



*Rewarding Learning*

**ADVANCED  
General Certificate of Education  
2013**

---

## **History**

**Assessment Unit A2 1**

**[AH211]**

**TUESDAY 14 MAY, MORNING**

---

# **MARK SCHEME**

## General Marking Instructions

### 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 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 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.

## 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.

<b>Level</b>	<b>Assessment Objective 1a</b>	<b>Assessment Objective 1b</b>	<b>Assessment Objective 2</b>
	Answers at this level will:	Answers at this level will:	Answers at this level will:
<b>1</b>	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.
<b>2</b>	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.
<b>3</b>	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.
<b>4</b>	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.

## Synoptic Assessment

Examiners should assess the candidate's ability to draw together knowledge and skills in order to demonstrate overall historical understanding. Candidates' answers should demonstrate breadth of historical knowledge and understanding by ranging comprehensively across the period of study as a whole. They should make links and comparisons which are properly developed and analysed and thus indicate understanding of the process of historical change. The knowledge and understanding of the subject should come from more than one perspective – political or cultural or economic – and there should be understanding demonstrated of the connections or inter-relationship between these perspectives.

### Generic Levels of Response for Synoptic Assessment

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

#### **Level 1 ([0]–[5]) AO2(b), ([0]–[7]) AO1(b)**

Answers at this level may recall some accurate knowledge and display understanding of mainly one part of the period and one perspective. The answer will be characterised throughout by limited accuracy and a lack of clarity. Answers may provide a descriptive narrative of events. There will be few links and comparisons made between different parts of the period. Answers will be mainly a series of unsubstantiated assertions with little analysis **AO1(b)**. There may be perhaps an awareness of contemporary **or** later interpretations, but the answer may focus only on one interpretation **AO2(b)**. Answers at this level will be characterised throughout by unclear meaning due to illegibility, inaccurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; there will be an inappropriate style of writing; and defects in organisation and lack of a specialist vocabulary.

#### **Level 2 ([6]–[10]) AO2(b), ([8]–[15]) AO1(b)**

Answers at this level may recall and deploy knowledge which draws from examples across the period. The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy and at times lack clarity. The answer will provide some explanation though at times will lapse into narrative. Links and comparisons will be made but these will not be fully developed or analysed. Answers will contain some unsubstantiated assertions, but also arguments which are appropriately developed and substantiated **AO1(b)**. There will be an awareness of contemporary **or** later interpretations about the subject, but this will be limited and in need of further development **AO2(b)**. Answers at this level will have frequent lapses in meaning, inaccurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; at times the style of writing will be inappropriate; there will be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

#### **Level 3 ([11]–[15]) AO2(b), ([16]–[22]) AO1(b)**

Answers at this level will recall and deploy knowledge accurately, drawing from all parts of the period with clarity and focus. Answers provide focused explanations and make links and comparisons which are developed and analysed, indicating an understanding of the process of historical change. Arguments are developed, substantiated, illustrated and reach a judgement **AO1(b)**. There is a satisfactory evaluation of either contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject **or** a partial evaluation of **both AO2(b)**. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation and some specialist vocabulary.

**Level 4 ([16]–[20]) AO2(b), ([23]–[30]) AO1(b)**

Answers at this level will demonstrate accurate recall of knowledge from across the period studied with clarity and precision. Answers will provide detailed and focused insightful explanations drawing on actions, events, issues or perspectives across the period, and there is an excellent understanding of the connections or interrelationships between these. A judgement is reached using arguments that are fully developed, illustrated and substantiated **AO1(b)**. There is a well-informed and insightful evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations **AO2(b)**. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate; there is very good organisation and appropriate use of specialist vocabulary.

## Option 1: Anglo-Spanish Relations 1509–1609

AVAILABLE  
MARKS

Answer **one** question.

- 1 “Elizabeth’s rejection of Philip II’s marriage proposal in 1559 was the most important turning point in Anglo-Spanish relations in the period 1509–1609.” To what extent would you agree with this statement?

This question requires an assessment of the importance of this particular event as a turning point in Anglo-Spanish relations. Answer will consider a range of other events and compare their impact on Anglo-Spanish relations with Elizabeth’s rejection of Philip II. Other possible turning points should include the divorce of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon, the split with Rome, the Habsburg-Valois dynastic wars, the French threat and the French Wars of Religion, Elizabeth’s Religious Settlement, the Dutch Revolt, the Treaties of Nonsuch and Joinville and conflict in the Americas.

Top level responses will reflect on the themes behind events and consider how far religious, economic or dynastic aims dominated Anglo-Spanish relations. Responses should consider how far international relations were affected by the internal policies of each nation. Answers should focus on whether Elizabeth’s rejection of Philip II’s marriage proposal was the most important turning point in Anglo-Spanish relations or was merely a symptom of changes caused by other factors.

The structure of the answer is immaterial: whether thematic or chronological, adherence to the issues in the question and the quality of evidence is the requirement for creditable marks.

**Answers may deploy some of the following knowledge and contemporary and later interpretations:**

- (a) Answers should focus on how Philip II’s marriage proposal and Elizabeth’s rejection of it could be regarded as a turning point. Responses should consider the political motivations behind the actions of each of these monarchs. Philip II had just signed the Treaty of Cateau-Cambresis which ended the long Habsburg-Valois dynastic war, yet the failure of previous peace agreements suggested that he prepare diplomatically for future hostilities. Philip sought to continue his alliance with the English despite Elizabeth’s religious beliefs. A contemporary comment from Philip like “Better a heretic on the English throne than a French woman” could be used by candidates to highlight the importance of dynastic aims. Answers should show the political intent in his marriage proposal. As a young monarch with questionable legitimacy, Elizabeth must have been tempted to accept Philip’s proposal but her rejection shows the type of monarch that she would be. Responses could suggest that Philip’s pride was hurt by rejection and that this increased his dislike of England which eventually led to war and so the rejection of the marriage proposal was a key turning point.

Anglo-Spanish relations were to decline in the following decades and this may not have occurred if Philip and Elizabeth had married. Candidates could employ contemporary opinions such as William Cecil's advice to Elizabeth on marriage or the historian Belloc's views on who was directing English policy. The good relations of Mary and Philip's period could be attributed to their marriage and this stabilising factor did not exist later in the century. In this way answers may conclude that Elizabeth's rejection of the marriage proposal was the most important turning point in Anglo-Spanish relations in the period 1509–1609. However, responses might reject this view by considering the continuation of good Anglo-Spanish relations in the 1560s. Philip expressed his relief in not having to marry Elizabeth and continued to protect both her and England from both Papal and French threats. Answers may conclude that it was not the marriage issue but other changes which influenced Anglo-Spanish relations.

- (b) Answers should focus on Anglo-Spanish relations in the early part of the period and could suggest that the divorce and split with Rome was the most important turning point in this relationship. Responses should show that relations were good in the early part of the century and Henry VIII's marriage to Catherine of Aragon in 1509 confirmed the alliance established in the Treaty of Medina del Campo. Answers might show how influential Catherine was in supporting a military alliance with Spain against France and that Anglo-Spanish relations remained good even after King Ferdinand's manipulation of Henry VIII. Candidates might refer to contemporary comments made by Catherine of Aragon in letters to her father, Ferdinand of Aragon. Responses should show how good Anglo-Spanish relations were in the 1520s, even after Charles V's victory at Pavia. With Charles V's need for English support lessened by his domination of France after his victory at Pavia, it was not surprising that relations began to decline. Contemporary comment from Henry could be used to show how he desired to use Charles V's successes to make gains in France and this could be supported by historical comment from Guy on the pragmatic foreign policy aims of Wolsey. Henry VIII was desperate for a male heir and by 1527 he openly sought a divorce. Charles V's opposition to this and his influence over the Pope was to make a divorce virtually impossible and was to sour Anglo-Spanish relations. Answers might suggest that this was to create the most important turning point because all further divisions came from this point. Henry VIII's method of achieving divorce was to split the English Church from Rome and this was to create religious differences between England and Spain which underpinned all future areas of disagreement. Responses could suggest that this was the most important turning point in Anglo-Spanish relations. Answers might counter this by showing improved relations in the later 1530s and Henry VIII's and Charles V's alliance against the French in 1543. Religious differences seemed to have little impact at this point or in stopping Charles V's continued alliance with Edward VI and his openly Protestant Protectors, Edward Seymour and John Dudley.



- (c) Answers might argue that the most important turning point was the ending of the Habsburg-Valois Wars in 1558. On each occasion that Spain sought alliance with England it was as a counter to the power of France. Responses should show clear evidence of this with examples such as the Treaty of Bruges in 1521. The only lessening in Anglo-Spanish relations was with Charles V's victory over the French at the Battle of Pavia. Once Charles again felt pressured by the French he sought an English alliance despite his differences with Henry VIII. Contemporary comments by Charles V to his ambassador Chapuys could be used to support this. The decline in Anglo-Spanish relations after 1558 could be said to be due to the peace that existed between Spain and France and was therefore a key turning point. Candidates might use the opinion of an historian such as Woodward on the importance of France in weakening Spain.
- (d) Responses might suggest that it was not peace with France that proved the turning point in Anglo-Spanish relations but rather France's decline. The beginning of the French Wars of Religion in 1562 was to commence nearly forty years of civil war in France. Candidates might use Philip's contemporary comments about Mary Queen of Scots as evidence of his early support for Elizabeth. Philip's support for Elizabeth was replaced by opposition to her inside a decade. In 1570 Philip supported the rebellion of the Northern Earls which aimed to replace Elizabeth with her Catholic cousin, Mary Stuart. Contemporary comments between Philip and his ambassador, De Spes, could be used by candidates to support this and of Philip II repeating this support in the Ridolphi plot, the Guise plot and the Babington plot. Answers might suggest that such a dramatic swing in Philip II's policy was allowed by the turning point of the French Wars of Religion.

Elizabeth's opposition to Philip could be explained by the decline in the French threat. In 1558 Elizabeth was a young Queen with a questionable legitimacy who faced strong opposition, both internally and internationally. In 1558 Mary Stuart, backed by her father-in-law King Henry II of France, proclaimed herself the rightful Queen of England. With Mary's mother running Scotland with the aid of French troops, Elizabeth found herself in a precarious position. The death of Henry II in 1559 followed by the death of his son, Francis II, in 1560, left both Mary Stuart and France in a weaker position. Elizabeth's position improved still further with the outbreak of religious conflict in France and her need for Spanish protection declined. The opinion of historians such as Wilson on Elizabeth as a defensive monarch could be used here and compared to Rouse's view of her as a Protestant crusader. Responses might suggest that declining Anglo-Spanish relations came from this turning point.

- (e) Answers might argue that the most important turning point was Elizabeth I's Religious Settlement of 1559–1571. This settlement made England a Protestant country and highlighted the differences with Spain. Candidates might use the contemporary opinion of Philip II as he saw himself as "the sword of Catholicism" and Elizabeth's religious changes were bound to encounter his opposition. When Philip II sent

the Armada in 1588, it carried an army of priests to restore the true faith to England. Candidates might use the views of historians like Kamen and Davies on Philip and his “black legend” to support his motivation for action. The growing Protestant nature of England saw Englishmen such as Drake view themselves as God’s chosen nation who were to carry the truth to the world. Such beliefs led to clashes, especially in the New World where economic competition added to religious hatred. Without the turning point of religious differences, the conflict of the 1580s may not have arisen.

- (f) The Dutch Revolt beginning in the 1560s could be argued to be the most important turning point in Anglo-Spanish relations. The Netherlands held key economic importance for its Spanish masters and its English trading partners. Philip II’s mishandling of the revolt caused it to run for over 30 years and to be an open sore in Anglo-Spanish relations. Many of the arguments between England and Spain concerned the Dutch. Philip was worried about English assistance to their Dutch coreligionists and Elizabeth feared a Spanish army only a day’s sailing from England’s coast. In 1584 Philip signed the Treaty of Joinville with the French Catholic League and Elizabeth feared a Catholic Crusade against England with invasion coming from the Netherlands. Elizabeth’s reaction was to sign the Treaty of Nonsuch in 1585 which sent troops to support her Dutch allies. Candidates could use the views of Walsingham or Robert Dudley on intervention in the Netherlands to support this argument. The historical opinion of Neale could be used to support this discussion.
- (g) Answers may argue that the death of Elizabeth in 1603 marked a turning point in Anglo-Spanish relations since the conflicts between England and Spain in the 1580s and 1590s were at least partly based on a personality clash between the respective monarchs. This argument is supported by the fact that the Anglo-Spanish War was concluded by James I and Philip III in the Treaty of London, signed in 1604, a year after Elizabeth’s death.

Responses could argue that any of these was the most important turning point in Anglo-Spanish relations.

*Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately* [50]

50

- 2 “Spain’s kings dominated England’s monarchs.” To what extent would you agree with this assessment of Anglo-Spanish relations in the period 1509–1609?

This question requires an assessment of the extent to which Spanish monarchs were more powerful than their English counterparts. Answers should consider how events demonstrated this relationship and if it remained constant across the period. Responses should consider the changing nature of the period and how issues such as religion, which had been a uniting factor, became an area of conflict between the nations.

Top level responses will reflect on how each nation viewed itself. Spain's rise under Charles V came about at a period when Henry VIII was declaring the national identity of England. Answers might suggest that the image each nation had of itself might be different from the reality of their respective positions. The "golden age of Spain" might contradict Spain's chronic financial position of the period and this could have influenced Anglo-Spanish relations.

The structure of the answer is immaterial: whether thematic or chronological, adherence to the issues in the question and the quality of evidence is the requirement for creditable marks.

**Answers may deploy some of the following knowledge and contemporary and later interpretations:**

**(a) Henry VIII and Ferdinand, 1509–1516**

This period saw the young and inexperienced Henry VIII succeed his father as the English monarch. Anglo-Spanish relations had been established on a good footing as the Treaty of Medina del Campo had created strong links between the new Tudor dynasty and a newly united Spain. Ferdinand had over thirty years of experience as a monarch and so his relationship with Henry VIII was rather unbalanced. In 1509 Henry married Ferdinand's daughter, Catherine of Aragon, and this made Henry more supportive of a Spanish alliance. Candidates might use the contemporary view of Henry VIII who saw himself as a "warrior prince" as a means to explain his hope to gain glory in war with France. In the Anglo-Spanish war against France in 1512 Ferdinand persuaded Henry to land English troops in southern France. Ferdinand used this as cover for his own capture of Navarre and then signed a peace deal with France leaving Henry and England on its own. Contemporary comments from Machiavelli support the view of Ferdinand as a manipulative ruler and historian Elliott points to his use of England to make gains in France and Italy. Answers should show that Anglo-Spanish relations in this period seem to support the statement of Spanish monarchs controlling their English counterparts.

**(b) Henry VIII and Charles V, 1516–1547**

The first three years of this period saw the more experienced Henry VIII in a strong position yet Charles V's election as Holy Roman Emperor was to quickly redefine their relationship. Charles was now one of Europe's leading figures controlling huge resources of land, money and military forces. England and Henry found themselves as a second rate power compared to the dominance of Spain and France. Despite this imbalance of power, England was to find itself in a much more influential position than its power indicated.

With the Spanish Habsburgs locked in a dynastic struggle with their French counterparts, the Valois, England, under the direction of Thomas Wolsey, was more important than its power suggested. In

1521 a formal alliance was created between England and Spain against France. Henry VIII operated as an equal with Charles V and, as Henry was married to the Emperor's aunt, it could be suggested that he controlled the relationship. By 1525 Charles V's victory over Francis I at the Battle of Pavia had changed international relations. Charles ignored Henry's suggestions of joint action in France and clearly demonstrated his control over Henry. Candidates might use the contemporary opinions of Charles V in his diary describing Henry VIII as not a true friend. Henry's plan of his own kingship of France and Charles' lordship over all Europe demonstrates that Henry saw Charles as the dominant force at this point.

Henry's desire for a legitimate male heir demanded a divorce and answers should show how this changed Anglo-Spanish relations. Charles V saw Henry's attempts to divorce his aunt, Catherine of Aragon, as an attack on the standing of the Habsburg family. Despite this opposition, Henry pressed ahead with the divorce issue and, when blocked by Charles' control of the Pope, he was prepared to break with Rome. The poor relations of the 1530s could not be said to allow either monarch to control relations. Candidates could use the historical debate of Elton or Haigh on the importance of the split with Rome and its influence on Anglo-Spanish relations. The 1540s were to see a marked improvement in Anglo-Spanish relations. The deaths of Catherine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn removed many of the obstacles to good relations and Charles was once again desperate for an ally against France. Contemporary opinions expressed by Charles to his ambassador Chapuys could be used by candidates to support this position. Henry was keen to resume good relations and Charles to strengthen his international position so, despite Spain's stronger status, Spanish monarchs may not have controlled relations.

**(c) Edward VI, Mary I and Charles V, 1547–1558**

Answers might suggest that this period is often referred to as "the mid-Tudor crisis". With a minor and a woman as rulers of England, it could be argued that they had difficulty in ruling England and were bound to be controlled by the powerful Charles V. Protector Somerset and Northumberland dominated during the reign of Edward VI and, despite England's move to Protestantism, they maintained good relations with Spain. Responses might question why "his Most Catholic Majesty" Charles V was prepared to maintain links with an openly Protestant country and monarch. Although much more powerful than Edward VI, Charles V still required English assistance and this limited the amount of control he had over Edward.

Mary I's accession to the English throne seemed to strengthen Anglo-Spanish relations. Mary was strongly Roman Catholic and pro-Spanish and this was demonstrated by her desire to marry Philip Habsburg. Candidates might use the contemporary view expressed by Parliament, in limiting Philip's power as King, to support the power of England's monarchs. Answers might suggest that Mary was a weak

ruler and that her husband controlled England and eventually dragged it into war against the French, which led to the loss of England’s last possession in continental Europe, Calais. Candidates could consider the views of Pollard who supports the idea about the weakness of Mary’s government. Responses could consider the limitations that the English parliament placed on Mary and Philip’s marriage to emphasise that Spanish monarchs did not control their English counterparts.

**(d) Elizabeth I and Philip II, 1558–1603**

Answers might suggest that the late 1550s and 1560s did see Philip II controlling Elizabeth. Much of Elizabeth’s reign was characterised by questions over her legitimacy. In 1558 Mary Stuart, with the support of her father-in-law, Henry II of France, proclaimed herself Queen of England. Elizabeth was desperate for support and this was provided by Philip II and might suggest his control of Elizabeth. Philip II stated “better a heretic on the throne, than a French woman” and this could be used to explain Philip’s support for Elizabeth. The mildness of Elizabeth’s Church Settlement of 1559–1571 encouraged Philip to feel that he could restore Elizabeth to the true faith. By 1568 Philip saw the error in this idea and he agreed with the Pope’s decision to excommunicate Elizabeth.

By the 1570s Elizabeth’s confidence had grown and mirrored the growth in England’s confidence. Candidates might use contemporary views of men like Hawkins who requested reform of the navy to challenge the Spanish on the high seas. With a growing maritime and trading background, England viewed itself as God’s chosen Protestant nation. Growing conflict between England and Spain, with war breaking out in 1585, shows the clash between Elizabeth and Philip and that neither was able to control the other. The views of Wernham and Neale could be used by candidates to demonstrate the motivations for Elizabeth’s foreign policy.

**(e) James I and Philip III, 1603–1609**

Both nations found themselves worn out by long years of war with huge financial deficits created in England and Spain. The Treaty of London served both nations, allowing Spain to deal with its Dutch problems but the terms seemed to favour England. Responses could suggest that there was no control of English monarchs by their Spanish counterparts. Candidates might quote contemporaries like Robert Cecil and the Duke of Lerma on the aims of each nation in the Treaty of London. The opinion of Roper could be used to support the weak position in which Spain found itself.

*Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately* [50]

**Option 1**

50

**50**



## Option 2: Crown and Parliament in England 1603–1702

AVAILABLE  
MARKS

Answer **one** question.

- 1 “The reign of Charles I (1625–1649) transformed the relationship between Crown and Parliament more than any other reign in the period 1603–1702.” How far would you agree with this verdict?

This question requires an assessment of the extent to which the events of the reign of Charles I were the most significant in changing the relationship between the King and his Parliament.

Top level responses will reflect on the impact of the Constitutional Revolution, the Civil Wars and the execution of the King. Whig historians have tended to argue that the increasing power and influence of Parliament was due to a more gradual process. A comparison will be made with the importance of the reigns of other Stuart monarchs.

Responses may begin with an outline of the relationship between Crown and Parliament at the outset of the period, during the reign of James I.

The structure of the answer is immaterial: whether thematic or chronological, adherence to the issues in the question and the quality of evidence is the requirement for creditable marks.

**Answers may deploy some of the following knowledge and contemporary and later interpretations:**

**(a) Charles I (1625–1649)**

Two civil wars and the execution of Charles I reveal the extent of the breakdown in the relationship between the King and his Parliament. During his period of Personal Rule, Charles I’s abuse of his prerogative financial devices and Laudian changes to the church had alarmed the gentry. Candidates could employ the contemporary opinion of the Earl of Strafford to illustrate the perspective of the Crown in this period. The Constitutional Revolution of 1640–1642 revealed the extent of opposition Charles faced from Parliament. It challenged the King’s right to appoint his own ministers and increased its influence over the church by abolishing the Court of High Commission. The King’s prerogative financial devices were restrained and the prerogative courts were abolished. Monarchy’s power to call, prorogue and dissolve parliament was weakened by the Triennial Act.

However, Parliament did not achieve all its objectives and the change in its relationship with the King was hardly “revolutionary”. Candidates may analyse the significance of the conflict between Crown and Parliament in the two civil wars of the 1640s and the defeat of monarchy on the battlefield. It could be argued that the execution of Charles I represented the most significant transformation of the position of Parliament. However, the execution was carried out by a minority and the difficulty in finding an alternative political settlement is evident in the restoration of Charles II in 1660. Candidates may employ an observation from a historian such as Morrill about the importance of the execution.

**(b) James I (1603–1625)**

James I called parliament more readily than his predecessors and his reign was marked by cooperation and conciliation rather than conflict. James did clash with his Parliaments over finance, particularly impositions and monopolies. He was criticised for his inconsistent religious policy and his failure to lead the Protestant cause in European war. However, while his relationship with his Parliaments was at times strained, it would be inaccurate to see his reign as a time of transformation. Contemporary comment from Buckingham and the views of historians such as Wormald could be used to explain the impact of the reign of James I.

**(c) Charles II (1660–1685)**

Charles II was restored with virtually the same powers as his father, although the reforms of the “Constitutional Revolution” remained in place. Despite failing to regain his right to collect prerogative taxation and maintain prerogative courts, Charles had, actually, retained most of the key powers. He could call, prorogue and dissolve Parliament, veto legislation and dispense individuals from the law. He appointed ministers, controlled foreign policy and remained the Head of the Church. Arguably, the Restoration Settlement had transformed the position of Parliament by returning the monarch to the seat of political power and even strengthening his position. The Cavalier Parliament passed a Triennial Act in 1664 which weakened the 1641 version; the Militia Act reasserted the Crown’s control of the armed forces and the Clarendon Code created a strong alliance with the gentry and Church. The strength of the Crown’s position is evidenced by Charles II’s ability to eventually rule without a Parliament (1680–1685). Any transformation of the relationship between Crown and Parliament during his reign represented a strengthening, rather than weakening, of the position of the monarchy. The revisionist interpretation of the Restoration and reign of Charles II may be employed.

**(d) James II (1685–1688/1689)**

James II aimed to secure religious and political toleration for Catholics; however, his methods caused a breakdown in his relationship with Parliament and brought about the Glorious Revolution. Suspending the Test and Corporation Acts was seen as an attack on the Anglican Church and his promotion of Dissenters only succeeded in uniting his opponents. The Court of Ecclesiastical Commission and Declarations of Indulgence provoked Parliament to take steps to protect the Church and ensure a Protestant succession. His promotion of Catholics into positions of influence alarmed his opponents and would be tackled by the Bill of Rights. Contemporary comment from the Earl of Clarendon could be employed to illustrate the impact of the actions of James II. While the prerogatives of the monarchy were not directly altered during the reign of James II, his actions created the circumstances for the Revolution Settlement which resulted in significant changes in the role and position of Parliament.

**(e) William and Mary (1689–1702)**

The Glorious Revolution represented a significant change to the power and position of monarchy and arguably transformed the relationship between Parliament and the Crown. Joint monarchy challenged the very concept of the divine right of kings and the Coronation Oath and Bill of Rights signalled a new relationship between Crown and Parliament. The Crown's dispensing power and abuse of legal proceedings was ended and the levying of taxes and calling of a standing army now required parliamentary consent. Although this represented a transformation of Parliament's position during the reign of James II, these moves were designed to fix the abuses of his reign rather than revolutionise the relationship between Crown and Parliament.

The most significant change in the position of Parliament came in the final decade of the century and was a direct result of the European war. The revised Triennial Act of 1694 helped to ensure the regular calling of Parliament and, to finance the war, William established a Commission of Accounts and Civil List, allowing Parliament a degree of control over the King's spending. By servicing the Crown's National Debt, using the Bank of England, Parliament became an essential and permanent institution of government. The Act of Settlement of 1701 determined the religion of the monarch and clarified Parliament's role in foreign affairs. Increasingly it was in the monarch's interests to ensure that his ministers had the approval of Parliament. Candidates may include an observation from an historian such as Starkey about the changing relationship between Crown and Parliament in this period.

This final decade saw an increasingly effective working relationship between King and Parliament. Parliament met almost annually and saw its range of powers expand. Good responses may note that James I enjoyed a similar working relationship with his Parliament and, although the prerogative position of Parliament had changed, it was arguably not transformed. The Crown retained the right to choose ministers, determine foreign policy and call, dissolve and prorogue Parliament. It could even be argued that the increased financial strength of the monarchy meant the Crown was, in some respects, stronger than ever before.

*Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.*

[50]

50

- 2 "Clashes over religion caused the most significant changes to the relationship between Parliament and the Crown in the period 1603–1702." To what extent would you accept this statement?

This question requires an assessment of the extent to which clashes over religion caused the most significant changes to the relationship between King and Parliament.



Top level responses will analyse the importance of other factors such as finance, foreign policy or the liberties of the subject. Parliament secured the greatest concessions from the Crown in the Constitutional Revolution, at the execution of Charles I, the Restoration Settlement, the Glorious Revolution and during the Nine Years' War in Europe.

The structure of the answer is immaterial: whether thematic or chronological, adherence to the issues in the question and the quality of evidence is the requirement for creditable marks.

**Answers may deploy some of the following knowledge and contemporary and later interpretations:**

**(a) The relationship between Crown and Parliament before 1640**

During the reign of James I (1603–1625) Crown and Parliament certainly clashed over religion, although arguably the most significant conflicts were over finance and foreign policy. The inconsistency of James I's religious policy, notably his leniency towards his Catholic subjects, invoked criticism from Puritans in Parliament. Tensions over religion were particularly evident when James resisted leading the Protestant cause in the Thirty Years' War. Despite these clashes, there was no significant change in the relationship between Crown and Parliament during the reign of James I.

Indeed, the Crown was not forced to make any real concessions before the Constitutional Revolution of 1640–1642. During the early years of his reign Charles I faced direct criticism in Parliament over his foreign policy failures and his money raising methods. Opposition intensified during Personal Rule as he allowed Archbishop Laud to make radical, and largely unpopular, changes to the church. The importance of religion in creating opposition is evidenced in the rebellion of the Scottish Covenanters. Criticism of his financial policies reached their height after the introduction of Ship Money. Contemporary opinion from Archbishop Laud could be given, while candidates could refer to the arguments of historians such as Sharpe.

**(b) The "Constitutional Revolution" of 1640–1642**

The Crown had to make substantial concessions during this period but, at this point, religion, finance and liberties were all involved. Foreign policy was not the most contentious issue, although there had been some debate in the 1630s about Charles I's Hispanophile tendencies. 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 his strengthened financial position to build up a standing army and rule, as an absolutist, with no regard for the liberties of his subjects.

Parliament's demands in the Constitutional Revolution were not solely focused on religion, although the failed Root and Branch Petition did demand an end to the episcopacy. Parliament did succeed in removing a number of the King's financial devices and in securing a more regular

calling of Parliament through the Triennial Act. Indeed, Parliament seemed most intent on ensuring that Charles could not rule without it again. Contemporary comment from MPs like Strode and the views of historians such as Williams could be used to explain the clash between the Crown and Parliament in this period.

**(c) The Execution of Charles I, 1649**

In 1649 the monarchy was weak. It had surrendered to Parliament and the Army – and what could be lower than regicide in 1649? Religion had certainly been a central issue in the Civil War, indeed the demands of the New Model Army, after it had secured victory in the two civil wars, reflected a determination to secure a new religious settlement in England. The attempts to reach settlements with the King ultimately failed because Charles could not be trusted over religion. It is arguable that it was the prevarication and duplicity of Charles himself which was the most important cause of his eventual execution, rather than any specific financial, religious or prerogative issue. Candidates could employ the contemporary opinion of leading figures such as Vane to illustrate the reasons for, and impact of, the execution. Even at the time of the execution royalist support was already building over the idea of Charles I as a religious martyr, and the monarchy began a counter-attack which led ultimately to the Restoration.

**(d) The Restoration Settlement and the reign of Charles II, 1660–1685**

Charles II returned after a period of economic, political and social turmoil. The power and position of both monarchy and the Anglican Church was restored. The Clarendon Code reasserted the authority of the Church of England and re-established the partnership of Crown, Church and Gentry.

The Restoration Settlement had confirmed all the reforms passed by Parliament in the Constitutional Revolution but it also restored a strong monarchy, with Charles II inheriting virtually the same powers as his father. Indeed, Charles was able to use his loyal Cavalier Parliament to further strengthen his position. The early years of his reign were marked by co-operation and partnership with Parliament rather than conflict, although there was some opposition to his foreign policy failure in the Dutch War. Candidates may include an observation by an historian such as Carter about the impact of the Restoration Settlement. Charles II's attempts to allow religious tolerance through the Declaration of Indulgence provoked intense opposition but it was the potential succession of his Catholic brother James which provoked the most extreme reaction. Enflamed by fears of a Popish Plot, Parliament attempted to exclude James from inheriting the throne, causing Charles to finish his reign in a period of Personal Rule. The contemporary opinion of James, Duke of York may be employed. While there is no doubt that religion played a central role in this breakdown in the relationship between Crown and Parliament, it was also provoked by concerns about foreign policy and prerogative power. Nevertheless, the Exclusion Crisis did not actually change the power or position of Parliament or the Crown, although it had created a breakdown in their relationship which was to have serious consequences in the reign of James II.

**(e) James II, The Glorious Revolution and the Revolution Settlement, 1685–1689**

Although James inherited a position of stability from his brother, his pro-Catholic actions and determination to establish religious freedom of worship ultimately resulted in his downfall. His Catholicising policies had offended his subjects but they were also worried about his financial strength, his growing standing army and threat to liberties. Certainly, it might be argued that religion was the underlying concern. The monarchy was certainly weak in 1688–1689 as James II had been compelled to flee the country and his successor had to negotiate the “Glorious Revolution” with Parliament. Contemporary comment from the Earl of Rochester and the views of historians such as Bliss could be used to explain the impact of the Glorious Revolution. The relationship between King and Parliament was changed as a result of the new coronation oath, the Bill of Rights, the Mutiny Act, the Toleration Act and the revised financial arrangements.

**(f) Changes to the Role and Status of Parliament during the reign of William III**

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. Although it could be argued that the war in Europe was to defend the Protestant status of the English monarchy, ultimately it was foreign policy, rather than religion, which caused the changes in the relationship between Crown and Parliament which occurred in the final decade of the century. The creation of the Commission of Accounts, Civil List and the passing of a revised Triennial Act enabled Parliament to play a more incisive and regular role in government. Arguably, it was this willingness of Parliament and the Crown to co-operate, rather than any specific conflict, which made the most significant change to the relationship between the two. Candidates may employ the contemporary opinion of the Earl of Shrewsbury to illustrate the relationship between King and Parliament in this period.

By the end of the century the relationship between Parliament and the King had certainly changed. Parliament now played a more direct role in government, particularly in the area of finance. It was also able to influence the King’s religious and foreign policy. Clashes over religion had provoked many of these changes although financial issues and conflicts over the liberties of the subjects had played their part. Arguably, it was the issue of foreign policy in the reign of William and Mary that was most significant in creating the circumstances for change. The revisionist interpretation of this period may be explored.

*Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.*

[50]

50

**Option 2**

50

### Option 3: Liberalism and Nationalism in Europe 1815–1914

AVAILABLE  
MARKS

Answer **one** question.

- 1 “From both an economic and a political perspective, liberalism in Europe made steady and consistent progress throughout the period 1815–1914.” How far would you agree with this assessment?

This question requires an outline of the key features and aims of the economic and political dimensions of liberalism, and an assessment of the progress it made during the period from 1815 to 1914. Answers should consider whether that progress was steady and consistent across the period. Differing outcomes in different periods and in different countries should be noted, with attention paid to the gradual growth of individual freedoms, as well as the growth and subsequent decline of free trade within the period.

Top level responses will reflect on, for example, the slowness of liberal ideas to take hold until the decline of the Habsburg Empire began to become more apparent, as well as the contrast between the progress made in gaining individual liberties and that of responsible governments as the period wore on. The structure of the answer is immaterial: whether thematic or chronological, adherence to the issues in the question and the quality of evidence is the requirement for creditable marks.

**Answers may deploy some of the following knowledge and contemporary and later interpretations:**

- (a) The progress of liberalism, whether steady and consistent or not, must begin with the Treaty of Vienna. By restoring ancien regime monarchies, and establishing Austrian hegemony over central Europe, it dealt a blow to liberals whose hopes had been raised by the principles and some of the practices of the French Revolution. Liberals tended to be middle class, and in a largely pre-industrial Europe there were simply not enough of them to exert sufficient pressure to achieve constitutions, which they saw as a guarantee of personal and parliamentary rights. Metternich’s counter-intelligence system and his use of the Holy Alliance elsewhere effectively nipped most liberal stirrings in the bud. Austrian troops were sent to Italy in 1820 and 1831, a French army dispatched to restore the despotic Spanish monarchy in 1823, and the German Confederation prevailed upon to clamp down on academic freedom after student demonstrations.
- (b) Answers should show, however, that some limited progress was made during the 1815-1848 period, with reference to the *Zollverein*, a free trade area which by 1835 included most of the German states. In political matters, despite Charles X’s obvious contempt for constitutional procedures, France at least possessed limited Charters (granted in 1814 and 1830), while in South West Germany the constitutions promised when the Confederation was established were maintained throughout the period. It may be noted that these limited examples do not display “consistent” progress. Contemporary

examples of interpretation for the earlier period might include Metternich's justification for his anti-liberal stance, or a clause from the 1814 French Charter guaranteeing press freedom.

- (c) 1848 will be mentioned as a setback for liberalism. Although initially rulers were compelled to grant constitutions, and liberals found themselves either in power or attempting to work with the old monarchs, they were unable to establish themselves for any length of time. The old regimes retained control of the armed forces, while liberals proved indecisive or naïve. They had little empathy with the needs of the peasantry, who remained apathetic or even hostile to the liberals, and in France and in Austria an upsurge of radicalism frightened the property owning classes, the natural constituency for liberalism. Yet, despite the defeats, some progress took place, with Piedmont holding on to its constitution even after Habsburg influence was restored, while within the Empire the last vestiges of serfdom were abolished. Above all, the old rulers had been thoroughly scared by the revolutions, recognised the changing circumstances, and were prepared to make liberal concessions, so long as these were on their own terms. Historians such as Peter Jones might be utilised for their views on the medium-term as well as the short-term repercussions of 1848.
- (d) Thus far it may be concluded that there was little steady or consistent progress for liberalism, with constitutions maintained in France and some of the German states, but not in Italy or the Habsburg territories, while free trade flourished only in Germany and in Britain. The years after 1848 initially saw regression rather than progress, with the French turning to the restoration of the Empire and Napoleon III utilising press censorship and limiting the rights of the Assembly in order to bolster his own power. Yet his promise of "order first, liberty later" was not an empty one. In the 1860s a series of reforms brought into being the "liberal Empire", with Ollivier, an avowed republican, as its Prime Minister. His acceptance of the post underlined a new, less idealistic and more pragmatic approach on the part of the liberals, one which would help produce a surge in liberalism's fortunes. In Piedmont Cavour modernised his state in the 1850s, making it a showcase for liberal values. He went on to display a diplomatic finesse not usually associated with earlier nineteenth century liberals by unifying and imposing the liberal Piedmontese constitution on Italy. In Germany Prussian liberals were still numerous but, despite Frederick William IV granting his own constitution after the revolutionary outbreaks of 1848 had been quelled, the introduction of a three tier voting system left the King in a powerful position, and the Manteuffel era of the 1850s was a bleak one for liberal progress. Nevertheless, the Prussian Liberals became a powerful force in the *Landtag*, so much so that they were able to thwart von Roon's plans for army reform. Here, however, progress ceased for five years, as Bismarck simply ignored parliament to bulldoze the reforms through. By 1867, with successful wars leading to the establishment of the North German Confederation, the National



Liberals, as much in awe of Bismarck's achievement as other groups, were founded, going on to become Bismarck's chief allies in the *Reichstag*. In Austria after 1850 the Bach Era meant a return to authoritarian government, but in the 1860s Franz Josef gave some hope to liberals with a series of constitutional experiments. It took the defeat of 1866 to provoke major progress, however, with the Fundamental Laws granting freedom of the press and association. In economic terms liberalism made important gains in the middle of the nineteenth century, the most high profile success being the Cobden-Chevalier Treaty of 1860, which greatly reduced tariffs between Britain and France. The best answers may argue that the "golden period" centred on the 1860s contrasted sharply with the periods before and after, and does not suggest "steady and consistent progress". "Interpretations" might include the views of historians such as Roger Price on whether Napoleon III's Empire was liberal, or Mork's views on the supposed capitulation of German liberals to Bismarck.

- (e) The heyday of economic liberalism was not to last. Harvest failures and stock market setbacks in the mid-1870s resulted in a depression affecting most of Europe. Manufacturers in industrially retarded countries had been less keen on free trade than those in Britain and Germany, while grain imports from North America hurt farming interests. Accordingly, spreading from Germany, protection was reintroduced across the continent. A further defeat for economic liberalism followed with the introduction of welfare schemes (for example in Germany and Austria) which involved the state in a way that contrasted sharply with classical liberal, laissez-faire beliefs. The rise of socialism, largely the result of wider suffrages, meant that liberalism as a bourgeois and individualist creed was threatened. Irene Collins offers some interpretations on this theme. In one area liberalism arguably flourished in the late part of the period as individual rights were extended (even Russia achieved basic civil rights after the 1905 Revolution), but this was not always accompanied by the growth of parliamentary power. Bismarck abandoned the National Liberals in 1879, but they had already shown illiberal tendencies with their support of the *Kulturkampf*, and would go on to offer enthusiastic backing for Tirpitz's naval expansion after 1900. But the *Reichstag* remained relatively powerless, and towards 1914 the Kaiser ruled largely as an authoritarian monarch, as did Franz Josef in Austria, where again individual freedoms were not necessarily matched by responsible governments (reference might be made to the historical debate on the extent of the Second Reich's authoritarianism). Italy was not a good advertisement for the progress of liberalism, with free trade economically harmful to the South, a hostile papacy and a parliament which became notorious for corruption and cronyism. Answers may find more evidence of steady and consistent liberal progress in France, where, after the fall of Napoleon III, the Third Republic displayed both liberal instincts and a willingness to fight for them. Federalists and Legitimists were confronted and defeated in the 1870s, as was the neo-Bonapartist Boulanger in the 1880s and syndicalist strikes in the

1910s. The Chamber of Deputies had, however, been exposed as corrupt at the time of the Panama Scandal, while, although the liberals were on the side of the angels, it took twelve long years to exonerate the innocent Dreyfus. (Ruth Harris' book on Dreyfus might be cited for her views on liberal responses to the Affair).

Most answers will perceive that liberalism endured a difficult beginning after 1815, made perceptible progress after 1850, while after 1870 parliaments did not always flourish, nor did laissez-faire, yet at the same time civil rights tended to grow. It is likely that "progress" will be recognised, but that its "steady and consistent" nature will be queried. Well-argued material on either side of the debate will be rewarded.

*Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately* [50]

50

- 2 "The unification of Germany was the greatest achievement of nationalism in Europe in the period 1815-1914." To what extent would you accept this verdict?

This question requires consideration of the process of German unification: the obstacles in the way of a unified Germany, the failure of German nationalists to achieve anything substantial before the 1860s, and the successes of that decade, placing particular stress on the role played by Bismarck, his diplomacy and the wars that led to the formation of the German Empire in 1871. Secondly, there has to be some treatment of other nationalist successes during the period, including, for example, the unification of Italy, Hungarian home rule and the independence of Belgium and a judgement made as to whether German unification was in fact nationalism's greatest achievement. The best answers may, in addition to the above, consider the nature of the Second Reich: was it a genuine nationalist achievement or a Prussian takeover? Comparisons with nationalism's achievements elsewhere, and contrasts between the spectacular success of the 1860s and the failures of the earlier, and later, periods will probably be present.

**Answers may deploy the following knowledge and contemporary and later interpretations:**

- (a) Nationalism had made tentative progress under Napoleon, with steps towards unification in Germany and Italy, and the partial recreation of Poland, but the Treaty of Vienna brought a brutal end to such nationalist aspirations (contemporary interpretative material might cite Metterich's anti-nationalist rationale). Over the period 1815–1860, nationalists who wished to unify or rid themselves of foreign oppression were generally frustrated, defeated by the opposition of the Great Powers, especially Austria. Only Greece and Belgium attained it in the years before 1860. The achievement of independence by the Greeks was not inconsiderable. They had been rebelling against the Ottoman Empire since 1821, but were locked in a stalemate until rescued by Allied intervention after 1826. Britain, France and Russia fought to defeat the

Turks and ensure the recognition of an independent Greece by 1832. Belgium was unhappy at its second-class status under Dutch rule, imposed as part of an “arc of containment” around France. Protests against discrimination became riots and when secessionists seized control of the protest movement the Great Powers recognised that the Kingdom of the Netherlands had failed, leading to Belgian independence in 1831. Answers may see Greek or Belgian independence as major achievements, particularly because they represent an early overturning of the post-war settlement (a quotation from Ray Pearson on the significance of 1830 in the history of nationalism might be utilised here). These “nationalist” successes can be played down because they ultimately depended upon Allied permission. Many answers will recognise the significance of the *Zollverein*, often cited as an important step towards German unification, but the best answers will note that in 1866 almost all the *Zollverein* states, for all that they were content to be part of a trading bloc encompassing much of “Germany”, chose to fight against Prussia in a war which, when it was lost, would lead to the unification of Northern Germany.

- (b) In support of the proposition, the weaknesses of pre-1850 nationalism may be cited. In Italy, the ease with which risings in 1820 and 1821 were suppressed, the failures of Mazzini throughout the 1830s and 1840s, and the nationalist humiliation in 1848 made the successes of the 1860s all the more remarkable. Italy may be seen as a rival for the tag of “greatest achievement”. The country was rapidly united after the war of 1859, and its emergence as an independent state might be seen as an achievement to rank with the creation of Germany. Nationalist sentiment was well developed in Italy, and Cavour made use of this, but leadership from Piedmont, which he had helped to make the most advanced state in the peninsula, would be crucial. He also scoffed at the idea of *Italia fara da se*, believing that Italy alone could not hope to oust the Austrians, recruiting instead French, and later Prussian, help for the task. The conquest of the South was undertaken by Garibaldi, a genuine nationalist, but his spectacular progress north might have been halted by Austria had it not already lost the war of 1859 and Lombardy. The slow decline of Austria aided the Italian cause, but Garibaldi’s daring, Cavour’s diplomatic courtship of Napoleon III and his cultivation of the National Society all contributed to a significant achievement. Dennis Mack Smith’s views on Cavour could usefully be referred to here.

The emergence of Hungary as a self-governing state within the Habsburg Empire in 1867 was another important victory for nationalism. The Magyars had for some time been seeking independence, before being crushed in 1849 after briefly holding their own. But the deal negotiated by Francis Deak for Hungary, falling short of full self-government, was largely the result of a new realism forced on those charged with preserving the integrity of an Empire which had recently suffered devastating defeats by the French in North Italy and by the Prussians at Sadowa (Pelling’s belief that the Habsburg Empire was doomed after 1867 could be used here).



- (c) The German achievement commands the greatest respect, and, given the nature of the question, should be dealt with in appropriate detail. A loose Confederation of 39 states, largely under the control of the Austrians, became a Prussian-led Empire in less than a decade. Bismarck's political and diplomatic ability saw him stand firm, albeit unconstitutionally, against a vehement Liberal majority as von Roon sought to increase the size of the Prussian army and reduce the liberal influence of the *Landwehr*. With his military hand strengthened he enticed Austria into the Danish War, and contrived the terms of the Convention of Gastein as a further trap for the Austrians, luring them into a war which culminated in the establishment of the North German Confederation in 1867. Similarly, Napoleon III was stampeded into a declaration of war by a French public inflamed by Bismarck's deliberately provocative editing of the Ems Telegram. Bismarck's careful preparations for war deserve consideration. The decision for Italians to engage Austria on its southern flank, deliberately vague promises to Napoleon III to keep France neutral in 1866 and a Treaty of Prague moderate enough to prevent an Austrian desire for revenge all showed Bismarck's diplomatic cunning. His appeal to German nationalism, as in the carefully cultivated storm over Schleswig in 1863, was usually a cover for Prussian aggrandisement, but still served to win over many German nationalists. German unification was not, of course, the work only of Bismarck. Von Moltke proved a superb general in the field, while von Roon's rebuilding of the army was vital. The speed of Prussian mobilisation, the Dreyse needle gun, and the Krupp 6-pounder cannon all contributed to Prussian/German military superiority. Much of this would not have been possible without the coal and iron of Prussia, as well as its rapid industrialisation. Fritz Stern might be quoted to support this argument. Better answers may, while acknowledging the speed, scale and future significance of the creation of the German Empire by 1871, query whether this was a victory for nationalism. The dominance of Prussia over the new state it had created was all too evident, while the close relationship between liberalism and nationalism, a prominent feature of the earlier history of the ideology, was swept aside. Bismarck's private views on his loyalty to Prussia rather than Germany offer useful scope for interpretations.
- (d) After 1870 other nation-states were formed, although none of the same size or political significance as Germany or Italy. Bulgaria and Albania emerged less as a result of their own endeavours than of the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–1878 and the Balkan Wars respectively, aided by the steady retreat of Turkey in Europe. Norway's independence was unopposed by the Swedes, and did not, unlike other nation-state creations, make any significant geo-political waves.

Answers may mention, by way of contrast with Germany and other "successful" nationalist campaigns, that a number of nation-states had to wait until the Great War for their moment, notably the Irish, Poles, Czechs and South Slavs. They might also wish to consider whether "success" is judged merely by the foundation of the state, or whether

stability, responsible government and treatment of minorities should be considered. Thus Italy suffered from a corrupt parliamentary system and a divided North and South, (“We have created Italy, now we have to create Italians” (D’Azeglio) is a useful contemporary interpretation), Germany persecuted Catholics for a period, and Yugoslavia never really reconciled its different minorities. Finally, some might consider that a strong sense of nationalism, developed through cultural means, whether a nation-state resulted or not, is a “success” for nationalism.

*Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately*

[50]

**Option 3**

AVAILABLE  
MARKS

50

50

## Option 4: Unionism and Nationalism in Ireland 1800–1900

AVAILABLE  
MARKS

Answer **one** question.

- 1 “When supported by the Catholic Church, Irish nationalists succeeded; when this support was lacking, they failed.” To what extent would you accept this assessment of constitutional and revolutionary nationalism in Ireland in the period 1800–1900?

This question requires an assessment of the role played by the Catholic Church in the success of constitutional and revolutionary nationalism in this period. Top level responses will examine the proposition clearly, and explain how the role of the Catholic Church was a factor in the success or failure of these two strands of nationalism. Regarding constitutional nationalism, answers may reflect on the response of the Church towards the activities of Daniel O’Connell and Parnell, and groups connected with them such as Young Ireland and the Land League. Regarding physical force nationalists, some specific reaction of the Church towards Emmet, Young Ireland or the Fenians is required. Good responses may conclude that at various times the fortunes of all nationalists were influenced by several factors, of which the Church was only one. The extent of these influences will be made clear by the argument in the answer.

**Answers may deploy some of the following knowledge and contemporary and later interpretations:**

- (a) Constitutional nationalists did benefit from the support of the Catholic Church at various times in this period. Daniel O’Connell was the beneficiary of clerical endorsement during his campaign to achieve Catholic emancipation. It was the clergy who collected the “penny rent”, the fighting fund for the campaign. The clergy persuaded O’Connell to mobilise the 40 shilling freeholders in key by-elections, kept order at rallies and, through the writings of Bishop Doyle, enhanced the legitimacy of the campaign. Candidates could refer to contemporary comment from Catholic clergymen such as Bishop Doyle, or from historians such as McCartney about the role played by the Catholic Church in assisting O’Connell. Parnell received the support of the Catholic Church during his campaign to achieve home rule in the 1880s. The Parnell testimonial, a national fund designed to rescue Parnell from debt and reward him for his patriotic achievement, was effectively launched by Dr. Croke, the Archbishop of Cashel, in March 1883. In October 1884, the hierarchy entrusted the care of the Irish Catholic educational interests to the Home Rule Party and Parnell. By 1885 leading clergymen were given honoured position in the organisation of the Home Rule Party. Reference could be made to historians such as Lyons about the support given by the Catholic Church to Parnell.

(b) The support provided by the Catholic Church was only one of several factors which influenced the extent to which constitutional nationalists were successful during this period. O'Connell's successful emancipation campaign was also attributable to his tactics, powerful personality, the support of the Catholic middle class and, crucially, the good fortune that his campaign reached a climax at a time when the Tory government was at its weakest. Observations from contemporaries could be utilised to illustrate O'Connell's leadership qualities during the emancipation campaign. O'Connell's mixed fortunes in his liaison with the Whigs in the form of the Lichfield House Compact owed more to the political realities and circumstances of the time. His failure to achieve the repeal of the Union was influenced by his own shortcomings in leadership, the absence of the 40s freeholders and his row with Young Ireland. Reference could be made to historians such as O'Ferrall regarding O'Connell's disappointments after the success of emancipation. Additionally, he faced a combination of Peel's resolve to maintain the Union at all costs, as well as his reforms such as the Maynooth Grant which was designed to lessen clerical enthusiasm for repeal. Candidates could employ contemporary comment from Peel explaining his determination to uphold the Union. Reference could be made to historians' interpretations regarding the impact which Peel's reforms had on O'Connell's repeal movement. Ultimately, the outbreak of the Famine and its legacy shattered any aspirations for organised constitutional nationalists for the next twenty years.

Parnell's success in obtaining land reform and promoting the home rule agenda at Westminster came about because of a wide range of factors. Davitt, the Land League and the involvement of former Fenians in the New Departure were crucial in the pressure for land reform. The long-standing problems of agriculture – known as the “land question” – and the difficulties faced by the majority of the peasantry all existed before Parnell. For most of the Catholic hierarchy the Land League was a highly suspect organisation, partly because of the involvement former members of the Fenian movement and partly because of its association with agrarian violence. Parnell's creation of a tightly knit, unified and pledge-bound party at Westminster made him into a formidable force which government could not ignore. Candidates could employ contemporary comment from Parnell outlining his views on the land question and the role of the Home Rule party at Westminster. Moreover, Gladstone was a statesman willing to take the political risks involved to bring social and political reform for Ireland. However, the Catholic Church did contribute to Parnell's demise, since, following his divorce scandal in the 1890s, he was disowned. Gladstone, too, because of pressure from the nonconformist influence in the Liberal party, was forced to abandon Parnell. British nonconformist leaders, whose home rule convictions were, like those of Gladstone, interlinked with Christian principles, now saw Parnell as a blight on a moral cause. Candidates could use the assessments of historians such as Bew and O'Brien on the reasons for the downfall of Parnell.

- (c) The Catholic Church offered no support to revolutionary nationalists in this period, which contributed to their failure to achieve their common objectives of severing the connection with Britain by means of force. However, clerical opposition was not the only reason for the failure of physical force nationalists to achieve their objectives.

Emmet's revolt in 1803 received no clerical support, but its failure was due to the fact that it was badly planned, with neither sufficient men nor arms to achieve its objectives. This uprising in the Dublin Liberties in July 1803 was easily suppressed by the yeomanry, and in the short term was notable insofar as it claimed the life of Lord Chief Justice Wolfe. Emmet and other leading conspirators were captured, tried and hanged. Candidates could draw on interpretations from historians such as Kee regarding Emmet's rebellion. Young Ireland failed miserably in its rebellion of 1848. The Catholic Church was already suspicious of its attitudes towards Catholic education prior to 1848. However, the failure of this 1848 revolt had more to do with the Famine and the lack of any adequate planning on the part of the participants. Fenianism in the 1860s suffered because of a hostile response from the Catholic hierarchy. Clerical antagonism towards the Fenians can be explained in several ways. The Fenians represented a connecting link with the Young Ireland revolutionary gesture of 1848. Cardinal Cullen led the Catholic Church into a formidable barrier to any hopes that the Fenians had of winning any semblance of popular support. The Church declared it sinful for Catholics to join secret, oath-bound societies. Any revolutionary assault on the established order or property was condemned. Cullen moulded the clergy to caution Catholics against godless revolutionaries. He was anxious, not that his priests should stay out of politics, but that they should only enter political activity in a manner of which he would approve. Excommunication of Catholics was threatened for Fenian involvement. Cullen was sustained by the Vatican declaration, the Syllabus of Errors in 1864, which pronounced against secret societies all over Europe. Reference could be made to comments from Catholic clergymen condemning the Fenian movement. However, other factors diminished Fenian projects. The response of government, by means of spies and legislation, was appropriate and effective. The Fenians failed to mobilise support from either the Catholic middle class or Presbyterians. The movement was handicapped by a divisive leadership and woeful preparations. While perhaps 50 000 turned out in the rebellion of 1798, less than 10 000 were mustered for the rebellion of 1867. Observations from historians such as Moody or Lyons could be utilised to assess the failure of the Fenian revolt of 1867.

Ironically, the execution of three Fenians in the aftermath of their failed revolt witnessed a shift in the relationship between popular Catholicism and the Fenian movement. The Catholic Church participated in the public outpourings of anger at the deaths of what became known as the "Manchester Martyrs". At mass on the day following the executions, priests prayed for the souls of the three martyrs. Priests and laity

collaborated in solemn mock funerals. While the Catholic Church was by no means approving of Fenian aims or strategy, there was a blurring of the distinctions between constitutional and revolutionary traditions in the period after 1867. As with the Easter Rising of 1916, so in 1867 the execution of Irish rebels created a support for Fenianism which had hitherto been lacking. Candidates could refer to contemporary reaction in Ireland to the deaths of the Fenians, as well as assessments from historians such as Lyons and Kee.

*Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately* [50]

50

- 2 “Economic considerations determined their attitudes towards the Union and the methods they used to defend it.” How far would you agree with this assessment of the supporters of the Union in the north and south of Ireland in the period 1800–1900?

This question requires candidates to examine the attitudes towards the Union held by its supporters in the north and south of Ireland. Top level responses will address the proposition widely. Economic considerations partly explain why support for the Union was so strong, but the extent of these considerations was not equally shared. Economic considerations had differences in emphasis. Religious motives were more influential in shaping unionist opinion towards the Union in the north than in the south of Ireland. Moreover, attitudes to the empire impacted more strongly on the support for the Union for those in the south. Their relationship with each other can be best measured by examining the activities of the various organisations established to uphold the Union. Their titles and methods are indicative of social and geographical contrasts.

**Answers may deploy some of the following knowledge and contemporary and later interpretations:**

- (a) Economic considerations influenced the attitudes of the supporters of the Union in the north and south of Ireland. Ulster unionists believed that their industrial progress would be damaged by any attempt to repeal the Union. Belfast’s industry grew after 1801, a success that was attributed unhesitatingly to the Union (“look at Belfast and be a repealer if you can” was Henry Cooke’s famous comment), but no less important than the extent of this industrial growth was its nature: semi-detached from the rest of the Irish economy, and export-orientated. Many commentators drew attention to the industrial progress of shipbuilding, linen and ropemaking, and the fact that the northern part of the country had a proud and world-wide reputation. Reference could be made to contemporary Ulster unionist businessmen such as Thomas Sinclair, or from organisations such as the Belfast Chamber of Commerce. Southern unionists had a different emphasis, and feared that their agricultural prosperity would be undermined by the establishment of a home rule parliament in Dublin. The widening of the franchise in the form of the Reform Acts of 1867 and 1884, along with



the Secret Ballot Act of 1872 and the reform of local government in 1898, all coalesced to make the landowning interest apprehensive about its security. The activities of the Land League and the violence of the Land War of 1879–1882 indicated that such apprehensions had some credibility. The election of 69 MPs to the Home Rule Party in 1880, followed by Gladstone's first home rule bill six years later, prompted Southern unionists to form the Irish Loyal and Patriotic Union to co-ordinate their response. Candidates could refer to contemporary statements from Southern unionist organisations such as the Cork Defence Union regarding their agricultural interests. The differences in emphasis regarding economic considerations may be linked to the social structure of unionism.

- (b) Social background determined the attitudes to the Union in the north and south of Ireland. Many of the leaders of northern and southern unionists came from agricultural or business backgrounds, and this social standing represented the material interests of their wider following. Defined in social terms, unionism in Ireland was a coalition of the Irish landed interest and northern Presbyterian commercial class. Landlords such as Midleton and Lansdowne were prominent in the south, while businessmen such as Thomas Sinclair provided leadership at the Unionist Convention at Belfast in 1892. The northern Presbyterian middle class endorsed the Union and, to a lesser extent, the Empire partly because this is where their economic interests lay. Southern Irish landlords believed that their social and political influence was declining after the Famine, and so looked to the Union as a more reliable bulwark than an Irish parliament dominated by those who might accelerate land reform without safeguarding the landlord interest. Candidates could employ contemporary comment from Belfast businessmen such as Sinclair, or Southern unionist landlords such as Clanrickarde.
- (c) Attitudes towards religion determined attitudes toward the Union, though this was more prevalent in the north than in the south of Ireland. Religious motives were expressed with greater forcefulness among Ulster unionists than among their southern counterparts. The influx of Catholics into Belfast in search of employment caused sectarian tension, which exploded into violence at moments of political crisis during this period. The city experienced rioting in 1872 and later in 1886, on the occasion of the introduction of the first Home Rule Bill. Then, sporadic rioting over a five-month period resulted in 32 killed and 371 injured. There were also rioting in Derry in 1870 and 1883. Faced by the threat to the Union by the Repeal Association of Daniel O'Connell, the Rev. Henry Cooke addressed a meeting of 40 000 unionists at Hillsborough, promising to lead those in attendance against what he believed was the onslaught of Roman Catholicism. The Protestant Colonisation Society was formed in 1830 when emigration was threatening the Protestant ascendancy in Ulster. This Society aimed to ensure that all lands vacated through emigration would continue to be occupied by Protestants. Occupiers of such lands were

also forbidden to marry Catholics, or risk forfeiture of their holdings. Reference could be made to contemporary comments from northern unionists regarding their religious concerns, or employ comments from leading unionist newspapers such as the *Belfast Newsletter*. By contrast, religious attitudes were less important in shaping the attitudes of Southern unionists. Since they were a scattered minority, who depended on the goodwill of their Catholic neighbours, Southern unionists highlighted the fact that the Union was beneficial to all. It was a recurring theme of literature and speeches that the question of the Union was not a religious issue at all. Moreover, Catholics were made welcome into Southern unionist organisations. The Cork Defence Union in 1885 declared that the Union was “non-sectarian and non-political”, and said that they aspired to unite together “all friends of law and order of all classes”. William Kenny, a leading Catholic lawyer who won the St. Stephen’s Green seat in Dublin in 1892, was an example of a Catholic supporting the Union in the south. Pushed into politics by the shock of the Home Rule Bill of 1886, Kenny said, “We are determined to show that Unionist Ireland is not represented by Ulster alone”. Candidates may draw on comments from leading Southern unionist writers such as Lecky, or the later interpretations from historians such as McDowell. Good answers may link these contrasts in religion to the geographical distribution of unionism.

- (d) Imperial considerations impacted on the support for the Union, especially in the south of Ireland. The whole concept of the imperial ideal, and the fact that Ireland occupied a place in the largest empire in the world, was a key motivation in attracting support for the Union from the south of Ireland. It was argued that Ireland shared in the prosperity, prestige and security that the British Empire bestowed. It was widely believed that any loosening of ties with Westminster, in the form of Home Rule, would ultimately lead to the demise of the Empire. Good responses may examine the social background of the leaders of southern unionism to explain this devotion to the Empire. Midleton and Dunraven served the Empire in administrative capacities, while most of their contemporaries were educated outside Ireland, had great experience of travel, and thus perceived Ireland’s place in the world in a wider context. Candidates could utilise contemporary comment from Southern unionist organisations such as the Irish Loyal and Patriotic Union or the Irish Unionist Alliance on the theme of Empire.
- (e) An assessment of the titles and methods of their respective organisations illustrates the contrasts in the methods used by the supporters of the union during this period. Geographical considerations impacted on the methods which the supporters of the Union used to protect their interests, reference to which reveals great contrast in their relationship. While Ulster unionists comprised a population of 800 000 out of 1.2 million, their southern counterparts represented only 250 000 out of a population of 2.2 million in the three remaining provinces. In the north, members of Young Ulster, founded by Frederick Crawford, possessed firearms and ammunition. In 1885, Ulster unionists used the



threat of force in their response to the Home Rule threat. Unionist Clubs, under Lord Templeton, were formed in 1893, followed by the creation of the Ulster Defence Union by Edward Saunderson in 1894 for the purpose of collecting funds and organising resistance to Home Rule. Lord Randolph Churchill's visit to Belfast in February 1886 was memorable for his exhortation that "Ulster will fight and Ulster will be right". Candidates could employ assessments from historians such as Rees or Kee regarding Ulster unionist methods. The methods of Southern unionists were quite different. They used their social and political contacts, along with their wealth, to produce propaganda, publish literature and contest elections. In 1885 the Irish Loyal and Patriotic Union financed 46 election contests in Ireland and Britain. The Irish Unionist Alliance managed meetings, distributed manifestoes and petitions, and organised tours of Ireland for British electors. Southern unionists exploited their political influence in the House of Lords where, by 1886, of 144 peers with Irish interest, 116 owned land in the south and west of Ireland. The fact that the House of Lords retained the power of veto over government legislation during this period meant that such social and political contacts were a formidable weapon against Home Rule. Contemporary comment from Southern unionist organisations could be referred to, as well as interpretations from historians such as McDowell. These differences between the supporters of the Union are conveyed by their self-perception, which is symbolised by the very titles of their organisations. In the south, the word "Irish" was prominent, while in the north, the word "Ulster", which suggests a special feeling of identity, featured widely. Examples are "Irish Loyal and Patriotic Union", "Ulster Loyalist Anti-Repeal Union", "Young Ulster" and "Ulster Defence Union".

*Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately*

[50]

50

**Option 4**

**50**

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

AVAILABLE  
MARKS

Answer **one** question.

- 1 “The most important motive of every leader of the Soviet Union between 1917 and 1991 was to promote the ideas of the Revolution of October 1917.” To what extent would you agree with this statement?

This question requires an assessment of how far the Soviet Union and its leaders attempted to promote the revolution as the primary goal of their foreign policy.

Top level responses will reflect on the motivations of individual leaders and consider what other perspectives could be used to understand their actions and assess the nature of the proposition at the heart of the question.

The structure of the answer is immaterial: whether thematic or chronological, adherence to the issues in the question and the quality of evidence is the requirement for creditable marks.

**Answers may deploy some of the following knowledge and contemporary and later interpretations:**

**(a) 1917–1924**

Candidates will draw upon a range of material from across the period that allows them to address the question. Candidates may initially draw attention to the authority Lenin wielded over foreign policy, observing that he rather than Trotsky ensured the withdrawal from World War One and the cancellation of all foreign debts. It is evident in these actions, and also in the ensuing Civil War, that Lenin sought to secure the revolution as a primary objective. However, candidates may point out that Lenin adopted a dual approach with the early establishment of the Comintern and the subsequent Russo-Polish War, which, while initially defensive in character, was perceived as an opportunity to promote the revolution rather than merely protect it. As Condren commented, “the Soviet leadership pursued its aims with whatever means were at its disposal”.

Candidates may point out that Lenin was prepared to adapt policy to circumstances and as such was willing to enter trade agreements with Britain and Germany in the early 1920s. As Lynch has argued, “Lenin adopted an essentially realistic approach.” Also Lenin himself commented: “We stand for an alliance with all countries without exception.” Equally, candidates may draw attention to the role of different foreign commissars and speculate that they influenced the direction of foreign policy, whether it was Chicherin with his anglophile tendencies or later Litvinov with his push for collective security. Of course, it could also be argued that the foreign commissars merely reflected the wishes of Lenin or Stalin respectively rather than being a major determinant of foreign policy themselves. Thus, candidates can argue that throughout the 1920s Soviet foreign policy was quite pragmatic but, given the opportunity, its leaders would have promoted the revolution.

**(b) 1924–1945**

It could be argued that, like Lenin, Stalin also adapted policies as the international situation dictated. However, it is commonly argued that Stalin adopted a more inward looking foreign policy of “socialism in one country” as opposed to Trotsky’s more internationalist “permanent revolution.” As Volkogonov has argued: “From a frontal attack on the citadel of imperialism, with the aim of igniting world revolution, Stalin switched to the strategy of prolonged siege.” It is also reasonable to assert that Stalin was primarily attempting to protect, rather than promote, the revolution, even though there were to be significant shifts in the nature of the Soviet Union’s foreign policy throughout his rule. For example, candidates may draw attention to the ideologically committed “left turn” of the late 1920s when foreign communist parties were ordered to distance themselves from the “social fascists” of the moderate left. However, such policies were abandoned with the emergence of Nazism and the explicit threat it posed. Candidates may point out that changes in direction, such as the adoption of collective security and its associated treaties with France and Czechoslovakia, and the joining of the League of Nations in 1934, could be considered as a willingness to forego the promotion of the revolution in the interests of security. This argument is supported by Lynch who maintained that “Soviet foreign policy was primarily concerned with finding allies to nullify the German danger”.

It could also be suggested that such pragmatism also determined the limited involvement of the Soviet Union in the Spanish Civil War, although it could be argued that Stalin was also using this as an opportunity to settle political scores with the Trotskyists in Spain and also, opportunistically, seizing of the Spanish gold reserves. Candidates could, however, argue that in a way Stalin was promoting communism *per se*, in that it was communism and the Soviet Union that was standing up to fascism, not democracy. This view had currency at the time.

The Munich Conference of 1938 brought an end to any hopes the Soviet Union may have had that collective security would be a buffer against expansionist fascism and thus the Soviet Union was to sign the Nazi-Soviet Pact in August 1939. While it could be argued that such a surprising pact was designed to buy the Soviets more time from the inevitable Nazi advances and was therefore a defensive measure, candidates may wish to explore the event from other angles. The possibility that the Soviets were trying to bring about a war between Fascism and Capitalism could be considered and that they hoped to profit from such a conflict in terms of promoting the revolution. Equally, candidates may seek to suggest that Stalin was inherently brutal and was more than willing to sign a pact with the Nazis given the territorial expansion it brought, not so much to promote or protect the revolution, but rather as a reflection of imperial ambition. There is considerable scope at this point to discuss how different schools of historians have interpreted this particular set of events. Candidates could consider the arguments put forward by any of the following schools: The German School, The Collective Security approach and the Orthodox Soviet interpretation.

World War Two and the Grand Alliance can reasonably be understood as a fight to save the Soviet Union. Indeed, since it was presented as the Great Patriotic War, it might be reasonable to argue that Stalin was attempting to guarantee the survival of the nation rather than promote international revolution.

**(c) 1945–1953**

In the era following the Second World War Two there is the opportunity to consider whether Stalin was merely seeking to protect the Soviet Union or was attempting to establish a communist empire in eastern Europe and thus promote the revolution. On the one hand, there is the takeover of eastern European nations and the establishment of pro-Moscow governments. Candidates could consider how this was achieved in countries such as Poland or Czechoslovakia and consider to what degree these actions are best understood. The legacy of World War Two and the use of the Atomic bomb may well have led Stalin to establish a buffer zone as a form of defence. However, it could be argued that Stalin seized the opportunity to do what Lenin was unable to do and build a “red bridge” into Europe and successfully promote the revolution. Once again the post-war world has occasioned much debate amongst historians and thus affords students the opportunity to consider the arguments of orthodox, revisionist and post-revisionist historians.

Equally, candidates could analyse the manner in which Soviet actions were undertaken with regard to Germany and the division of not just the country itself but also of the capital, Berlin. It could be argued that Stalin was essentially reacting to western initiatives and, while being genuinely fearful of a resurgent Germany, the Berlin Blockade and the consolidation of power in East Germany were the only options he possessed at that point.

Candidates might also consider Soviet actions in southern and western Europe, assessing to what degree they cast light on Stalin’s primary motivations. The lack of involvement in Greece, or the Italian post-war elections, may hint that Stalin had limited territorial ambitions and those he possessed were designed to establish a buffer zone. Indeed, McCauley has argued that “Stalin’s two main concerns, in short, were money and security”.

**(d) 1953–1964**

With the death of Stalin, the Soviet Union was faced with opposition from capitalist powers but also the need to consolidate its hold on communist regimes in Eastern Europe. This was reflected in a series of military and diplomatic events during the leadership of Khrushchev. Candidates may focus on the creation of the Warsaw Pact as an example of maintaining control or as a response to the existence of NATO and the inclusion of West Germany in its structures. Equally attention could be given to Khrushchev’s break with Stalinism but also his subsequent repressive actions in response to the Hungarian

Uprising in 1956. Equally they may point out that the Soviet Union sought a more conciliatory approach to relations with the US dominated capitalist West with reference to the Geneva Conference of 1955 and the withdrawal of troops from Austria. Once again, the concern with maintaining control over Eastern Europe was evident with regard to the building of the Berlin Wall in 1961 and this could be contrasted with the more positive diplomatic developments that ensued in the light of the Cuban Missile Crisis. One line of analysis may seek to emphasise that Khrushchev essentially sought to revert to a Leninist style of “peaceful co-existence” and as such this was less about promoting the revolution, but rather about consolidating the status quo. Indeed, Khrushchev himself argued that “there are only two ways: either peaceful co-existence or the most destructive war in history”. Alternatively, candidates may draw a distinction between the security concerns that influenced Khrushchev’s decisions with regard to Hungary and the Eastern Bloc and his desire to see improvements in relations with Western states.

**(e) 1964–1982**

The leadership of Brezhnev offers candidates the opportunity to highlight continuities with the previous regime but also changes that occurred, particularly with regard to the improvement in relations with the capitalist West. Notable episodes that could be considered and used to illustrate these points include the uprising in Czechoslovakia in 1968 and the subsequent announcement of the Brezhnev Doctrine. Once again, it appears that the Brezhnev regime was not so much concerned with promoting the revolution but rather ensuring Soviet domination over Eastern Europe. Within Europe there was little attempt to export communism beyond its existing confines. The Brezhnev years could also be presented as an example of the willingness of the Soviet Union to seek peaceful co-existence with capitalist powers as an attempt to protect the revolution. With regard to the former, Mason has argued that it should be viewed as an attempt by the Soviet Union to “minimise tensions and avoid dangerous crises”. Most notably this is evident with regards to *Ostpolitik* and later *détente*. Brezhnev himself stated in 1971 that “we stand for the dismantling of foreign military bases. We stand for a reduction of armed forces and armaments in areas where military confrontation is especially dangerous, above all in central Europe”. However, candidates may like to emphasise that the motivating forces behind such relations were in large part economically driven, whether as a result of the need to curtail excessive military spending or through a desire to increase domestic productivity.

The end of *détente* emerged as a result of the Soviet engagement in Afghanistan. This was presented to the world by the United States as Soviet expansionism and led Reagan to argue that the Soviet Union was “the focus for evil in the modern world”. However, it could also be suggested that Brezhnev was attempting to limit Islamic fundamentalism from spreading to the Soviet Union and thus undermining the revolution, rather than promoting it. However, his

actions could also be understood in the context of what has been termed the Second Cold War which gave the appearance of an aggressive Soviet Union seeking to expand its influence beyond its borders once more.

**(f) 1982–1991**

While candidates may comment on the limited impact of both Andropov and Chernenko, one would expect some serious consideration of the leadership of Gorbachev. While it can be argued that Gorbachev was deeply motivated to reform the Soviet Union, through both domestic and foreign policy initiatives, candidates can illustrate how the renunciation of the Brezhnev doctrine was ultimately to lead to the complete undermining of the very thing he sought to protect. Candidates may seek to draw links between the economic imperatives and the security demands of the Soviet state and how Gorbachev tried to overcome this problem and, in doing so, brought about the collapse of the Soviet Union. Indeed, Phillips has argued that the Soviet Union “could not sustain the resources needed to pursue an Empire”. In this regard Gorbachev was definitely not engaged in the promotion of revolution.

*Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately*

[50]

50

- 2** “Before 1945 the opponents of communism in Europe were unsuccessful because they were divided, after the Second World War, they were very successful because they were united.” How far would you accept this verdict on the period 1917–1991?

This question requires an assessment of the extent to which the opponents of the Soviet Union were unsuccessful before 1945 because of their divisions but very successful in the years after 1945 because of their unity of purpose and approach.

Top level responses will reflect on the extent of division between the different opponents of the Soviet Union prior to 1945 and how far this altered in the years after World War Two. They will also discuss how successful the opponents of communism were prior to and after 1945.

The structure of the answer is immaterial: whether thematic or chronological, adherence to the issues in the question and the quality of evidence is the requirement for creditable marks.

**Answers may deploy some of the following knowledge and contemporary and later interpretations:**

**(a) 1917–1933**

Candidates may reasonably argue that there were initial divisions among the opponents of communism as a result of the legacy of World War One. Distinctions could be drawn between Britain, France and



Germany. There was a clear desire to destroy the Soviet Union evidenced through the involvement of France and Britain in the Civil War on the side of the Whites. At this stage it would appear that the opponents of communism were indeed divided and the methods used by the some of opponents of communism were aggressive. Churchill remarked that he wanted to see Bolshevism strangled “in the cradle.” The early 1920s witnessed the deepening of the divisions that had initially been apparent and the aims were also to alter. In the initial years the French and British were clearly unsuccessful in their attempts to destroy the Soviet Union.

Candidates may argue that Britain sought the isolation of the Soviet Union despite treaties such as the Anglo-Soviet Trade Agreement of 1921. Essentially relations were hostile as evidenced in both the Curzon Ultimatum of 1923 and the Zinoviev letter of 1924.

By contrast, Germany through the Treaty of Rapallo in 1922 and the subsequent Treaty of Berlin saw the two pariah nations work together. Furthermore, the series of German treaties after Locarno which sought to assuage Soviet concerns over its western borders witnessed an essential division in the western opponents of communism. Even though the Soviet Union was hardly at the heart of international relations, neither was it totally isolated. This was despite the fact that, as Hobsbawm has noted, the “victorious allies wanted to make the world safe from Bolshevism”.

**(b) 1933–1945**

The rise of Hitler saw a reversal of relations in terms of the positions of Britain, France and Czechoslovakia as there were some attempts to develop a policy of Collective Security against the Nazi threat. Germany, once the primary ally of the nascent communist state, was now avowedly determined to destroy it. However, candidates may emphasise the limited nature of Collective Security when it came to opposing fascism in Spain and most notably as a result of the Munich Conference of 1938. It is possible that candidates may thus use the 1930s to highlight the different aims and methods adopted by the opponents of the Soviet Union and how ultimately unsuccessful they were. Equally, candidates have ample opportunity to delve into the various interpretations around this period by exploring the arguments of the German School, the Orthodox Soviet approach or indeed the Collective Security School.

Candidates may note that that in the early 1940s Britain and France were united with the Soviet Union against Hitler and may also refer to the emergence of the United States as a key actor on the European stage. At this point it is viable to argue that there was no aim to destroy the Soviet Union and former foes were now allies and were successful as such.

The latter years of World War Two and the early years of the Cold War were to witness divisions within the war-time alliance. Candidates could discuss the role America was to play in creating a coherent opposition to the Soviet Union with explicit aims and clearly delineated means. Both the Orthodox and Revisionist approaches offer candidates the opportunity to consider US motives. Was it a case of merely a series of defensive actions to prevent the spread of communism as the former contends, or was it a case of attempted “dollar imperialism”?

**(c) 1945–1968**

Whether it was the economic devastation wreaked by the war amongst the Western allies or just the sheer power of an unscathed and ambitious United States, the opponents of the Soviet Union arguably possessed a coherence after 1945 that had been absent prior to World War Two. The division of Germany, the acceptance of Soviet control of eastern Europe and the policy of containment all indicated a determined approach to opposing the Soviet Union. The Berlin Airlift of 1948, the destruction of the Greek communists prior to this in 1946 and the securing of western democracies from any domestic communist threat through the Marshall Plan all acted to limit the power of the Soviet Union. Furthermore, on a military level, the use of the Atomic bombs in 1945 and the creation of NATO in 1949 witnessed a clear commitment to a strong military presence that was either designed to act as a deterrent or as a means of forcing the Soviets to overstretch militarily, as Eisenhower argued.

Despite occasional divergences within the opponents of communism, such as the French withdrawal from NATO between 1959 and 1966, there was nothing resembling the divisions of the opponents of the Soviet Union in the 1920s or 1930s. Indeed, one would expect students to comment not only on the absence of divisions but also the shared aims which primarily focused around containment of the Soviet Union in terms of its influence in Eastern Europe and the absence of any communist threat in the western democratic states.

While the express aim may have been to contain communism, candidates may want to note that there was a clear limit to this policy. Whether it was the Hungarian uprising in 1956, the Berlin wall in 1961 or the Prague Spring of 1968, the opponents of communism limited themselves to strong denunciations but took no military action. Equally, candidates may argue that the opponents of communism also sought stability. The nuclear age and the impact of the Cuban Missile crisis witnessed a series of measures designed to stabilise superpower relations, most obviously the Test Ban Treaty of 1963 and the Hotline that was established between the White House and the Kremlin, also in 1963. As Gaddis has argued, “Kennedy tried to lower the (nuclear) risk without much help from his Kremlin counterpart”.



**(d) 1968–1979**

Whether candidates regard the measures taken by the opponents of communism in the period 1968–1979 as successful will depend on how they define their aims. Candidates may suggest that, as far as Europe was concerned, stability was the primary aim. The development of détente, SALT I and the Helsinki Final Act of 1975 could be seen as further evidence of the process whereby peaceful co-existence became the policy aim and the methods were those of traditional diplomacy. However, this argument may be overstated and, in view of the continued emphasis on nuclear weapons by the USA, it could be asserted that détente was more of a pause in the intensity of the Cold War than a change. As Stephen Ambrose has argued, the US commitment to arms reductions was largely weak, pointing out that throughout the Nixon administration “the Pentagon added three new warheads a day to the MIRV arsenal”.

However, it is possible to argue that the opponents of communism were planting a time bomb within the Soviet Union with regard to the commitment to Human Rights encapsulated in the Helsinki Final Act.

**(e) 1979–1991**

After 1979 a clear departure from such stability can be seen with the emergence of the Second Cold War. Candidates may argue that this was a result of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan or equally the emergence of an ideologically hard line axis between Washington and London. With regard to the former, Carter viewed it as the greatest threat to world peace since World War Two. One would anticipate candidates drawing attention to both the rhetoric and the willingness of the United States to invest in a new range of nuclear weapons and the so-called Star Wars programme. Whether this constituted a new aim on behalf of the opponents of communism as they sought to defeat the Soviet Union through increased military expenditure is open to debate. Candidates may well draw attention to the change in relations brought about by the emergence of Gorbachev in the Soviet Union. They could argue that the ensuing collapse of communism was the result of the aims of the USA and the handbag cheerleading of Margaret Thatcher, or that it came about as a result of the policies of Soviet leaders. In conclusion, a number of possible interpretations are viable and candidates may fruitfully explore several. Either way they may reasonably conclude that the opponents of communism were more successful after the Second World War and that they were more united.

*Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately*

[50]

50

**Option 5**

**50**

**Total**

**50**