the extent to which Prussia's victory over Austria in 1866 was due to its economic strength. Answers at the top of this level should establish a link between Prussia's economic strength and its military superiority over Austria in 1866. Prussia's share of world manufacturing output rose from 3.5 per cent in 1830 to 4.9 per cent in 1860. Its population rose from 15.1 million in 1841 to 19.5 million in 1866. Its railway network expanded rapidly. In 1841 it had just 375 kilometres of railways. By 1847 this figure had gone up to 2325, by 1860 it was 5762 and by 1865 this had risen to 6895. Railways were an important factor in the outcome of the Austro-Prussian War since some were built specifically for military reasons and they enabled Prussia to mobilise more quickly than Austria. Prussia was fortunate to have coal supplies and its strong economic position was based on a significant increase in coal production which meant that by 1870 it produced three times as much coal as Austria. This laid the basis for Prussia's superior weaponry in the Austro-Prussian War, in particular the "needle gun". In 1865–1866 only 45 per cent of Prussians but 70 per cent of Austrians still worked on the land. While Prussia's finances in 1866 were on a sound footing, the national debt in Austria trebled between 1848 and 1866. A key factor which promoted German economic expansion was the Zollverein, from which, of course, Austria was excluded. It undoubtedly contributed to the sharp increase in trade because of the introduction of a common system of customs and tariffs and the removal of customs barriers. However, it should be borne in mind that, while Austria's economy did not expand as quickly as Prussia's, it did not stagnate in the 1850s and 1860s. Its iron, cotton and woollen industries in Lower Austria and elsewhere prospered. In 1850 its customs barriers

with Hungary were dismantled and its railway network had been expanded between the north and the south. Nonetheless, there is no doubt that Prussia's economic superiority over Austria was a key factor in the outcome of the Austro-Prussian War. Answers at the top of this level will begin to refer to other factors such as Prussia's superior political and military leadership and the favourable international climate for Prussia in 1866. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility, though there may be occasional lapses (AO1a).

Level 4 AO1b ([18]–[22]), AO1a ([7]–[8])

Answers at this level will be very well informed and display clarity of argument. They will provide a clear and coherent argument about the extent to which economic factors determined the outcome of the Austro-Prussian War. Answers at this level should discuss the “non-economic” factors which contributed to Prussia's victory in 1866. In terms of political leadership, Prussia was very well served by Otto von Bismarck, who was appointed Chancellor in 1862. He was the leading politician of his day and his Austrian counterparts were no match for him. Answers may refer to the extent to which Bismarck can take the credit for the decision of the leading powers not to intervene in the Austro-Prussian War. Prussia's military leaders were also of a very high calibre. Helmuth von Moltke distinguished himself as Prussian Chief of general Staff and played a very important part in Prussia's military success in the Austro-Prussian War of 1866. He established a body whose task was to organise the transportation of troops to the battlefield, making effective use of the railway network. This proved very successful and Prussia mobilised its troops more quickly than the Austrians. As a military commander, Moltke proved far superior to his Austrian counterpart, General Ludwig von Benedek. Answers should also discuss the role of general Albrecht von Roon in modernising the Prussian army. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, consistently very good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

AO1b

[22]

AO1a

[8]

30

2 This question targets:

- (i) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations, show understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantial judgements.
- (ii) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

Level AO1b ([1]–[5]), AO1a ([1]–[2])

Level 1 answers may provide little more than a narrative about the steps by which German unification came about, making little reference to the issue raised in the question. Answers may contain some superficiality and generalisations. They will be characterised throughout by defects in accuracy, organisation, a limited vocabulary, poor spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility.

Level 2 AO1b ([6]–[11]), AO1a ([3]–[4])

Level 2 answers will make a number of relevant points but there will be gaps in knowledge. They may give some examples of Bismarck's diplomatic skills, referring perhaps to the Danish or Franco-Prussian War but may make only passing reference to the unusually favourable international climate in the 1860s. Answers will have frequent lapses in accuracy, the use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

Level 3 AO1b ([12]–[17]), AO1a ([5]–[6])

Level 3 answers will make a more detailed analysis of the extent to which Bismarck's diplomatic skills were responsible for the decision of the European powers not to become involved in the Danish and Franco-Prussian Wars. Answers at this level will provide a range of examples in discussing the issue raised by the question. They may refer to the Danish War to illustrate Bismarck's diplomatic skills, noting perhaps that he himself regarded this as his greatest diplomatic triumph. It is certainly true that during this war he adhered rigidly to international treaties to avoid giving the powers any pretext for intervention. Similarly, Bismarck succeeded in portraying France as the aggressor in the Franco-Prussian War. Answers may focus on the Ems telegram and Bismarck's motives for editing it, referring perhaps to Bismarck's claim in 1892 that the changes he made to the telegram were designed to provoke a war with France. Answers may also discuss to what extent Bismarck's skilful diplomacy was responsible for Napoleon III's failure to support Austria in the Austro-Prussian War. On the other hand, there is no doubt that Bismarck was certainly helped by the very favourable international climate during the 1860s. For example, in the Danish War Britain's inclination was to help Denmark but this sympathy was largely lost as a result of Denmark's refusal to consider the partition of Schleswig. France's interests were not directly affected by the conflict and it hoped that the other powers would be weakened by their involvement in the war. Russia had sympathy with Denmark but expressed concern at the increasingly radical stance adopted by the Danish Government. In addition, Russia wanted to remain on good terms with Austria and Prussia following the Polish insurrection of 1863. Answers may also illustrate the unusually favourable international climate in the 1860s by referring to the unwillingness of the powers to become involved in the Franco-Prussian War. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility, though there may be occasional lapses (AO1a).

Level 4 AO1b ([18]–[22]), AO1a ([7]–[8])

Answers at this level will be very well informed and display clarity of argument. They will assess the extent to which Bismarck can take the credit for the decision of the European powers not to become involved in the Danish and Franco-Prussian Wars. Answers will compare the relative importance of the very favourable international climate in the 1860s and Bismarck’s ‘skilful diplomacy’ in explaining the non-intervention of the great powers. While it does not matter what conclusions answers reach, essays at this level should do justice to both sides of the argument. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, consistently very good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

AO1b

[22]

AO1a

[8]

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

30

3 This question targets:

- (i) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations, show understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantial judgements.
- (ii) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

Indicative content:

Level 1 AO1b ([1]–[5]), AO1a ([1]–[2])

Level 1 answers may provide a brief outline of the part played in the unification of Germany by Count Helmuth von Moltke, who took up the post of Prussian Chief of Staff in 1858, and General Albrecht von Roon, who was appointed Prussian War Minister in 1859. Answers may contain some superficiality and generalisations. They will be characterised throughout by defects in accuracy, organisation, a limited vocabulary, poor spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

Level 2 AO1b ([6]–[11]), AO1a ([3]–[4])

Level 2 answers will make a number of relevant points but there will be gaps in knowledge. They will note that Moltke distinguished himself as Prussian Chief of General Staff and, after the Danish War of 1863, William I gave him the position of what amounted to Supreme Commander of the Army. Answers will also outline Roon's role in reforming the Prussian Army. The decision to reform the army was taken after its mobilisation in 1859 in response to the outbreak of the Italian War revealed serious weaknesses. Answers will have frequent lapses in accuracy, the use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

Level 3 AO1b ([12]–[17]), AO1a ([5]–[6])

Level 3 answers will make a more detailed comparison of the contributions of Moltke and Roon to the unification process. Moltke played a very important part in Prussia's military success in the Austro-Prussian War of 1866. He established a body whose task was to organise the transportation of troops to the battlefield, making effective use of the railway network. This proved very successful and Prussia mobilised its troops more quickly than the Austrians. As a military commander, Moltke proved far superior to his Austrian counterpart, General Ludwig von Benedek. In his capacity as Minister of War, Roon aimed to create an effective and genuinely professional army. To this end, he introduced an Army Bill in 1860 which aimed to increase the size of the Prussian Army from 50,000 to 110,000 men, thus bringing it into line with the size of the Austrian and French military forces. The bill envisaged the augmentation of the officer corps and the establishment of 39 new infantry and 10 new cavalry regiments. Roon's bill also proposed the relegation of the militia, a preserve of the middle classes, to garrison and other unimportant duties. The Liberals, who had enjoyed a majority in the Prussian Landtag since 1858, supported army reform in principle but expressed misgivings about the tax increases which would result from the bill and also opposed the downgrading of the militia. Roon displayed considerable tactical skill in his efforts to manipulate the Landtag but the bill was repeatedly rejected and William I even contemplated abdication. As the constitutional crisis deepened, Otto von Bismarck, on the advice of Roon, went to Berlin and it was also Roon who persuaded the King to grant an audience to Bismarck which led to his appointment as Prussian Minister President in September 1862. Answers will be

characterised by accuracy, good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility, though there may be occasional lapses (AO1a).

Level 4 AO1b ([18]–[22]), AO1a ([7]–[8])

Answers at this level will be very well informed and display clarity of argument. They will compare the relative importance of the contributions made by Moltke and Roon to the unification of Germany and justify their conclusions. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, consistently very good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

AO1b

[22]

AO1a

[8]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

30

Option 4

60

(Answer **two** questions)

1 This question targets:

- (i) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations, showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantial judgements.
- (ii) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

Indicative content:

Level 1 AO1b ([1]–[5]), AO1a ([1]–[2])

Answers at this level may provide a basic narrative on German foreign policy. (AO1b). The answer will be characterised throughout by defects in accuracy, organisation and grammar (AO1a).

Level 2 AO1b ([6]–[11]), AO1a ([3]–[4])

Answers in Level 2 will be more detailed and will begin to discuss foreign policy under Weimar or Hitler but there will be gaps in knowledge or a lack of focus on the question (AO1b). Answers will have frequent lapses in accuracy, the use of vocabulary, spelling, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

Level 3 AO1b ([12]–[17]), AO1a ([5]–[6])

Level 3 answers will be better informed and will address the question in a more confident manner. Candidates may address either aims or methods in an in-depth and comprehensive manner or they may address both concepts in a partial manner. Answers should discuss both Weimar and Nazi foreign policy but they may lack balance with one area pre-dominating or they may fail to address the whole time period in question, perhaps omitting 1929–1933 or 1939–1941. Candidates may refer to the common aims that Weimar and Nazi Germany undoubtedly shared such as the desire to reverse the Treaty of Versailles, the desire to regain lost territory, rearmament and expanding to the East. Additionally candidates may also demonstrate differences in aims such as Hitler's racial aims, his desire to expand beyond pre-1919 borders and his desire to carry out an ideological invasion of Russia, destroying communism and gaining Lebensraum. In terms of methods, differences between Weimar and Nazi Germany could be explored such as Weimar's cooperation with the League of Nations and Stresemann's policy of fulfilment in contrast to Hitler's more aggressive actions at the Rhineland 1936, Czechoslovakia 1939, Poland 1939 and leaving the League of Nations. Top-level answers may also begin to demonstrate that there were some similarities in methods such as the desire to win allies, such as Britain, and the policy of secret rearmament (AO1b). The answer will be characterised by accuracy, good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility, though there may be occasional lapses (AO1a).

Level 4 AO1b ([18]–[22]), AO1a ([7]–[8])

Level 4 answers will demonstrate a comprehensive knowledge of German foreign policy from 1919 to 1941. Candidates must address both aims and methods in a sustained and confident way throughout Weimar and Nazi Germany. Answers should include a discussion of the similar aims and methods which Weimar and Nazi Germany shared while also demonstrating awareness that there were clear

differences. Both Weimar and Nazi Germany clearly saw the revision/removal of Versailles as a major policy aim. This involved regaining lost territory, removing reparations and restoring Germany's pride and position as a great nation. Both were clearly Nationalist with Stresemann advocating eastward expansion, Brüning proposing a customs union with Austria and Weimar embarking on a secret rearmament programme in 1932; all echoed by Hitler in his foreign policy with events such as the Anschluss with Austria in 1938. However, Hitler did not want to be confined to the frontiers of Imperial Germany and saw the conquest of Eastern Europe and eventually Russia as long-term goals. In addition his racial theories and extermination programme were much more extreme than the views held by the Weimar politicians. His methods clearly diverged from those of Weimar Germany, especially as he grew stronger in the 1930s, introducing open rearmament and conscription and beginning the aggressive occupations of the Rhineland, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland and Russia. Candidates can examine the question chronologically or thematically but clear links/differences between Weimar and Nazi Germany must be established (AO1b). The answer will be characterised by accuracy, consistently very good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

AO1b

[22]

AO1a

[8]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

30

2 This question targets:

- (i) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations, show understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantial judgements.
- (ii) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

Indicative content:**Level 1 AO1b ([1]–[5]), AO1a ([1]–[2])**

Level 1 answers will be a narrative and may describe aspects of Hitler's foreign policy with little reference to the question (AO1b). The answer will be characterised throughout by defects in accuracy, organisation and grammar (AO1a).

Level 2 AO1b ([6]–[11]), AO1a ([3]–[4])

Answers at Level 2 will have more relevant detail but there will be gaps in knowledge and the answer may lack focus on the question in places. Candidates may refer in general terms to Hitler's foreign policy and begin to assess consistency of aims and/or opportunism (AO1b). Answers will have frequent lapses in accuracy, the use of vocabulary, spelling, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

Level 3 AO1b ([12]–[17]), AO1a ([5]–[6])

Level 3 answers will be well informed and will address the question in a more assured manner. Candidates may concentrate more on planning or opportunism in an in-depth manner or they may address both concepts in a partial manner. Evidence of careful planning such as the 25 points programme, Mein Kampf, The Secret Book of 1928, Hitler's speeches, the Four Year Plan of 1936 and the Hossbach Memorandum may be referred to. These examples of planning and consistency of aims can be discussed with reference to specific episodes of Hitler's foreign policy to demonstrate the link between planned aims and actual events. Candidates may refer to the desire to win allies, rearmament, reversing the Treaty of Versailles, gaining Lebensraum, achieving autarky, invading Russia, destroying communism, uniting German speakers and Hitler's racial aims. Some candidates may choose to argue that Hitler's aims were simply general guidelines and that his foreign policy was largely opportunistic/reactionary. They may refer to incidents such as the invasion of the Rhineland, the Nazi-Soviet pact, the Axis with Italy and the Spanish Civil War. Answers in this level may also be very well debated with good supporting evidence but fall short, e.g. omitting 1939–1941 (AO1b). The answer will be characterised by accuracy, good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility, though there may be occasional lapses (AO1a).

Level 4 AO1b ([18]–[22]), AO1a ([7]–[8])

Answers at this level will be more comprehensive with candidates producing a detailed and well debated response to the question. They should address both planning and opportunism in a sustained manner with candidates free to debate where the balance lies. The whole time period in question should be discussed in order to achieve this level. Hitler's foreign policy objectives should be discussed with supporting evidence and top candidates will be able to demonstrate the link between Hitler's overall aims and the conduct of his foreign policy. Candidates may refer to Hitler's economic policies, the rearmament of Germany, the revision

of the Treaty of Versailles and the invasion of Russia as evidence of Hitler carrying out some of his long term objectives. They may refer to outside influences on Nazi foreign policy such as the Abyssinian Crisis, the policy of appeasement, the collapse of the Stresa Front and French intransigence at the 1933 Disarmament Conference as evidence of Hitler reacting to events. Some candidates may refer to the intentionalist/structuralist debate but this is not a requirement. Answers in this level should also reach a clear conclusion (AO1b). The answer will be characterised by accuracy, consistently very good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

AO1b

[22]

AO1a

[8]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

30

3 This question targets:

- (i) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations, show understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantial judgements.
- (ii) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

Indicative content:**Level 1 AO1b ([1]–[5]), AO1a ([1]–[2])**

Answers will provide a narrative on the Versailles Treaty (AO1b). The answer will be characterised throughout by defects in accuracy, organisation and grammar (AO1a).

Level 2 AO1b ([6]–[11]), AO1a ([3]–[4])

Answers will be more detailed and start to discuss the flaws in the Versailles Treaty and their contribution to causing a second World War. The Treaty led to great resentment in Germany with the harshness of its terms, e.g. crippling reparations, Article 231 and military restrictions (AO1b). Answers will have frequent lapses in accuracy, the use of vocabulary, spelling, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

Level 3 AO1b ([12]–[17]), AO1a ([5]–[6])

Answers will discuss the importance of the failure of the Treaty of Versailles to create a lasting peace and therefore cause the Second World War in a more confident manner. The Treaty caused much resentment in Germany: political opinion from all parties along with the majority of the population despised the Treaty. Many believed that since the German government had signed an armistice in 1918, they were entitled to a fair peace treaty: hence the origins of the “stab in the back” theory exploited by Hitler. This feeling of resentment was accentuated by the belief that the Treaty would be conducted in line with Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points and contributed to the belief that the Peace treaty was a “Diktat”. Germans despised the severe military and territorial losses and, of the latter, the most disliked was the loss of Danzig, especially the creation of the “Polish Corridor”, because it separated East Prussia from the remainder of German territory. The denial of the principle of self-determination to Germany created instability in Eastern Europe which Hitler later exploited, e.g. Poland and Czechoslovakia contained national minorities. In addition, good Level 3 responses could also refer to the feeling by some leading figures at the time that the Treaty would not be successful, such as Marshall Foch, or that it was too harsh, a view expressed by Keynes. They may also decide that, although the Treaty was flawed, it was the inability to properly enforce it during the 1920s and 1930s that led to the outbreak of war. A limited number of other causes may also be briefly debated at this level such as the role of appeasement or the impact of USA and USSR isolation (AO1b). The answer will be characterised by accuracy, good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility, though there may be occasional lapses (AO1a).

Level 4 AO1b ([18]–[22]), AO1a ([7]–[8])

Answers will assess the role of the Versailles Treaty in a more complete way. Candidates should discuss the weaknesses of the Treaty and how those weaknesses failed to create a lasting Peace Settlement in Europe. Good answers will reflect that a major weakness in the Treaty was the large reliance on German compliance in

enforcing the Treaty. Hitler exposed this weakness through his gradual and aggressive process of Treaty revision in the late 1930s through actions such as open rearmament, Anschluss with Austria and his handling of the Czech crisis. Candidates may argue that 1939 already remedied many grievances connected with Versailles, so that the causes of the Second World War lay elsewhere. In addition to a comprehensive discussion of the importance of the failure of the Treaty of Versailles to create a lasting peace settlement candidates will assess the role played by other causal factors such as the global impact of the Wall Street Crash which led to the rise of aggressive nationalism in Germany, Japan and Italy. The depression also severely affected the ability of Britain and France to respond to the actions of the aforementioned states, leading to the policy of appeasement and to the construction of the Maginot line in France. Candidates could discuss the importance of the absence of the USA and USSR from European affairs which arguably allowed Hitler to proceed with his aggressive foreign policy and contributed directly to the policy of appeasement. Top level answers will therefore debate the role of the Versailles Treaty in relation to a selection of these other factors (AO1b). The answer will be characterised by accuracy, consistently very good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

AO1b

[22]

AO1a

[8]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

30

Option 5

60

Total

60



Rewarding Learning

ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education
January 2010

History

Assessment Unit A2 2

assessing

Module 5

[A2H21]

WEDNESDAY 20 JANUARY, MORNING

**MARK
SCHEME**

Level of response mark grid

This level of response grid has been developed as a general basis for marking candidates' work, according to the following assessment objectives:

AO1a recall, select and deploy historical knowledge accurately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner;

AO1b present historical explanations, showing understanding of appropriate concepts, and arrive at substantiated judgements;

AO2 In relation to historical context:

- interpret, evaluate and use a range of source material;
- explain and evaluate interpretations of historical events and topics studied.

The grid should be used in conjunction with the information on indicative content outlined for each assessment unit.

Level	Assessment Objective 1a	Assessment Objective 1b	Assessment Objective 2
	Answers at this level will:	Answers at this level will:	Answers at this level will:
1	recall, select and deploy some accurate factual knowledge and communicate limited understanding in narrative form. There will be evidence of an attempt to structure and present answers in a coherent manner.	display a basic understanding of the topic; some comments may be relevant, but general and there may be assertions and judgements which require supporting evidence.	limited recognition of the possibility of debate surrounding an event or topic.
2	be quite accurate, contain some detail and show understanding through a mainly narrative approach. Communication may have occasional lapses of clarity and/or coherence.	display general understanding of the topic and its associated concepts and offer explanations which are mostly relevant, although there may be limited analysis and a tendency to digress. There will be some supporting evidence for assertions and judgements.	an attempt to explain different approaches to and interpretations of the event or topic. Evaluation may be limited.
3	contain appropriate examples with illustrative and supportive factual evidence and show understanding and ability to engage with the issues raised by the question in a clear and coherent manner.	display good breadth of understanding of the topic and its associated concepts. Analysis is generally informed and suitably illustrated to support explanations and judgements.	there will be an ability to present and evaluate different arguments for and against particular interpretations of an event or topic.
4	be accurate and well-informed and show ability to engage fully with the demands of the question. Knowledge and understanding will be expressed with clarity and precision.	display breadth and depth of understanding of the topic and its associated concepts. Explanations will be well-informed with arguments and judgements well-substantiated, illustrated and informed by factual evidence.	there will be appropriate explanation, insightful interpretation and well-argued evaluation of particular interpretations of an event or topic.

Notes concerning Synoptic assessment

1. Examiners should assess the candidate's ability to draw together knowledge and skills in order to demonstrate overall historical understanding. Candidates' answers should demonstrate **breadth** of historical knowledge and understanding by ranging comprehensively across the period of study **as a whole**. They should **make links and comparisons** which are properly developed and analysed and thus indicate understanding of the process of historical change. The emphasis is on continuity and change within the topic, developing a broad overview of the period studied, centred on links and comparison between different aspects of the topic studied. We cannot expect detailed depth of knowledge.
2. The knowledge and understanding of the subject should come from **more than one perspective** – political or cultural or economic – and there should be understanding demonstrated of the **connections or inter-relationship** between these perspectives.
3. The indicative content for each answer is not provided in a “levels of response” format. Examiners should consult the generic levels of response before deciding on the mark to be awarded.

GENERIC LEVELS OF RESPONSE FOR SYNOPTIC ASSESSMENT

Table of marks allocated to each assessment objective in the synoptic essay

Level	AO1a Marks	AO1b Marks	AO2 Marks
1	1–2	1–4	1–3
2	3–4	5–8	4–7
3	5–6	9–13	8–11
4	7–8	14–17	12–15

The generic levels of response should be used in conjunction with the information on the indicative content outlined for each answer.

Level 1

Answers at this level may recall and deploy some accurate knowledge mostly about one part of the period and mostly from one perspective – political, economic or cultural. The answer will be characterised throughout by defects in accuracy, organisation, a limited vocabulary, poor spelling, grammar and punctuation, and legibility. **(AO1a)**

Answers may provide information in a descriptive and/or narrative form with limited explanations. There may be a few links and comparisons made between different parts of the periods or perspectives with some understanding of the key historical terms and concepts. Answers may be in the form of assertions and there may be some attempt at illustration or substantiation. **(AO1b)**

There is some recognition of the possibilities of a debate on the subject but the answer may focus on only one interpretation. **(AO2)**

Level 2

Answers at this level may recall and deploy knowledge that is mostly accurate, and drawn from more than one part of the period and from one perspective. The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy, organisation, the use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar and punctuation, and legibility. **(AO1a)**

Answers may provide some explanations, though with digressions into a descriptive and/or narrative form. There may be some links and comparisons made between different parts of the periods and perspectives, but these may not be fully developed and analysed. There is some understanding of the key historical terms and concepts. Answers may contain assertions that have some appropriate illustration or substantiation. **(AO1b)**

Although there is an awareness of a debate about the subject, the attempt to explain different approaches to, and interpretations of, the events may be generalised or incomplete. **(AO2)**

Level 3

Answers at this level will recall and deploy knowledge accurately about this subject, drawn from all parts of the period. The answer will be characterised by accuracy, good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar and punctuation as well as legibility, though there may be occasional lapses. **(AO1a)**

Answers provide focused explanations and make links and comparisons that are developed and analysed, indicating an understanding of the process of historical change. There is an ability to make connections and identify interrelationships between perspectives. Answers contain judgements that are appropriately illustrated or substantiated. **(AO1b)**

There is a discussion of the subject with an evaluation of alternative interpretations. **(AO2)**

Level 4

Answers at this level will demonstrate accurate recall of the full breadth of historical knowledge across the period as a whole. The answer will be characterised by accuracy, consistently very good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar and punctuation as well as legibility. **(AO1a)**

Answers provide focused and insightful explanations concerning the period as a whole and make links and comparisons which are properly developed and analysed, indicating good understanding of the process of historical change. The knowledge and understanding of the subject is from more than one perspective and there is full understanding of the connections or inter-relationships between these perspectives. Understanding of the key historical terms and concepts is excellent. Judgements are fully substantiated. **(AO1b)**

There is a full discussion of the subject with an insightful evaluation of alternative interpretations. **(AO2)**

(Answer **one** question)

- 1** This question asks candidates to examine both exploration and expansion, so answers at the highest level must consider both. Candidates must consider religious and non-religious explanations with the best answers deciding which is most important. Answers may be weighted in favour of Spain whose greater expansion might require more focus.

Religious Motivation

- (a)** Spain – there was a sincere desire in Spain to convert ‘the heathen’ to the true faith. Success against the Moors, in the late 15th Century, had developed throughout the 16th Century due to conflict with the Turks. Religious belief was reinvigorated by Humanism and later by the Counter Reformation. Leadership throughout the century was by the ‘Catholic Monarchs’ – Ferdinand and Isabella, Charles II (V) and Philip II. Religious fervour of the leadership may have been a motivating factor although less prominent motivations may be equally important.
- (b)** England – English religious motivation took longer to develop and was less fanatical. During the reign of Elizabeth, Englishmen were no longer prepared to accept the papal division of the non-European world. In addition, persecuted religious groups sought a chance to move to the New World, to live and worship as they pleased. This slower development of religious motivation might explain England’s limited overseas success.

Economic Considerations

- (a)** Spain – Spain’s discovery of the New World gave it domination, especially of South America. The early focus was of a quick route to the Far East spice trade but quickly developed into exploitation of the continent’s resources. The Spanish government assumed control of all the voyages and the profits of colonial trade, with monopoly granted to Seville and Cadiz. The state levied a whole range of taxes on non-Indians and sold a range of monopolies. Despite the banning of enslavement of Amerindians, slavery still took place, justified as a punishment for rebellion, and was driven by economic gain. Certainly the actions of Pizarro and Cortes were driven by greed rather than religious conversion.
- (b)** England – English exploration was driven by the search for a North-West passage; Cabot (1509), Frobisher (1576), Davies (1585–1587), Willoughby and Chancellor (1553), all sought an alternative route to the East. English expansion in North America looked to develop resources like wood, fish and tobacco.

Colonies

- (a)** Spain – sought to recreate a Spanish society in the New World. Ties of blood and friendship drew Spaniards to the New World so that localities were populated by people from the same areas. This aided colonies in being successful and took pressure off the growth of population in the Motherland.

- (b) England – its colonial aspirations were less ambitious than their Spanish rivals with many colonists wishing to make profit and then return home. Many Englishmen wished to use the New World as a dump for an allegedly surplus and undesirable population.

Clearly both Spain and England were motivated by religious ideas although these were much stronger in the Spanish case. However, other motivations were equally or more important than religion, although neither nation emphasised these. [40]

40

- 2 This question focuses on the second half of the century. Spain's development of its colonies in the Americas went largely unchallenged until the reign of Elizabeth I and candidates should consider how and why this change occurred. Candidates may drive their answers by a focus on privateers but may also use a more chronological approach to Anglo-Spanish conflict in the 16th century.

Candidates might consider why little rivalry occurred pre-1560.

- Marital and dynastic links were important in both binding and unravelling Anglo-Spanish relations. Henry VIII's marriage to Catherine of Aragon cemented the Treaty of Medina del Campo. Divorce damaged this link and the products of the marriage and the divorce, Mary and Elizabeth, would influence relations later. Philip's attempts to replace his dead wife Mary I with Elizabeth were rejected and this clash was mirrored in other clashes including the New World. The removal of Papal authority from England undermined the Spanish monopoly of the New World which had been granted by the Pope.
- Early Anglo-Spanish relations were cemented by a common enemy, France. France's descent into the War of Religion removed a threat to both England and Spain and allowed conflict to increase. One symptom of this conflict was a clash in the New World.
- Rebellion in the Netherlands threatened a vital trade for English wool and this worried England. Some English mercantile enterprise switched toward the Americas and hence conflict increased. Elizabeth was more worried about the presence of a large Spanish army in the Netherlands and this threat increased rivalry between England and Spain. English interference in internal Spanish policy undermined Philip and damaged Anglo-Spanish relations.
- The Reformation brought a major redefinition of Anglo-Spanish relations. Philip II saw himself as 'the sword' of the Catholic Reformation while England saw itself as an 'Elect nation'. Both countries believed that they had a divine mission to further God's will and work. Philip II supported the Papal excommunication of Elizabeth. This conflict led Elizabeth to encourage 'privateers' and their actions in the Americas. Religion was a major factor that damaged relations but personal dislike between Elizabeth and Philip heightened conflict.
- The actions of men like Drake and Hawkins enraged Philip especially as their actions damaged the Spanish economy which depended on New World bullion. Spanish domination of the New World antagonised English efforts to develop new markets, resources and homes for surplus population.

Analysis of this question should identify that expansion in the New World was a source of conflict between England and Spain. Certainly privateers were a factor in this conflict but may only have been a symptom of a much greater clash. However, consideration of a range of other factors might suggest that New World rivalry was also a symptom of rivalry and was not the decisive factor. [40]

Option 1

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

40

40

(Answer **one** question)

1 The answer should examine if it is accurate to describe Parliament’s role and status as transformed between 1603 and 1702 and if it was an “equal partner” with the Crown after 1660. In general, one would expect candidates to argue that, in some areas, Parliament’s role and status had changed considerably; in others change was less significant; and, in a few respects, Parliament remained subordinate to the Crown. Issues of finance, as well as politics and religion, should be mentioned. Some of the following issues are anticipated.

(a) Finance

- *Sole authority for taxation.* In 1603 the King was expected to “live off his own” and could not raise money without the consent of Parliament. This was tested by the early Stuart monarchs but firmly established by Parliament in 1641. Parliament’s role and status was expanded further at the Restoration: in 1660, Parliament fixed the King’s income at £1.2 million and sought to provide this revenue for him. In the 1690s Parliament provided the King with money for a Civil List out of which he ran the government. They were careful to authorise taxation for a much shorter period of time and by undertaking to guarantee the interest payments of the National Debt they maintained their indispensability. After 1689, Parliament met annually. One might argue that Parliament’s power over royal revenue had been transformed.
- *Methods of taxation.* In 1603 Parliament approved the customs at the start of each reign and authorised subsidies to augment ancient forms of royal income. By 1641 Parliament had insisted that the King abandon raising revenue by prerogative methods of revenue. After 1660, Parliament authorised Excise, which first appeared in 1643, and a Land Tax as well which was a variation on the ancient subsidy method of assessing income from property. The Crown was now dependent on Parliament and could not resort to independent sources of income.
- *Appropriation of supply.* Although it appeared radical when this principle was put forward by the 1690s, this feature was customary.

(b) Politics

- *Appointment of ministers.* Parliament had no say in this in 1603. By 1700 the Crown was coming under pressure to appoint ministers who could command a majority in the House of Commons but even at this late stage there was no legal obligation to do so.
- *Determination of the succession to the throne.* This had long been a forbidden area for Parliament. There was a failed attempt by Parliament to determine the succession in the Exclusion Crisis of 1679–1681. It was not until 1689 that Parliament was strong enough to stipulate a Protestant Succession in the Bill of Rights and the Hanoverian Succession in the Act of Settlement of 1701.
- *The making of foreign policy.* This was the prerogative of the Crown in 1603 and remained so until the end of the century; but by the Act of Settlement of 1701 Parliament dictated that the Crown could not go to war in defence of its foreign dominions and Parliament was upset when the Partition Treaties of 1698 and 1699 were not shown to them. In 1701 William thought it best to ask Parliament’s approval for his treaty of Grand Alliance.

(c) Religion

- *The monarch's religion.* Parliament was helpless to insist on the religion of the monarch before 1660 and was still so by 1685. It was not until the Bill of Rights of 1689 that Parliament insisted that the monarch had to be Protestant.
- *Parliament and the Church of England.* Parliament established (or in its view, re-established) its right to share in the determination of church policy in 1640 when it condemned Laud's canons and asserted the principle that Convocation had no right to bind the church without the consent of Parliament. After 1660, the Clarendon Code, the Test Acts and the Toleration Act of 1689 indicated the supremacy of Parliament over the church, belief and practice. [40]

40

2 The power of the Crown depended on a number of issues. As well as the financial policies it pursued, its power might be affected by policies on religion, how the liberties of the subject (and in the seventeenth century this was largely taken to mean the liberties of a property owner) were affected and foreign policy. If one accepts the assumption that the monarchy could be seen to be at its weakest when it had to make the most concessions to Parliament, then it would appear that the monarchy was at its weakest in 1640–1642, 1649, 1660 and 1689 and, finally, in the decade which followed. Answers at the highest level will consider the scope of the century and these various perspectives of finance, religion, liberty and foreign policy.

- (a)** In the period 1640–1642, the Crown had to make substantial concessions. But, at this point, religion, finance, liberties were all involved. Foreign policy was not the most contentious issue, though admittedly there was some debate in the 1630s about Charles I's Hispanophile tendencies. The Five Knights' Case raised concerns about the Crown's right to imprison without showing specific reasons. The Petition of Right showed concerns about billeting and the application of martial law on civilians. Although the Crown had controversial religious policies (sale of monopolies, Ship Money, levying tonnage and poundage without consent, forced loans, forest fines), it might be argued that religion did in fact lie at the heart of all the problems because contemporaries believed that if Charles I were to attain financial independence he could dispense with Parliament, introduce Catholicism unhindered, use any surpluses to build up a standing army and in a Catholic, absolutist state, ride roughshod over his subjects' liberties.
- (b)** Again in 1649 the monarchy was weak. It had surrendered to Parliament and the Army – and what could be lower than regicide in 1649? It was religion rather than finance that was most important. The attempts to reach settlements with the King had failed because the King could not be trusted over religion. However, even at the time of the execution royalist support was already building over the idea of Charles I as a martyr, and the monarchy began a counter-attack which led ultimately to the Restoration.
- (c)** The monarchy was weak in 1688–1689: James II had to flee the country and his successor had to negotiate the “Glorious Revolution”. He was raising revenue without consent but the Crown's financial strength was partly the result of an over-generous Parliament. But they were also worried about his growing standing army and threat to liberties. But it might be argued that religion was the underlying concern. His Catholicising policies had offended his subjects.

(d) In the 1690s, William's commitment to a pan-European alliance to resist Louis XIV meant that he had to make substantial concessions to ensure that Parliament continued to authorise taxation to finance the war. It might be argued that the Crown was at its weakest/made the most concessions in this period when it clashed with its subjects over foreign policy. [40]

Option 2

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

40

40

(Answer **one** question)

- 1 Some candidates may agree with the proposition, considering that “progress” did take place across the century under discussion, but better answers will note the fluctuations in liberalism’s progress, and see the improvement in its fortunes after 1850, with the best answers also querying continuing progress in the last quarter of the period and noting setbacks at that time.

Since some sort of baseline has to be established if subsequent progress is to be measured, the position of liberalism in 1815 needs to be sketched in. As a result of the Treaty of Vienna the old Empires and many former despots were restored, and liberal aspirations were stifled, especially in central and eastern Europe. Metternich not only maintained a draconian censorship in the Habsburg territories, but secured *carte blanche* from the illiberal Russians and Prussians to organise punitive expeditions against liberal revolt wherever it took place. Thus, Austria restored despotic governments in Piedmont, Naples, Modena, Parma and the Papal States, and used its influence to ensure the passing of the Carlsbad Decrees and the Six Acts to quell German student unrest. In Russia Alexander I soon withdrew from his pose of enlightened despotism, the liberal Decembrist Revolt of 1825 was harshly suppressed, and in France Charles X sought to restore monarchical, aristocratic and ecclesiastical power in spite of the 1814 Charter. His successor, Louis Philippe, established a more liberal regime, but it did not survive when it proved unwilling to accept modest demands for an extension of the franchise. But this series of setbacks did not mean that liberalism was completely impotent. In 1848, profiting from a conjunction of economic and political crises, liberals were still strong enough to play a leading role in and become the beneficiaries of a series of revolts. But early gains were dissipated as these liberals showed their political inexperience and allowed the more wily old governments to regain control, with the only tangible success, after the Prussian constitution was altered to allow a three-tier voting system, the Piedmontese Statuto.

Yet to say that liberalism made no concrete progress between 1815 and 1850 is to over-simplify. The free market philosophy which emerged from the Scottish Enlightenment and was later developed by the Manchester School led first Huskisson and later Peel to move Britain decisively towards free trade, while in Germany the Prussian Zollverein expanded rapidly to include much of the North in a German free trade area. Britain also witnessed a decisive move towards a predominantly middle class electorate with the 1832 Great Reform Act and its local government corollary, while the Charters of 1814 and 1831 gave France constitutions which for all the failings of its kings gave the country the most liberal system of government on the continent of Europe. But Louis Philippe’s reign illustrated a failing that was to trouble liberals for a long time, namely that they were largely drawn from the middle class. They wanted government to be controlled by those who had “a stake in the country”, i.e. property holders, and Chief Minister Guizot, and indeed many of the liberals who later found themselves in power during 1848 were reluctant to share power with those lower down the social scale, tending to equate democracy with “mob rule”, just as great a threat to liberty as was despotism.

Post 1848 liberalism had little immediate success. In Austria the Bach era saw a return to despotism, while Prussia experienced authoritarian government under first Manteuffel and then Bismarck. Napoleon III followed a policy of “order first, liberty later” throughout the 1850s and much of the following decade. But the old rulers had not been left unmoved by 1848. Recognising concession as preferable to overthrow, they began to appease the growing middle class with extension of the franchise and the relaxation of restrictions on individual freedoms. The lowering of trade barriers continued, the Cobden Treaty offering reciprocal concessions even between the old enemies of Britain and France, where Napoleon III, possibly for self-preservation, inaugurated the so-called liberal Empire in the late 1860s. The electorally successful National Liberals, making their peace with Bismarck, worked in government with him in the 1870s, while Thiers and Cavour, the former through his ruthless suppression of the Communards and then the Royalists, and the latter with his unification of Italy under Piedmontese control, showed a steel and a decisiveness which earlier liberals across Europe had singularly lacked. Even Russia saw reform under Alexander II, although this was more in the nature of enlightened despotism than liberalism, with the Czar refusing to grant Russia an elected parliament, a sine qua non for liberals.

From 1870 on liberalism arguably met with both success and a failure. In much of Europe individual liberties and parliamentary government based on a wider franchise made steady advances. Against that there were undoubted setbacks. The Great Depression which set in after 1875 sparked off a German-led retreat from free trade, until only Britain among the Great Powers retained its belief in free trade. Shamefully, the German attack on the Catholic Church in Prussia was conducted with Liberal support, and although the Reichstag continued to be elected by universal male suffrage, its powers were strictly limited right up to 1914. Anti-Liberal forces on both Left and Right threatened the existence of the French Third Republic, but to be fair, the government overcame them all. After the 1905 Revolution Russia at last was granted a parliament, but successive alterations to the franchise were enforced by the Czar to ensure an eventually docile Duma, while by 1900 Franz Josef was ruling Austria as an authoritarian Emperor again. The rise of socialism and of embryonic welfare state reform, both representing a collectivist rather than a classically liberal individualist approach, may be seen as another setback for liberalism.

More nuanced answers which recognise that the extension of liberal values was neither steady nor consistent should be rewarded, but any accurate material which addresses the question is perfectly acceptable.

- 2 The answer will probably concentrate on individuals, but should also give proper consideration to political, economic, social and cultural trends which were also important in the success of nationalism. This mark scheme will deal first with individuals, then with other factors, but it would be quite acceptable to use a chronological framework for the answer. What is important is not simply to concentrate on individuals, but to give proper consideration to those other factors not necessarily generated by political leaders.

Germany and Italy provide the best examples of the “political leadership” argument. Bismarck’s achievements in throwing his weight behind Prussian army reform, utilising every opportunity to steal a diplomatic march over Austria

and France, ensuring that when war did come those countries fought alone, and imposing the desired Prussian dominance over the eventually unified Germany: all these are achievements of the first magnitude, and will usually receive full and generous treatment from candidates. Better answers might also recognise the contribution of Minister of War von Roon, another political leader without whose vital work the German Empire could not have been established. The achievements of these men may profitably be compared with earlier German nationalists, who between 1815 and 1850 met only with failure, in no small measure due to their inability to throw up a leader of genuine stature. Well-meaning politicians like von Gagern lacked the determination, even ruthlessness, which characterised Bismarck and his successful political allies.

Similarly, the unification of Italy owed its success largely to political leaders. Cavour helped develop Piedmont as a model state – liberal, increasingly prosperous and the envy of those toiling under less enlightened regimes. His astute courtship of Napoleon III, his luring of the Austrians into a declaration of war, his secret links with the influential National Society, and the way in which he outwitted Garibaldi to ensure the retention and dominance of the House of Savoy all mark him as a political leader of the first rank. Garibaldi, the romantic hero of the Risorgimento, remains a key individual, yet his political astuteness was less impressive than his bravery on the battlefield. Nonetheless, without his exploits Italy's deep south might well have remained outside the new Kingdom, while his influence continued to inspire nationalists far beyond his native country. Garibaldi's mentor, Giuseppe Mazzini, although a failed revolutionary in practical terms, was likewise an inspiration to nationalists across Europe. Kossuth, the Hungarian patriot, is another whose success was short-lived, but whose influence continued.

Other political leaders who might be mentioned include Napoleon I, whose rationalisation of several states into one entity was for many the first glimmering of nationalist consciousness, while Napoleon III's former involvement in the world of Italian secret societies and his revisionist stance towards the Vienna Settlement made him a natural figurehead for nationalism, while his participation in the war of 1859, although brief, proved decisive.

There are a number of factors beyond strong political leadership which made for nationalist success, including the prevailing international climate. For the most part aspiring nation-states required the approval or even the assistance of at least one of the Great Powers, examples being Greece and Belgium in the earlier part of the period, and Bulgaria and Albania later on. War was frequently an essential catalyst in nationalist success: thus a cluster of mid-19th century wars resulted in the creation of Italy and Germany and the granting of partial autonomy to Hungary by the Habsburg Empire. On the other hand, the Poles, Irish and Czechs failed to gain independence before 1914, lacking a major war which would affect their destiny, but had to wait for the political turmoil caused by the Great War to seize their opportunity. Another aspect of the international situation which may be noted was the weakness of the Ottoman Empire, which allowed a series of Balkan nation-states to emerge throughout the period, from Greece in 1829 through Bulgaria in 1878 and Albania in 1913.

Many writers, artists and musicians, who argued the case for independence, or stimulated an interest in the language, history or musical heritage of a people, helped build nationalist consciousness throughout Europe. Culture was of great

importance in extending nationalism's appeal and therefore its success, and candidates should be able to refer to a number of writers and musicians, e.g the Czechs Smetana and Palacky, the Italians Verdi and Manzoni, the German Fichte, the Finn Sibelius etc. Nationalism continued to thrive as the 19th century wore on, and part of its "success" was the way in which the people enthusiastically absorbed nationalist and patriotic symbols and propaganda. This aspect of cultural nationalism was frequently encouraged by the state, sometimes as a diversionary tactic when socialism's appeal seemed to be attractive to the working classes.

Economic factors also affected nationalism. In Germany the Prussian free trade experiment of the Zollverein is often credited with forging links with other German states which were political as well as economic, although better answers might also point out that in 1866 many of the Zollverein states preferred to fight on the Austrian side. As protection made its comeback after 1875 trade rivalries in their turn stimulated nationalism as the hoped-for era of peace through free trade receded and economic rivalries raised patriotic fervour. The process of industrialisation increased the numbers of the literate middle class, who were the natural constituency for nationalist newspapers and writings, while the urbanisation associated with the rise of industry produced urban masses who, as the century wore on, were more receptive to nationalist propaganda than were their peasant compatriots.

Any other relevant and appropriate material should be rewarded.

[40]

40

Option 3

40

AVAILABLE
MARKS

(Answer **one** question)

- 1** This question invites candidates to assess the importance of the mobilisation of widespread support in the success and failure of constitutional and revolutionary nationalism. The phrase “widespread support” can be interpreted at the candidates’ discretion, and all valid interpretations will be rewarded. Top level answers will, of course, link the question of success and failure to other factors. Top marks will be awarded to answers which debate the issues as widely as possible.

(a) The role of widespread support played a significant role both in the success and failure of constitutional nationalism in this period.

Daniel O’Connell employed widespread support in achieving Catholic emancipation in 1829. He combined the power of the masses (peasantry) with the Catholic middle class, clergy, 40-shilling freeholders, as well as the goodwill of Presbyterians. Mass rallies, the collection of the penny rent and his electoral strategy provided this support with a tangible role in the emancipation campaign.

However, candidates should reflect on the role of other factors, such as the weakness of the British government and O’Connell’s leadership skills.

Regarding the campaign for the repeal of the Union, it can be argued that O’Connell was mostly successful in harnessing widespread support. However, Presbyterians were unenthusiastic, while the Young Irelanders eventually split with O’Connell. It can be argued that the extent of O’Connell’s support had little impact on the outcome of the repeal campaign, and may refer to the resolute stance of the government headed by Peel, his subtle tactic of positive reforms, as well as shortcomings in O’Connell’s judgement.

Parnell’s ability to mobilise widespread support was a key factor in his success. His association with the Land League and ex-Fenians created the New Departure, which was underpinned by the masses and the endorsement of the Catholic Church. Reforms such as the Land Act of 1881 and the Arrears Act of 1882 soon materialised. Moreover, Parnell’s support of a unified and pledge-bound political party at Westminster created the atmosphere in which the home rule debate could take place. While the Home Rule Bills of 1886 and 1893 failed, nothing could alter the fact that Parnell had placed the issue prominently on the political agenda in both Britain and Ireland. *Answers should also reflect on the role of other factors in Parnell’s success, such as the willingness of Gladstone to take an active interest in the Irish question, even at great political risk to his own government.*

Parnell’s failure and ultimate downfall can be attributed to a mixture of influence. The O’Shea scandal alienated the support of the Church, a large section of his party, and caused division among constitutional nationalists. Gladstone, under pressure from Nonconformists at home, disowned Parnell. *Answers can also debate the extent to which Parnell was the architect of his own downfall.*

(b) The failure of revolutionary nationalists to harness widespread support contributed to their failure in this period.

There was little support for the revolts of Emmet in 1803 and the Young Irelanders in 1848. When the Fenians rebelled in 1867, they faced the additional hindrance of public and strident condemnation from the Catholic Church, whose Primate, Paul Cullen, led the clerical assault.

However, answers should reflect on the other factors which impacted on the failure of revolutionary nationalists in this period. Inadequate planning was a common feature in 1803, 1848 and 1867. In the case of the latter, the Fenians further undermined their chances through leadership quarrels both in Ireland and USA. The role of government was also important, for each revolutionary outbreak was easily suppressed through a mixture of firm military response or infiltration.

*It is valid for answers to comment on the **success** of physical force movements.* Each movement provided inspiration for subsequent generations. Emmet can be linked to Pearse in 1916. The cultural links of Young Ireland inspired some of the leaders of the 1916 Rising. Some members of Young Ireland joined the Fenians. Indeed, the ease with which the British government learned of Fenian activities through spies contributed to the way in which the Rising of Easter 1916 was planned. Furthermore, the activities of the Fenians prompted Gladstone to initiate policies of social, economic and political reform for Ireland.

In summation, top quality answers will debate the role of widespread support in relation to other factors. [40]

40

- 2 Candidates are required to examine the motives and methods of the supporters of the Union, and assess the extent to which they were similar and different. Answers which explore this theme across a wide range of headings will reach Level 4. Final verdicts on the comparison/contrast debate are open to the candidates' discretion, provided appropriate evidence is provided.

(a) Ulster and Southern Unionists had several motives for upholding the Union, but they were not identical.

Religion was a motive common to both groups, with more emphasis in the north than the south. Strident comment about "Home Rule and Rome Rule" were common among political and religious leaders from northern Unionism, while comparable views on the potential religious impact of severing the Union were more restrained in the south. In contrast to the sectarian divisions in places such as Belfast, southern unionists emphasised the benefits of the Union to their Catholic counterparts. References to the geographical distribution of unionism help explain this difference.

Economic motives were more strongly identical to both. Northern unionism reflected on the gains of the Union in the form of shipbuilding, linen, cotton and ropemaking. In the south, the onset of social and economic reforms such as the Local Government Act of 1898, the Reform Act of 1884 and the Land Acts of 1870 and 1881 made unionist leaders there apprehensive about the implications of home rule for the landed interest.

Empire motives occupied the thoughts of both, but there was a clear contrast with a greater emphasis in the literature of southern unionists than in the north. Here, there were many references to the implications for the unity of the Empire if home rule was granted to Ireland. Candidates may reflect on the social structure of southern unionism, with many of its leaders, such as Dunraven, Midleton and Dufferin all serving the Empire in some official capacity.

(b) The methods of northern and southern unionists reflect similar comparisons and contrasts.

Geographical considerations meant that the threat of force was more potent in the north and unrealistic in the south. Hence, in the north there were organisations such as Young Ulster and the Protestant Defence Association. Ulster unionists comprised a population of c. 800,000 out of 1.2m, while their southern counterparts represented only 250,000 out of a population of 2.2m. While the north employed political methods such as electioneering and highly publicised rallies such as the 1892 Convention in Belfast, southern unionists used their impressive network of social and political contacts in other ways. For example, lobbying at Westminster on behalf of the Union was facilitated by the fact that of 144 peers with Irish interests, 116 owned land in the south. It is valid for candidates to reflect on the titles of the various organisations and comment on the self-perception of unionism. At various times there existed the Irish Unionist Alliance and the Irish Loyal and Patriotic Union in the south. In the north, there was the Protestant Colonisation Society, Ulster Clubs and the Ulster Loyalist anti-Repeal Union. [40]

Option 4

AVAILABLE
MARKS

40

40

(Answer **one** question)

- 1** Candidates should select appropriate evidence from Soviet Foreign policy in Europe after 1917 to illustrate the different factors that influenced it and thus gauge how consistent it was.

Most candidates will probably argue that Soviet foreign policy varied depending on a range of factors including circumstances, individuals, the international climate and the actions of other states. In such a broad topic, candidates have to be selective with their historical evidence. The following evidence from each phase is therefore only a suggestion as to what could be included.

(a) 1917–1924

According to Marxist ideology, Russia was not the most appropriate country to stage a communist revolution in 1917. Lenin justified staging a revolution in a relatively underdeveloped capitalist country by claiming that, if a communist revolution succeeded in Russia, this would inspire proletarian class based communist revolutions in advanced industrial societies. By 1919, it was clear that the USSR was the only communist regime in Europe. Lenin set up the Comintern in 1919 with the ideological goal of trying to spread communism internationally. In this regard it could be argued that foreign policy was initially motivated by an expansionist ideology. Equally it could be suggested this was a defensive measure to attempt to secure the revolution.

However, temporary capitalist intervention from western countries in the Civil War also demonstrated to the Bolsheviks that an isolated USSR was vulnerable and for a Communist regime to survive it would have to ensure its security in the future. Survival was the main priority in this phase and through the Treaty of Rapallo with Weimar Germany in 1922 the USSR showed that it could be pragmatic and work with capitalist states if necessary for survival. This could in turn be seen as consistent or a shift.

(b) 1924–1941

Stalin continued the more inward looking policies of Lenin and concentrated upon the economic reconstruction of the USSR. The policy of “Socialism in One Country” focused partly on industrialisation to develop its ability to increase its levels of rearmament to protect from potential attacks by capitalist states. By 1933 with the rise to power of Hitler the USSR recognised the potential threat of Nazism. In 1934 the USSR joined the League of Nations to try to co-operate with capitalist states such as the UK and France to achieve collective security. This could be regarded as inconsistent or a form of flexible pragmatism. After the Munich Conference in 1938 the USSR gradually realised that the West could not be relied upon and in 1939 it agreed the Nazi-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact with its ideological enemy Nazism. Once again this could be regarded as highly inconsistent or consistent in terms of Stalin’s Realpolitik approach to foreign policy.

Such pragmatism revealed that the USSR needed to gain time to rearm more but also partly in the interests of security it would be beneficial to acquire the Baltic states and Eastern Poland as a potential buffer zone against possible attack from the West. The USSR was also able to recover territory lost by the 1918 Treaty of Brest-Litovsk.

(c) 1941–1945

In this regard it could be argued that Soviet Foreign policy was at this point expansionist even if not motivated by ideology. The Nazi invasion of the USSR in June 1941 forced it into a temporary alliance with capitalist states to defeat the forces of Fascism but at some point during the Second World War Stalin decided that after victory had been achieved the USSR would never again have to depend on others for its own strategic security.

(d) 1945–1964

The traditional interpretation of the origins of the Cold War suggests that the USSR occupied the states of Eastern Europe it liberated from Nazi Germany for ideological motives to spread communism. Revisionist interpretations suggest that Stalin broke the 1945 Yalta Agreement more for reasons of security and survival. The USSR only narrowly escaped defeat during the Second World War and by 1945 it was near economic ruin. Its security needs led it to seek governments in nearby states which were not anti-Soviet and to ensure that no military threat ever emanated from German soil again. Stalin not only wanted to maintain a sphere of influence in Eastern Europe amongst the People's Democracies through the Cominform in 1947 and Comecon in 1949 but he also wanted to prevent a united capitalist Germany rising up again to threaten the USSR. This represents the background to the disagreements with the West over Germany culminating in the 1948 Berlin crisis.

After the creation of the Warsaw Pact in 1955 the USSR was determined to maintain the Iron Curtain. The 1956 Hungarian revolution was crushed to prevent states in Eastern Europe from leaving the alliance.

(e) 1964–1982

After the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968 the Brezhnev Doctrine revived the potential influence of ideology in Soviet Foreign policy by stressing that the USSR would protect and maintain any states which had become communist. However, other motives also explain Soviet Foreign policy in the Brezhnev era. Co-existence with the west through Détente, such as the SALT agreement of 1972, was partly pursued due to the stagnation of the Soviet economy which could not sustain high levels of rearmament, while the 1975 Helsinki Accords were signed by the Soviets to get recognition from the West of the Soviet Bloc for security reasons.

The 1979 Soviet invasion of Afghanistan led to the end of Détente and was justified by the Soviets on the ideological grounds of the 1968 Brezhnev Doctrine. Equally it could be argued that it was a defensive move motivated more by insecurity and the threat of Islamic separatism.

(f) 1982–1991

Soviet foreign policy was transformed after Gorbachev became the new leader in 1985. He was not prepared to shore up a USSR dominated structure in Eastern Europe which was failing economically and threatened to bankrupt the USSR itself if it continued to try to match the USA as a military force. In a speech to the United Nations in 1988, Gorbachev had committed himself to ending the Cold War, had renounced the emphasis in the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution on trying to export communist doctrine abroad and the 1968 Brezhnev Doctrine, and had committed the USSR to disarmament. From 1986 to 1989 he withdrew troops from Afghanistan; in 1987 he reached agreement with President Reagan to destroy all stocks of intermediate nuclear weapons

and in 1989 did not intervene to prop up unpopular communist regimes in the former Warsaw Pact. Gorbachev was not interested in spreading communism or maintaining the balance of power in Europe. He wanted to reform communism within the USSR but his policies resulted in the disintegration of the USSR in 1991. [40]

- 2 Answers that reach the higher level should discuss Fascist and Democratic opponents of Communism over the whole period from 1917 to 1991. They also need to address both aims and methods. Balanced answers must discuss both the 1917–1945 and the 1945–1991 periods.

(a) 1917–1945

Democratic powers demonstrated their initial hostility towards the USSR by intervention in the Civil War. Despite this aggression and the initial isolation of the USSR at Versailles and the League of Nations, democratic regimes reluctantly accepted the existence of the USSR as the 1922 Treaty of Rapallo with Weimar Germany showed rather than actively attempting to overthrow Bolshevik power.

From 1933 the main opponents to the USSR were no longer democratic regimes but Nazi Germany. Hitler made no secret of his loathing of Bolshevism and considered it to be an ideology that had to be destroyed. The invasion of the USSR would bring the territorial expansion needed to gain living space for the German people and regions of eastern Europe would provide many of the raw materials needed for Germany to gain self-sufficiency. Fascist opposition developed with the Anti-Comintern pacts in 1936 between Germany and Japan and in 1937 when Italy under Mussolini joined. The 1939 Nazi–Soviet pact failed to prevent the Nazi invasion of the USSR in 1941 which was an attempt to try to destroy the communist state by force. In this regard it could be argued that Hitler bore an initial similarity to the early opponents of the Soviet Union in his and their desire to destroy the Soviet Union and indeed he reached some form of accommodation with them. However, the appalling brutality of Hitler clearly contrast as do his broader aims.

Post World War Two the opposition to Bolshevism crystallises in the form of the USA. As a whole the US and its allies were unable to prevent Stalin from liberating countries in Eastern Europe from Hitler.

The creation of a Soviet satellite empire behind an *iron curtain* led the capitalist democratic western powers to adopt a policy of containment of communism as the Cold War escalated. The Domino theory now appeared – if one state falls under Soviet influence its neighbour will not be far behind. The 1947 Truman Doctrine illustrated America’s determination to contain the spread of communism in Western Europe and the Marshall Plan of 1947 gave vital economic aid to democratic states in Western Europe to produce stable economies and thus reduce the chances of internal communist revolutions. The 1948 Berlin Airlift prevented Stalin taking the whole of Berlin and the formation of NATO in 1949 showed that the West was determined to contain communism to Eastern Europe. It also demonstrated the nature of the policy that was adopted in that it stopped short of direct military intervention, which contrasted with previous decades.

The West was not prepared to intervene in the Soviet sphere of influence behind the Iron Curtain in Hungary in 1956 or Czechoslovakia in 1968 when the Soviets invaded. The acceptance of Eastern Europe as a Soviet sphere of influence was acknowledged in the 1975 Helsinki Accords. It could be argued that this was reflective of the continual shifts in policies of the opponents of communism – on the one hand, strong and antagonistic and then a shift to a greater degree of accommodation.

The era of Détente came to an end when Reagan and Thatcher denounced the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan of 1979. Indeed it could be argued that here was a renewal of an aggressive approach to destroying communism. In this instance a costly arms race and a ratcheting up of tension through bellicose rhetoric.

The collapse of the Soviet empire in 1989 and the collapse of the USSR in 1991 were primarily due to the policies of Gorbachev who was not prepared to engage in an expensive arms race with NATO led by Reagan. Despite the fears of many, NATO and the Warsaw Pact were essentially defensive alliances and neither was planning a surprise attack on the other, which would almost certainly have escalated into mutual nuclear destruction.

The West won the Cold War because the USSR withered away. In the long term the policy of containment was quite successful. Had it not been for the arms race, the USSR might have survived. Gorbachev believed that it could not continue to devote so much of its economy to the military.

Most candidates will probably suggest that the opponents certainly varied and that methods also varied, but that perhaps the destruction of Soviet Union was one aim they all shared at some point, but each answer should be judged on its own merits by the quality of the argument presented. [40]

Option 5

Total

40

40

40



Rewarding Learning

**ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education
January 2010**

History

Assessment Unit A2 3

assessing

Module 6

[A2H31]

THURSDAY 28 JANUARY, AFTERNOON

**MARK
SCHEME**

OPTION 1 ELIZABETHAN ENGLAND 1570-1603

- 1 (a) **This question targets AO2:** the candidate's ability to interpret and evaluate source material in relation to historical context.

Indicative content:**Level 1 ([1]-[2])**

Answer will typically paraphrase each source.

Level 2 ([3]-[5])

Answers will explain more fully the detail in the sources and make some direct comparisons. Some of the following points may be made. The six ministers are concerned at how Elizabeth views them. They fear that she has misinterpreted their attempts at improving the quality of preaching as disobedience to her. Although they are not entirely happy with her Church Settlement, they remain completely loyal and obedient to her rule and her laws. Elizabeth is warning James against Puritanism which is present in both their kingdoms. She is concerned about the support the English Puritans are obtaining in Scotland. She says she cannot tolerate it and asks James for his support.

Level 3 ([6]-[8])

Answers will make a fuller comparison and provide some explanation of the differing views. The six ministers are from within the Church of England and therefore, although they might not be entirely happy with all aspects of the 1559 Religious Settlement, they are prepared to work with it. By 1576 Elizabeth was becoming frustrated with prophesying and unlicensed preaching. Puritans believed that by prophesying they were not disloyal to Elizabeth but merely spreading the word of God according to the scriptures. They address their petition not to Elizabeth directly but to Cecil who was believed to hold Puritan sympathies. Their tone is loyal and respectful and they imply that they would never threaten the rule of Elizabeth. However, these six ministers may not be a true representation of the whole Puritan population in England. Elizabeth is writing during the later part of her reign in 1590. At this stage Puritanism had increased and Elizabeth has implemented legislation against them. She was frustrated with their presence in Parliament and had on occasions arrested supporters of the movement such as Strickland. By 1590 relations with Scotland and James have been improving and as the years progress it looks apparent that James will be heir to the English throne. Elizabeth sees the Puritans not only as a religious threat but also as a political threat which has the potential to be much more dangerous. She is also concerned about the support they are receiving in Scotland and the consequences this could have on stability in England. In Scotland the reformation has had a greater impact than in England. Elizabeth may have been exaggerating the threat of Puritanism and may also have been implying that James must respond to this threat on her command. She had still not declared him heir to the English throne.

Level 4 ([9]-[10])

Answer may use contextual knowledge to more fully explain the views expressed and question just how representative the six ministers were of the Puritan movement. Puritanism in Elizabeth's reign was not a defined movement and those within the Church, like the six ministers, would not have been as extreme in their views as the Presbyterians or Separatists. By 1576 Elizabeth was frustrated with the Puritan movement, especially prophesying so much, so that in 1576 she prohibited prophesying. Answers may demonstrate an informed understanding of Elizabeth's dislike of and fear of Puritanism. Elizabeth's personal letter to James highlights her view of Puritanism and how she views Puritans as a political as much as a religious threat. It implies that she is concerned with national security and is appealing to a fellow Monarch. Candidates should make reference to the motivation behind this letter.

AO2

- (b) **This question targets AO2:** the candidate's ability to interpret, evaluate and use a range of source material in relation to historical context.

Indicative content:**Level 1 ([1]-[2])**

Answers may rely on paraphrasing the sources or provide a narrative of the subject with little reference to the sources.

Level 2 ([3]-[5])

Answers may make some of the following points. Source 1 suggests that the Puritans within the Church are loyal and obedient to Elizabeth's rule and laws. Source 2 suggests that the Puritans are a great threat, both religiously and politically. Source 3 suggests that the Puritans were a divided group and during Elizabeth's reign they were not a significant threat.

Level 3 ([6]-[8])

Answers at this level must use more contextual knowledge to interpret the sources. They may also comment on the adequacy of the sources. At the top of this level they may question how representative the six ministers' view is. By 1576 Puritanism had gained a foothold in the Church but also within Parliament. Answers should also comment on the motivation and timing of Elizabeth's letter. It is a personal letter and is therefore quite emotive. Elizabeth perhaps exaggerates the threat to ensure James takes action. Source 3 presents a balanced view of relations. It claims that the Puritans failed in their aim to achieve further religious reform. It also implies that those within the Church were not a political threat to Elizabeth and that, although they might have disagreed over theology, they believed in her Supremacy. It does mention that as time progressed there was tension within the Puritan movement and this was not directed towards the Monarch.

Level 4 ([9]-[10])

Answers will interpret and evaluate the sources fully in relation to their historical context.

AO2

- (c) **This question targets AO2:** the candidate's ability to interpret, evaluate and use source material in relation to historical context.

Indicative Content:

Level 1 ([1]-[3])

Answers will paraphrase each source and make assertions that are not fully supported.

Level 2 ([4]-[7])

Answers at this level will comment that each source provides information from different viewpoints: The Petition gives the view of six ministers within the Church of England who want to proclaim their continued loyalty to Elizabeth. The personal letter is the direct writing of Elizabeth I to what was assumed was her heir to the throne. Source 3 provides an impartial, objective assessment. It reveals that Puritanism was present within the Church of England during Elizabeth's reign. It also suggests that Puritanism continued to grow and affect the established Church after the reign of Elizabeth.

Level 3 ([8]-[11])

Answers will go into more detail demonstrating the utility of the sources for a study of the relationship between Elizabeth and the Puritans. Answers at this level discuss utility, not just for the information it provides, but also for the quality of the evidence – author, date and audience. Source 1 gives the view of ministers within the Church, therefore they had a direct relationship with Elizabeth as they were part of her Church. However, they do not represent the whole Puritan movement. Source 2 provides the view of Elizabeth in a personal letter during the latter part of her reign when experiences had taught her to mistrust the Puritans. Source 3 encompasses historians' view on the relationship between Elizabeth and her Parliament. They place this relationship in context of what occurred after Elizabeth's reign.

Level 4 ([12]-[14])

Answers will use a wide range of criteria to assess utility, commenting on the significance of the information provided, authorship, motive, viewpoint, audience and date. Contextual information may be introduced to enhance the answer.

2 (a) This question targets:

- (i) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate knowledge and understanding of History in a clear and effective manner.
- (ii) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements.

Indicative Content:**Level 1 ([1]-[2]) AO1a, ([1]-[4]) AO1b**

Answers will offer mainly a descriptive, often superficial account of Elizabeth's relationship with her Parliaments with limited reference to evaluating if it was harmonious and successful. Answers will be characterised by defects in accuracy, organisation, a limited vocabulary, poor spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility.

Level 2 ([3]-[4]) AO1a, ([5]-[9])AO1b

Answers may provide a more detailed account of Elizabeth's relationship with her Parliaments, though answers will be characterised by narrative rather than analysis. Answers may indicate that there was tension regarding the Church Settlement, the question of marriage and succession, foreign policy, freedom of speech and the question of monopolies. Answers will have frequent lapses in accuracy, organisation, a suitable vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility.

Level 3 ([5]-[6]) AO1a, ([10]-[14])AO1b

Answers should identify that that there were harmonious relations between Elizabeth and her Parliaments. Candidates will look at how she used a range of methods to ensure that her Parliaments were a success. Within the Commons she employed managers to ensure that her policies were implemented. They constituted the "Queen-in-Council" which formulated policy, guided MPs as to what government wanted, steered Bills through and dealt with opposition. They will mention how Elizabeth used her prerogative powers to control her Parliaments and to ensure that opposition was limited. Above all, they should mention the power of Elizabeth's personality and how that limited tension and ensured success. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, organisation, good vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility, though there may be occasional lapses.

Level 4 ([7]-[8]) AO1a, ([15]-[18]) AO1b

Answers will demonstrate a good interpretation and assessment of Elizabeth's relationship with her parliaments. Answers will appreciate that there would be episodes of opposition and individuals, such as Wentworth, who spoke out against the government's policies on such topics as the religious settlement and the Commons' right of freedom of speech. They will assess just how successful she was in handling this opposition and produce a balanced argument. They will reach a sound conclusion as to whether they believe that her policy was a

success. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, organisation, good vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility.

(b) This question targets:

(iii) AO1a: the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate knowledge and understanding of History in a clear and effective manner.

(iv) AO1b: the candidate's ability to present historical explanations showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements.

Indicative content:

Level 1 ([1]–[2]) AO1a, ([1]–[4]) AO1b

Answers will mainly offer a descriptive, often superficial, account of cultural developments with limited reference to evaluating the achievements made. Answers will be characterised by defects in accuracy, organisation, a limited vocabulary, poor spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility.

Level 2 ([3]–[4]) AO1a, ([5]–[9]) AO1b

Answers may only look at one aspect of the topic. For example, they may deal with only Shakespeare and the Elizabethan theatre or else one poet. Answers will have frequent lapses in accuracy, organisation, vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility.

Level 3 ([5]–[6]) AO1a, ([10]–[14]) AO1b

Answers will take a more comprehensive view, covering a range of individuals and their work with reference to both drama and poetry. There may be references to issues such as education, printing, patronage and the achievements they made. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, organisation, good vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility, though there may be occasional lapses.

Level 4 ([7]–[8]) AO1a, ([15]–[18]) AO1b

Answers at this level must treat several aspects of cultural activity and assess the achievements made. They should examine Shakespeare and his contribution to the theatre, keeping in mind that much of his work was completed in the following reign. Mention might be made of Marlowe, Kyd and Dekker. Spenser and Raleigh will probably also be discussed. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, organisation, good vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility.

AO1a

[8]

AO1b

OPTION 2 THE LATER STUARTS 1660 – 1688

(Answer question 1 and question 2(a) or 2(b))

- 1 (a) This question targets AO2: the candidate's ability to interpret and evaluate source material in relation to historical context.

Indicative content:

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Answers will typically paraphrase each source.

Level 2 ([3]–[5])

Answers will explain more fully the detail in the sources and make some direct comparisons, e.g. Charles states his desire to promote an exchange of views in order to foster a greater toleration of diverse religious opinion whereas the Act of Uniformity is seeking to enforce attendance at Anglican services.

Level 3 ([6]–[8])

Answers will make a fuller comparison and provide some explanation of the differing views. Charles is wishing to set a clear line of demarcation with the recent past, especially religious divisions, and, without being explicit, is acknowledging that religious disputes and fanaticism were a significant factor in the Civil War and the unrest both preceding and following it. On the other hand, just two years later the Act of Uniformity could be said to be addressing the same issue but in a radically different way – here there is no mention of the King's desire for 'liberty to tender consciences' but rather a determination to remove all diversity on religious matters.

Level 4 ([9]–[10])

Answers may use contextual knowledge to more fully explain the views expressed. Candidates might argue that the Declaration of Breda in 1660 is simply a tactic on the part of the King to unite his people, offer them an almost utopian vision of a land no longer riven by religious disputes, and thereby ensure a smooth restoration of the Stuart monarchy. The Act of Uniformity has nothing of the spirit of the Declaration of Breda, and is perhaps suggestive of the fact that the King's stated desire for religious toleration was not shared by what might be called the political establishment. It might also be argued that, once in power, Charles II did not particularly exert himself to have his expressed goals put into operation. In this general assessment, the difference in date of the two sources is of critical importance.

AO2

[10]

- (b) **This question targets AO2:** the candidate's ability to interpret, evaluate and use a range of source material in relation to historical context.

Indicative content:

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Answers may rely on paraphrasing the sources or provide a narrative of the subject with little reference to the sources.

Level 2 ([3]–[5])

Answers may make note that none of the sources makes explicit reference to Charles promoting the idea of religious toleration as a political tactic, and that Source 3 in fact argues that it was a combination of Presbyterian and Anglican interests in Parliament that prevented any such legislation as the King had envisaged in Source 1 becoming a reality.

Level 3 ([6]–[8])

Answers use more contextual knowledge to interpret the sources and at the top of this level may argue that in the Declaration of Breda (Source 1) Charles, with the prospect of restoration at hand, is primarily intent on offering assurance to the people of his realm that he intends to pursue a policy that will ensure religious – and therefore political and actual – peace for the common good. However, by the time the Act of Uniformity (Source 2) is passed, two years have passed since the Declaration of Breda and the circumstances in which religious toleration was first mooted have changed. Candidates might note that the Act of Uniformity was part of the so-called Clarendon Code which sought to put general uniformity to the Established Church into effect, the other component parts of the Code being the Corporation Act (1661), the Conventicle Act (1664) and the Five Mile Act (1665). Source 3 argues that rather than Charles being insincere in his commitment to religious toleration, it was Parliament that took the lead opposing any liberality in the field of religion.

Level 4 ([9]–[10])

Answers will interpret and evaluate the sources fully in relation to their historical context. In addition to covering and developing the points already referred to, candidates might point out that after the passing of the Act of Uniformity, Charles issued a proclamation (26 December 1662) in which he reasserted his commitment to religious toleration and stated that a Bill to that effect would be laid before Parliament. When Parliament subsequently met and demanded the rigid enforcement of the Act of Uniformity, the King, dependent on that institution for money supplies, found that he had no option but to comply. Well-informed candidates might also point out that there was a degree of suspicion in parliamentary circles about Charles's desire for religious toleration, many seeing it as simply a move to extend favour to Roman Catholics, and were therefore determined that 'liberty to tender consciences' should not be enacted.

AO2

[10]

- (c) **This question targets AO2:** the candidate's ability to interpret, evaluate and use source material in relation to historical context.

Indicative content:

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

Answers will paraphrase each source and make assertions that are not fully supported.

Level 2 ([4]–[7])

Answers will comment that each source provides information from different viewpoints: the King, the English Parliament, and a modern historian. Each source is valuable in its own right. Information is provided in each source about the religious policy in the reign of Charles II. Source 1 would have us believe that the King genuinely desired religious toleration and an end to religious strife. Source 2 suggests that the Declaration of Breda has been cast by the wayside and been supplanted by a policy of religious rigidity. Source 3 presents the issue in a wider context, reflecting on the role of Parliament in the matter of determining religious policy.

Level 3 ([8]–[11])

Answers will go into more detail, demonstrating the utility of the sources for a study of the religious policy of Charles II. Answers at this level will discuss utility not just for the information it provides but also for the quality of the evidence – author, date and audience – and may use contextual knowledge to assess the value of the sources. All the authors are well placed to comment. However, the motive and purpose of each source is different. Charles is seeking to reassure the realm about his intentions with respect to religion, although arguably he is being disingenuous in doing so. The view of Parliament, as expressed in the Act of Uniformity, is opposed to the sentiments of the King, expressed in the Declaration of Breda, in that the case is made that only by strict adherence to the Church of England and its laws can peace be secured in the nation. In his commentary Kenyon suggests that Parliament has the upper hand in this debate between monarch and legislature.

Level 4 ([12]–[14])

Answers will use a wide range of criteria to assess utility, commenting on the significance of the information provided, authorship, motive, viewpoint, audience and date. Charles is arguably not being candid in Source 1, promoting religious toleration to smooth his path to the throne or, as many in Parliament suspected, using it as cover for restoring Roman Catholic rights in the kingdom. Source 2 reflects the mood in Parliament, and can be seen in the wider context of the Clarendon Code. Source 3 argues that neither Presbyterians nor Anglicans had a desire to indulge the King's wish to grant 'liberty to tender consciences', and candidates might go on to develop this point by arguing that at this early stage of the reign, Charles could not afford to get into a dispute with Parliament. Answers will be enhanced by contextual knowledge.

AO2

[14]

2 (a) This question targets:

- (i) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.
- (ii) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements.

Indicative content:**Level 1 ([1]–[2]) AO1a, ([1]–[4]) AO1b**

Answers will mainly offer a descriptive, often superficial, account of the foreign policy of Charles II. Answers will be characterised by defects in accuracy, organisation, a limited vocabulary, poor spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility.

Level 2 ([3]–[4]) AO1a, ([5]–[9]) AO1b

Answers may provide a more detailed account of royal policy, though answers will be characterised by narrative rather than analysis. Answers may find some evidence to suggest that Charles II's foreign policy was motivated by personal rather than national considerations. Candidates might cite the sale of Dunkirk for £375,000 to Louis XIV in 1662, thereby losing a valuable strategic outpost but providing finance for the King. Again, in 1670, Charles, seeking to solve his financial troubles, agreed to the Treaty of Dover, under which Louis XIV would pay him £160,000 each year. In exchange, Charles agreed to supply Louis with troops and to announce his conversion to Roman Catholicism 'as soon as the welfare of his kingdom will permit'. Louis was to provide him with 6,000 troops to suppress those who opposed the conversion. Charles endeavoured to ensure that the Treaty – especially the conversion clause – remained secret. It is debatable whether such moves were in the national interest

Level 3 ([5]–[6]) AO1a, ([10]–[14]) AO1b

Answers would be expected to have substantive knowledge and understanding of the foreign policy of Charles II. At this level, candidates should appreciate that Charles's foreign policy cannot simply be characterised as the selling out of English interests to obtain funding from Louis XIV. For example, reference could be made to the Second Dutch War (1665–1667), which was commercially motivated, and to the War of Devolution, in which England joined Sweden and the Netherlands to oppose Louis XIV's designs on the Spanish Netherlands. Answers will exhibit competent organisation, good vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility, though there may be occasional lapses.

Level 4 ([7]–[8]) AO1a, ([15]–[18]) AO1b

Answers will have more detail. They will be characterised by accuracy, organisation, good vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility. Answers at this level may argue that in relation to foreign policy, the interests of the King and those of the nation were not always at variance. For example, while the sale of Dunkirk was unpopular, it was a costly outpost to maintain;

Charles's marriage to Catherine of Braganza brought, as part of the dowry, Tangier and Bombay under English control. However, candidates will also be conscious that it is difficult to argue that the Third Dutch War (1672–1674) was in the national interest, producing as it did no material gains and contributing to the deterioration in relationship between Crown and Parliament.

AO1a [8]

AO1b [18]

(b) This question targets:

- (i) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.
- (ii) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements.

Indicative content:

Level 1 ([1]–[2]) AO1a, ([1]–[4]) AO1b

Answers will mainly offer a descriptive, often superficial, account of agricultural developments with limited reference to evaluating their nature. Answers will be characterised by defects in accuracy, organisation, a limited vocabulary, poor spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility.

Level 2 ([3]–[4]) AO1a, ([5]–[9]) AO1b

Answers may only look at one aspect of the topic. For example, the point might be made that due primarily to the growth of some of the larger towns, in particular London, there was a stimulus to the production of corn to the extent that supply overtook demand and a surplus was available for export.

Level 3 ([5]–[6]) AO1a, ([10]–[14]) AO1b

Answers will take a more comprehensive view. For example, in relation to grain export, an Act of 1670 removed existing restrictions on the export of corn, while an Act of 1673 granted a bounty of 5s on every quarter of wheat exported. Enclosure of land had begun well before the late Stuart period, but the years 1660–1688 were characterised by a widespread recognition that enclosure allowed for more efficient and profitable use of the land. The influence of the more intensive agriculture of the Low Countries stimulated the introduction of new fodder crops such as clover and turnip. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, organisation, good vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility, though there may be occasional lapses.

Level 4 ([7]–[8]) AO1a, ([15]–[18]) AO1b

Answers will demonstrate a very good understanding of the nature of the changes in English agriculture in this period. In addition to the points referred to above, candidates may also note the improvement in husbandry techniques, chiefly the development of techniques involving fodder crops. It is also worth noting that inward investment in agriculture increased in this period, producing

better farm buildings and more secure fencing and hedging. A balance should be struck, however, in relation to the proposition of 'remarkable progress', in that many of these changes were underway before 1660 and that not all parts of the country experienced the same level of progress. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, organisation, good vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility

AO1a

[8]

AO1b

[18]

OPTION 3 REFORM TO REBELLION 1775–1800

(Answer question 1 and question 2(a) or 2(b))

- 1 (a) **This question targets AO2:** the candidate's ability to interpret and evaluate source material in relation to historical context.

Indicative content:

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Answers will typically paraphrase each source.

Level 2 ([3]–[5])

Answers will explain more fully the detail in the sources and make some direct comparisons. Some of the following points may be made. John Beresford expresses concern about the religious nature of the rebellion, and a desire for reinforcement from Britain, while Beaghan acknowledges his part in the murder of Protestant prisoners by the United Irishmen.

Level 3 ([6]–[8])

Answers will make a fuller comparison and, using contextual knowledge, may provide some explanation of the differing views. The sources both deal with the same subject – the anti-Protestant nature of the 1798 Rebellion, specifically in County Wexford – and seem to agree that Protestants were ill-used by the Catholic rebels. Beresford is relaying information second-hand (note the use of the word 'appears') to Lord Auckland but his account seems to be verified by James Beaghan who was not only an eye witness to events in Wexford but an active participant in them.

Level 4 ([9]–[10])

Answers may use contextual knowledge to more fully explain the views expressed but also give more consideration to authorship, motive, date and mode. In Source 1, Beresford may have the objective of giving as black a picture as possible of the situation in Ireland in order to activate the British government into sending military reinforcements without delay. At the same time, the date of this source must be considered as a factor in Beresford's tone – at this stage no one can be certain that this rebellion will be defeated as easily as it turned out to be. Better-informed candidates might also question the reliability of the author of Source 1, someone who had little sympathy with the Catholic cause in Ireland. Again, candidates might challenge the veracity of Source 2, for although Beaghan was present at the killing of Protestants in Wexford, this is a published confession and the possibility at least exists that it was extracted from him under some form of duress. Yet while acknowledging these points, it is reasonable for a candidate to conclude that both sources tend to support the historical verdict on the nature of the rebellion in Wexford.

AO2

[10]

- (b) **This question targets AO2:** the candidate's ability to interpret, evaluate and use a range of source material in relation to historical context.

Indicative content:

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Answers may rely on paraphrasing the sources or provide a narrative of the subject with little reference to the sources.

Level 2 ([3]–[5])

Answers may make some of the following points. Sources 1 and 2 appear to be fully in support of the proposition that the 1798 Rebellion was primarily a sectarian conflict. Beresford refers to the presence of Catholic clergy in the United Irishmen ranks and to the murder of unarmed Protestants and those taken prisoner, while James Beaghan confesses to having taken part in such actions and comments on the sectarian hatred that seemed to characterise the rebel movement and its supporters. In Source 3, Thomas Pakenham does not make overt reference to the type of sectarianism mentioned by Beresford and Beaghan, but does note that the United Irishmen singularly failed in their objective to unite the people of Ireland.

Level 3 ([6]–[8])

Answers make more detailed reference to the sources and use more contextual knowledge to interpret them and, at the top of this level, may note that John Beresford's depiction of the situation in Source 1 may be motivated by a desire to mobilise the British government to a sense of urgency and action to suppress the rising. His concern about the reliability of the local forces does, however, indicate that the authorities were relying on Irish Catholics to maintain British rule in Ireland, so if this is a sectarian conflict, it is a complicated one. It might be argued that both Sources 2 and 3 support the idea that if the rebellion was not a simple sectarian conflict, then it was at least the sectarian dimension in Irish society that made the United Irish cause a hopeless one.

Level 4 ([9]–[10])

Answers will interpret and evaluate the sources fully in relation to their historical context and in terms of their authorship, motivation, date and mode. In Sources 1, John Beresford may be exhibiting an anti-Catholic bias that had in the past put him at odds with the Castle authorities during the short-lived vicereignty of Lord Fitzwilliam (1795). In relation to Source 2, candidates might question how much reliability can be placed on a 'published confession' but should note that as Beaghan was due to be executed in any event, there was apparently little reason for him to cooperate with the authorities and yet he produced an account that damned the United Irishmen, at least in Wexford. More astute candidates will note the reference to the Orange Order in Source 2 and develop this point in relation to the question. Source 3 gives a different perspective to the other sources, not just in terms of date but in relation to the geographic spread of the rebellion.

AO2

[10]

- (c) **This question targets AO2:** the candidate's ability to interpret, evaluate and use source material in relation to historical context.

Indicative content:

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

Answers will paraphrase each source and make assertions that are not fully supported.

Level 2 ([4]–[7])

Answers will comment that each source provides information from different viewpoints and at different times: first, John Beresford, a member of the Irish executive, is the defence of the established order; secondly, a former member of the United Irishmen who corroborates Beresford's account of sectarian murder by Catholic rebels in Wexford; and, thirdly, a secondary source from a modern historian. Information is provided in each source about the rebellion: Source 1 notes the anti-Protestant nature of the rising in Wexford; Source 2 presents eye witness evidence of events in Wexford; and Source 3 gives an overview of the failure of the United Irishmen but without specific reference to the rebellion.

Level 3 ([8]–[11])

Answers will go into more detail demonstrating the utility of the sources for a study of the 1798 Rebellion. Answers at this level will analyse the sources not just in terms of the information they provide but also in relation to the quality of the evidence – author, date, mode and motive. All the authors are well placed to comment. The author of Source 1, John Beresford, is a member of the Irish executive, and the Protestant ascendancy, and writes from an informed and concerned position. James Beaghan is a former United Irishmen, an eyewitness to the events described, and someone who blames the United Irish commanders for the excesses that took place. Pakenham is a modern historian and expert on the period, who has hindsight and has had the opportunity to consult a wide range of primary and secondary sources. The first sources is a private letter and may therefore reveal the author's true opinions, but Beaghan's account is a 'published confession', about which there may be concerns that it was extracted by the authorities for propaganda purposes. Pakenham seeks to provide an objective and impartial account, but it should be noted that this source does not make specific reference to the 1798 Rebellion.

Level 4 ([12]–[14])

Answers will use a wide range of criteria to assess utility, commenting on the significance of the information provided, authorship, motive, mode, audience and date. Candidates might reasonably conclude that all the sources have value, Source 1 providing an insight into the alarm felt by the authorities at the outset of the rising, yet acknowledging that Beresford may have a prejudiced viewpoint; Source 2 witnessing some of the events referred to in Source 1, but again tempered by doubts about the mode; and Source 3 providing an overview of the sectarian tensions and hostility that bedevilled the revolutionary vision of Wolfe Tone. Answers will be enhanced by the use of contextual knowledge.

AO2

[14]

2 (a) This question targets:

- (i) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.
- (ii) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements.

Indicative content:**Level 1 ([1]–[2]) AO1a, ([1]–[4]) AO1b**

Answers will mainly offer a descriptive, often superficial, account of the rise of the Volunteers. Answers will be characterised by defects in accuracy, organisation, a limited vocabulary, poor spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility.

Level 2 ([3]–[4]) AO1a, ([5]–[9]) AO1b

Answers may provide a more detailed account of the rise of the Volunteers, though responses will be characterised by narrative rather than analysis. Candidates would be expected to point out that with the entry of France and Spain into the American War of Independence, the withdrawal of troops from Ireland to fight in America, and the lack of government funds to raise a militia, there was an apparent need for the Volunteer defence force that emerged in 1778. Answers will have frequent lapses in accuracy, organisation, vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility.

Level 3 ([5]–[6]) AO1a, ([10]–[14]) AO1b

Answers will take a more detailed view. While noting the context and stimulus of the American War of Independence, candidates may note that there was considerable empathy for the American colonists in Ulster where the Volunteer movement first emerged, reflecting the family ties that spanned the Atlantic as a result of decades of emigration from the north of Ireland to the American colonies. Furthermore, Ireland, like America, had experienced a flowering of a sense of colonial nationalism in the eighteenth century in the form of the Patriots in the Irish Parliament. This group was inspired by the ideas of Swift and Molyneaux to seek the realisation of Irish nationhood. It was almost inevitable that the Volunteers should attach themselves to the Patriots in their quest for free trade and legislative independence. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, organisation, good vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility, though there may be occasional lapses.

Level 4 ([7]–[8]) AO1a, ([15]–[18]) AO1b

Answers will be more detailed and comprehensive. Candidates will demonstrate a good understanding of the reasons for the rise of the Volunteers that encompasses not only the context and stimulus of the American War of Independence but also the background influences upon the movement, i.e. Swift, Molyneaux and the Patriots. The war in America highlighted existing grievances and remedial theories espoused by the Patriots in Ireland and

provided the circumstances in which the Irish version of colonial nationalism could reach its zenith.

AO1a [8]

AO1b [18]

(b) This question targets:

- (i) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.
- (ii) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements.

Indicative content:

Level 1 ([1]–[2]) AO1a, ([1]–[4]) AO1b

Answers will mainly offer a descriptive, often superficial, account of the levels of coercion and conciliation in British government policy in Ireland in the period 1789–1800. Answers will be characterised by defects in accuracy, organisation, a limited vocabulary, poor spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility.

Level 2 ([3]–[4]) AO1a, ([5]–[9]) AO1b

Answers may provide a more detailed account of the levels of coercion and conciliation in British government policy in Ireland in the period 1789–1800, though responses will be characterised by narrative rather than analysis. Candidates may note that the government adopted different policy approaches at different times, influenced for example by the impact of the French Revolution, the emergence and development of the United Irishmen or the revival of the Catholic question. Answers will contain frequent lapses in accuracy, organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility.

Level 3 ([5]–[6]) AO1a, ([10]–[14]) AO1b

At this level, answers will offer a more critical assessment of British government policy in Ireland in the period in question. Government policy often veered between conciliation and coercion, as determined by the circumstances that prevailed at any particular time. Candidates will note specific examples of conciliation, such as the Catholic Relief Act of 1793, and specific examples of coercion, such as the Insurrection Act and other repressive legislation passed during Lord Camden's period as Viceroy. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, organisation, good vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility, though there may be occasional lapses.

Level 4 ([7]–[8]) AO1a, ([15]–[18]) AO1b

Answers will be characterised by accuracy, organisation, good vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility. Candidates will demonstrate a balanced and substantive understanding of British policy in Ireland in the period 1789–1800. In addition to the points already referred to, answers may also make reference to the Fitzwilliam episode, General Lake’s pacification of Ulster in 1797, and the British response to the 1798 Rebellion. Candidates will make a judgement based on the proposition posed in the question.

AO1a	[8]	
AO1b	[18]	26

OPTION 4 POLITICS AND SOCIETY IN VICTORIAN ENGLAND 1868 – 1894

(Answer question 1 and question 2(a) or 2(b))

- 1 (a) This question targets AO2: ability to interpret and evaluate source material in relation to historical evidence.

Indicative content:

Level 1 ([1]-[2])

Answers will merely paraphrase each source, and neglect the question.

Level 2 ([3]-[5])

Answers will provide more explanation, though the comparisons will be incomplete. Dale devotes all his energies towards condemnation of the Education Act, while Gladstone is more wide-ranging, identifying the Licensing Act as a source of difficulty.

Level 3 ([6]-[8])

Answers will compare the views of Dale and Gladstone more fully. Dale warns that the allegiance of Nonconformists for the Liberals can no longer be taken for granted, a point which Gladstone acknowledges in Source 2. Dale outlines the reasons for Nonconformist disaffection: their anger at what they see as the weakening of religious instruction in schools. While Dale suggests that the Education Act is the only source of disaffection towards the Liberals, Gladstone believes that “other minor causes” can explain the Liberal defeat. The bitterness of Dale’s comments are unmistakable. He uses words like “deliberately” and “backward and damaging policy” to describe the Liberal education stance, giving the impression that the Liberals did not care for the consequences or underestimated the Nonconformist response. Another key difference is that Gladstone prioritises the Licensing Act as the crucial issue above the Education Act in his party’s demise in the General Election of 1874.

Level 4 ([9]-[10])

Answers will provide more explanation while making their comparison, using some contextual knowledge. Dale’s article is published in 1872, shortly after the passing of the Education Act which he abhors, so emotions are still high. Moreover, the Gladstone government has been in power since 1868, making the timing of the next general election relatively close. Therefore, since the Education Act is now law, candidates may reflect that Dale’s motives are to caution the Liberals as to the electoral retribution they will face, and also mobilise Nonconformists and devise electoral machinery. Gladstone, writing within days of the election result, is more reflective. Writing to his brother, he can afford a level of confidentiality and perhaps self-indictment which is unrealistic to expect from a politician in public.

- (b) **This question targets AO2:** the candidate's ability to interpret, evaluate and use a range of source material in relation to historical context.

Indicative content:

Level 1 ([1]-[2])

Answers will paraphrase the sources, making little reference to the question.

Level 2 ([3]-[5])

Answers will use the sources in a basic response to the question. While Dale's comments came two years before the election, it is probable that after 1874 Nonconformists would claim credit – or responsibility – for the Liberals' defeat. Source 2 only partially acknowledges the role of Nonconformist dissent in the general election defeat. Source 3 claims that the impact of Nonconformist anger over the Education Act was exaggerated.

Level 3 ([6]-[8])

Answers will directly and fully compare the views held by the sources and assess the issue raised by the question. Source 1, although examined retrospectively after the election, contains sufficient evidence to support the proposition in the question. For example, Dale's resentment at the Education Act; his hint at Liberal betrayal by "going against our wishes"; the threat to end "the old allegiance" and "organise our political power". Gladstone is more tentative about the role of Nonconformism as a factor in the election. He places the Licensing question above all others – "torrent of gin and beer". Moreover, he refers to Catholic voters before identifying Nonconformists. Additionally, there are some unspecified "minor causes" of defeat.

Level 4 ([9]-[10])

Answers will provide some contextual knowledge to enhance the analysis. For example, Dale's warnings came true when the National Education League ran candidates against the Liberals in the election of 1874. Liberal election candidates were asked to pledge themselves to amend the 1870 Act to satisfy Nonconformist views, or forfeit Nonconformist support. The Licensing Act did result in a positive and permanent shift of publicans and brewers to the Conservatives, yet Gladstone's letter conveniently ignored all the other domestic issues and foreign policy failures which explained his demise in 1874. Source 3 suggests that Nonconformist actions were but one of several factors in explaining Gladstone's defeat, citing trade union reform, weaknesses in party organisation, and a general antagonism of the middle-class. Conservative Party organisation was flourishing under Gorst, leaving the Liberals lagging behind.

- (c) **This question targets AO2:** the ability to interpret, evaluate and use source material in relation to historical context.

Indicative content:

For Level 4, each source is examined, and a reasoned conclusion given as to value.

Level 1 ([1]-[3])

Answers will paraphrase the content of each source and make an assertion which is not fully supported.

Level 2 ([4]-[7])

Answers will comment on the value of each source, using the content more fully. Source 1 reveals that a once loyal body of support will no longer be forthcoming. Moreover, the authorship is a nonconformist leader, who was clearly in tune with the sentiments of those whom he represented. Source 2 is valuable since it comes from Gladstone and is written in private. Here, he makes no excuses for his defeat, though there may be some conjecture as to his overall judgement. Source 3 is valuable because of the obvious advantages which the professional historian enjoys: access to a wide range of evidence, and plenty of opportunity for analysis.

Level 3 ([8]-[11])

Answers will present a more sustained assessment of the value of each source, and come to a conclusion as to which is the most valuable. In Sources 1 and 2, a good focus on authorship and the amount of detail given will be rewarded. Also, the motive of the source and audience may be commented on. Source 3 may appear the most valuable simply because Adelman presents a wider analysis of the issues.

Level 4 ([12]-[14])

Answers will include some contextual knowledge to validate their assessment of value. Source 1 is valuable because Dale articulated the Nonconformist sense of betrayal from perceived threats to religious equality and freedom inherent in the Education Act. Nonconformists established the National Education League which took the unprecedented step of running its own candidates against the Liberals in the election of 1874. Good answers may remark on the gaps in Gladstone's explanation for his defeat in 1874, and may validly speculate that the "other minor causes" is a gross understatement for his unpopular foreign policy. Here, Disraeli exploited disquiet over the "Alabama" affair and imperial issues to some effect in the election. The value of Source 2 is therefore open to a variety of interpretations. Source 3 is perhaps the most valuable because of its range of explanations for Gladstone's defeat. Here, answers may employ contextual knowledge to endorse the assertions made by Adelman.

2 (a) This question targets:

- (i) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.
- (ii) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements.

Indicative content:**Level 1 ([1]-[2]) AO1a, ([1]-[4]) AO1b**

Answers will present a vague narrative on Salisbury's government.

Level 2 ([3]-[4]) AO1a, ([5]-[9]) AO1b

Answers will provide more details, but the response will be limited. For example, there may be a focus on either domestic or foreign policy.

Level 3 ([5]-[6]) AO1a, ([10]-[14]) AO1b

Answers will provide a more sustained if incomplete assessment of Salisbury's government. There may be some imbalance in the domestic / foreign sphere. Domestically, answers may debate such legislation as the Small Holdings Act, Mines Regulation Act, Housing of Working Class Act and the Labourers' Allotment Act. In foreign affairs, Britain signed the Mediterranean Agreements in 1887 with Austria-Hungary and Italy in response to Russian naval ambitions. In 1890 Salisbury reached agreement with Portugal, France, Germany and Italy over potential disputes with colonial territories.

Level 4 ([7]-[8]) AO1a, ([15]-[18]) AO1b

Answers will be more sustained and evaluative, addressing both domestic and foreign affairs with conviction. In domestic affairs, Salisbury aimed to provide an accommodation for his new Liberal Unionist allies following the split over home rule, as well as introducing much needed reform for the working class. In foreign affairs, Salisbury aimed to maintain peace, protect British interests in the face of any perceived threat from France and Russia, and consolidate Britain's hold over its colonies. At home, Salisbury was a cautious reformer who feared the attack on the rights of property which social reform implied. His government believed in laissez-faire, opposing the extension of state activity while cutting taxes. Yet his domestic record is creditable, benefiting both the farming community and the labourer. To emphasise the priority which his government gave to farming matters, Salisbury established a Board of Agriculture in 1889, with a minister at his head. In foreign affairs, Salisbury is often associated with a period of isolation. Britain remained aloof from the European alliance system, and by 1895 Britain was the only European power not involved in a formal alliance. The passage of the Naval Defence Act of 1889 was designed to curb the threat from Russia and France. By 1895 Britain possessed the largest colonial empire in the world while the Royal Navy was still seen as ruling the waves. *So long as the proposition in the question is addressed, it is immaterial which verdict is reached.*

(b) This question targets AO1a [8] and AO1b [18]:

- (i) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.
- (ii) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements.

Indicative content:**Level 1 ([1]-[2]) AO1a, ([1]-[4]) AO1b**

Answers will present a narrative about trade unions, making little reference to the issues raised in the question.

Level 2 ([3]-[4]) AO1a, ([5]-[9]) AO1b

Answers will provide more details, yet will be incomplete. For example, there may be a limited focus on disappointment or progress.

Level 3 ([5]-[6]) AO1a, ([10]-[14]) AO1b

Answers will address the issue of disappointment and progress experienced by trade unions in this period. There may be an imbalance in the answer or shortcomings in the time period. Trade Unions made progress as a result of government legislation, such as the Trade Union Act of 1871, the Criminal Law Amendment Act and the Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act of 1875. However, even with legal recognition, trade unionism was limited to a small minority of the workforce. By 1888, trade unions had approximately 750,000 members, representing about 10% of all adult male workers in the economy.

Level 4 ([7]-[8]) AO1a, ([15]-[18]) AO1b

Answers will assess in more detail the level of disappointment and progress of trade unions, and make a reasoned verdict as to where the balance lies. The period witnessed the formation of new unions of unskilled casual workers. These unions made some progress, such as the strike of the London Match Girls in 1888, the actions of the Gas Workers and General Labourers' Union in 1889, and the Great London Dock Strike of 1889 which lasted for 5 weeks. However, much of this progress was of short duration, as employers began to fight back in the 1890s. In 1890, the Shipping Federation was created to help break the hold of the Dockers' Union. In 1893 the National Free Labour Association provided blackleg labour to the Federation and other employers. As a result, membership of the Dockers' Union fell from 56,000 in 1890 to 23,000 by 1892. The success of the employers in the docks was similarly matched in cotton and coalmining. If the period 1888–1891 was one of progress for trade unions, then the 1890s was a period of disappointment. In addition, the electoral reforms of the period did not facilitate working men to enter parliament. Working men could only aspire to becoming MPs with sponsorship from a trade union.

OPTION 5 THE PARTITION OF IRELAND 1900 – 1925

(Answer question 1 and question 2(a) or 2(b))

- 1 (a) This question targets AO1a: the candidate's ability to interpret and evaluate source material in relation to historical context.

Indicative content:

Level 1 ([1]-[2])

Answers will merely paraphrase each source.

Level 2 ([3]-[5])

Answers will explain and compare the sources in a limited fashion. Craig argues in favour of the Government of Ireland Bill, outlining the benefits for Ulster Unionists. Source 2, however, raises the concerns of Southern Unionists.

Level 3 ([6]-[8])

Answers will more fully compare and explain the views of Craig and Walsh, providing additional analysis. Craig explains how the creation of an Ulster parliament will strengthen the Unionist stance against any form of Dublin rule. Walsh is concerned that the existence of only an Ulster parliament will make Irish unity less likely. Craig believes that the mere exclusion of Ulster from Home Rule would be an inadequate safeguard, implying that the existence of a tangible form of government would act as a barrier against any forced inclusion into an all-Ireland parliament. Walsh seems “puzzled” about the attitude of his northern counterparts, suggesting that there is a contradictory attitude over the creation of parliament in Ulster. Interestingly, Craig too, admits to a “remarkable” contradiction namely, that Ulster Unionists had fought to resist Home Rule in any form, yet were now willing to embrace a form of Home Rule for Ulster. He justifies this “contradiction” on the grounds that the fundamental objective of Ulster Unionist resistance was being upheld: freedom from Dublin rule. Walsh is concerned that the failure to create a comparable parliament in the south would lead to Southern Unionists becoming more isolated.

Level 4 ([9]-[10])

Answers will add some contextual knowledge to explain the contrasts. For example, the Government of Ireland Bill proposed two parliaments, one for six counties of Ulster, another for the remaining 26 counties, both elected by PR. The debate takes place in the middle of the Anglo-Irish War, hence Craig's comments about the Sinn Fein capacity to make Cavan, Monaghan and Donegal ungovernable for an Ulster parliament. Answers may speculate that Walsh's comments about the “road to the Union” being closed has something to do with the real presence of Sinn Fein in the 26 counties, where they had swept virtually all seats in the 1918 General Election. Interestingly, Craig does not refer to the other reason for accepting a six county Ulster parliament instead of nine, for on the 10 March the UUC believed that the former arrangement would make the Unionist position more secure than the latter.

- (b) **This question targets AO2:** the candidate's ability to interpret, evaluate and use a range of source material in relation to historical context.

Indicative content:

Level 1 ([1]-[2])

Answers will produce a paraphrase of each source.

Level 2 ([3]-[5])

Answers will produce a limited response; e.g. that while Craig had provided a convincing argument for an Ulster parliament, the authors of sources 2 and 3 thought otherwise.

Level 3 ([6]-[8])

Answers will examine the sources in a more sustained way, linking the content to the requirement of the question. Craig outlines several arguments in favour of a six county Ulster parliament. This achieves the objective of the original Ulster resistance of 1912–1914. An Ulster parliament makes Dublin rule less likely. A six county excluded area without a parliament seems more impermanent. Finally, six counties would be more manageable than nine. Walsh is unconvinced, confessing to be puzzled about the Ulster Unionist stance, and concerned about the prospects for Irish unity if Craig's will prevails. More vigorous dissent from Craig's stance is apparent in source 3, where Ulster Unionist delegates from the "abandoned" counties of Cavan, Donegal and Monaghan provide a rigorous account which vindicates a nine county Ulster parliament.

Level 4 ([9]-[10])

Answers will employ some contextual knowledge to enhance their analysis. For example, they could point to the tension which Ulster exclusion caused among Unionists north and south. The UUC had reluctantly agreed to the exclusion of six Ulster counties in the Lloyd George talks of 1916, with the delegates from Cavan, Donegal and Monaghan agreeing only due to the twin crises of the Easter Rising and the Great War. The concerns about exclusion reappeared in sources 2 and 3 in 1920 when, during the Anglo-Irish War, many Unionists feared for their future in a partitioned Ireland. The Ulster Unionists from the three excluded counties were determined to resist a repeat of the 1916 exclusion vote, and provided a detailed and coherent nine county argument based on the sentiments of the 1912 Covenant, as well as economic and geographical considerations.

- (c) **This question targets AO2:** the candidate's ability to interpret, evaluate and use source material in relation to historical context.

Indicative content:

For Levels 3 and 4, candidates should assess the value of each source, and come to a reasoned conclusion as to which source is the most valuable.

Level 1 ([1]-[3])

Answers will describe the content of the sources while making little reference to their value.

Level 2 ([4]-[7])

Answers will comment on the utility of the sources, using the content more fully. Source 1 is valuable because the author is a senior Ulster Unionist, while sources 2 and 3 provide impressive detail about Southern Unionists' attitudes towards the Bill.

Level 3 ([8]-[11])

Answers will present a more sustained assessment of the value of each source in relation to the question, reaching a credible conclusion. Source 1 encapsulated the Ulster Unionist viewpoint: that the Bill is good for Ulster; there should be a parliament for a six county Ulster, and that the nine county alternative is untenable. Source 2, from the IUA, presents the official Southern Unionist view. For them, the Bill was part of their wish for ultimate Irish unity, with appropriate guarantees. The creation of only one parliament for six Ulster counties presents Unionists in the south and west of Ireland with the prospect of living as an isolated and vulnerable minority in some form of 26 county state. The value of source 3 can be gauged at different levels. First, it articulates a "middle" view in the argument, from Ulster Unionists who are going to be omitted from the security of the six county parliament and left with similar apprehensions as their southern counterparts. The amount of detail they give in their statement is impressive, and their references to the geographical breakdown of various counties not only add credence to their arguments but hint at the frustration that they feel.

Level 4 ([12]-[14])

Answers will assess the value of the three sources in more detail, and use some contextual comments to enhance their analysis. Source 1 is from Charles Curtis Craig, brother of Sir James Craig, soon to be appointed as the first Prime Minister of Northern Ireland. Craig's arguments typify the logic which many Ulster Unionists had arrived at namely, that they were making a sacrifice and accepting a form of Home rule which would protect the majority of unionists. His reference to the UVF in 1913 correlates with the view that the Covenant of 1912 was out of step with the Covenant of 1912. By 1913, Carson had privately accepted some form of six county exclusion. This was repeated at the Lloyd George talks of 1916. The Bill of 1920 offered Ulster Unionists the best compromise that they could hope for. The criticism in sources 2 and 3 echoed those made in 1916 when exclusion was debated: that nine county settlement might be tolerated. Sources 2 and 3 are produced within days of each other.

Good answers may remark on some of the issues raised in source 3. Fermanagh and Tyrone dominated the Buckingham Palace Conference of 1914. The doubts about the voting loyalties of Unionist working men referred to the establishment of the Ulster Unionist Labour Association which ran candidates in the General Election of 1918 to ensure that the Unionist vote remained intact.

2 (a) This question targets:

- (i) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.
- (ii) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements.

Indicative content:

Level 1 ([1]-[2]) AO1a, ([1]-[4]) AO1b

Answers will produce a narrative of several events of the Home Rule crisis, with little reference to the issues raised.

Level 2 ([3]-[4]) AO1a, ([5]-[9]) AO1b

Answers will have more detail and relevance. Lapses in accuracy, organisation and grammar will appear.

Level 3 ([5]-[6]) AO1a, ([10]-[14]) AO1b

Answers will address some of the issues in a more confident if incomplete manner, lacking the depth of evidence required for a Level 4 mark.

Level 4 ([7]-[8]) AO1a, ([15]-[18]) AO1b

These answers will be more detailed, providing comprehensive knowledge of the issues involved.

Answer may choose to answer thus:

Asquith and the Liberals can accept some responsibility for their handling of the Home Rule crisis.

Asquith failed to provide any sense of leadership and direction for his cabinet. He neglected the Ulster question, and failed to consider the implications of Ulster Unionist resistance, let alone the role of the Conservative opposition. He allowed himself to be swayed by Redmond's optimistic assurances that Ulster resistance to the Bill was a bluff, and accordingly adopted an optimistic tone in public. Yet Asquith nurtured private doubts about the passing of the Home Rule Bill, which he conveyed to colleagues and the King. Moreover, the Liberals failed to devise any coherent strategy to deal with the issue of Ulster exclusion, especially over the critical concepts of time and area. In cabinet, Birrell, Churchill and Lloyd George expressed enough concerns for the government to have taken the initiative. Instead, the Liberals merely reacted to the crisis it unfolded, such as the Curragh Mutiny and the Buckingham Palace

Conference. Ironically, it was the outbreak of the First World War which “saved” Asquith and his government from the consequences of their failings over Home Rule.

Top level answers will apportion blame to other parties involved in the crisis.

Answers may reflect on the period 1906 – 1911, which accentuated the problems facing the Liberals. For example, the attitudes of the Conservatives following their three general election defeats of 1906 and 1910; their determination to seek revenge on the Liberals after being denied over the budget crisis of 1909 and the passing of the Parliament Act of 1911. By 1912, their new Leader, Bonar Law, was determined to reunite his party, defeat Home rule, break the Liberals and regain power at the next election. In this sense, the conduct of the Conservatives cannot be ignored.

Additionally, the political context of the Home Rule crisis may provide some degree of mitigation for the Liberals.

Other issues, such as the naval race with Germany, violent industrial action and suffragette activities distracted the government.

Additionally, the question of Home Rule was complex. It had split the Liberals under Gladstone. Compromise was difficult to achieve: what form should Home Rule take? What about guarantees for Ulster? How was Ulster exclusion to be achieved?

(b) This question targets:

- (i) AO1a:** the candidate’s ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.
- (ii) AO1b:** the candidate’s ability to present historical explanations showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements.

Indicative content:

Level 1 ([1]-[2]) AO1a, ([1]-[4]) AO1b

Answers will produce a narrative of several events of the Easter Rising, with little reference to the issues raised.

Level 2 ([3]-[4]) AO1a, ([5]-[9]) AO1b

Answers will have more detail and relevance. Lapses in accuracy, organisation and grammar will appear.

Level 3 ([5]-[6]) AO1a, ([10]-[14]) AO1b

Answers will address some of the issues in a more confident if incomplete manner, lacking the depth of evidence required for a Level 4 mark.

Level 4 ([7]-[8]) AO1a, ([15]-[18]) AO1b

These answers will be more detailed, providing comprehensive knowledge of the issues involved.

Answers may choose to answer thus:

The IRB planned and organised the Rising, and played a key role in bringing it about.

The role of key individuals should be examined. For example, T. J. Clarke provided a direct link with the Fenian tradition in his own person, embodying an absolute conviction that the connection with Britain could only be broken by an armed uprising to establish an independent Irish Republic. Answers should comment on the ideology of revolt which was manifest in the writings of IRB leaders such as Pearse, Connolly and Plunkett. Lyons says that “to call the Rising a revolution of the intellectuals would not wholly explain its complexity, but thinkers and writers did play a central role, both in formulating its programme and in setting it in motion”. Connolly involved his Irish Citizens’ Army in the Rising in the hope of bringing about a socialist revolution. The IRB imported guns from Germany, infiltrated the Irish Volunteers, made contacts with republicans in USA, and proceeded with a rebellion which they knew had no military prospect of success.

Other factors should be considered in analysing the reasons for the outbreak of the Rising:

Answers may reflect on the influence of the “New Nationalism”, epitomised by the GAA and the Gaelic League, which created the atmosphere of revolt. They may also comment on the mistakes made by officials at Dublin Castle in the days before the Rising, who failed to act on intelligence that a revolt was imminent at Easter.

The outbreak of the First World War created the opportunity for a revolt to take place. Home Rule was postponed indefinitely. The optimism of a quick victory in the First War had dissipated. Here was a political vacuum, as conventional political activity was now subservient to the needs of the war effort. The Irish Party, hitherto the voice of Irish nationalism, was left in the dilemma of having a mandate for Home Rule but no means of bringing it about. Moreover, Redmond’s speech at Woodenbridge, by creating a split in the Irish Volunteers, provided the IRB with a small group of armed men to manipulate to their advantage. By 1915, war weariness was evident, with a decline in voluntary recruitment in the face of mounting casualties. Kitchener’s refusal to acknowledge the contribution of Irish nationalists caused resentment. The creation of the wartime coalition government in May 1915 made the prospect of a Home Rule settlement in accordance with nationalist aspirations more remote. During 1915 – 1916 the IRB made their preparations for their rising: “England’s difficulty” had provided “Ireland’s opportunity”.

