

# **Examiners' Report**

## **June 2025**

**GCE History 9HI0 36**

## Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at <https://www.edexcel.com> or <https://www.btec.co.uk>.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our [contact us page](#).



## Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit <https://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus>. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

## Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: <https://www.pearson.com/uk>.

June 2025

Publications Code 9HI0\_36\_2506\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

# Introduction

It was pleasing to see that candidates were able to engage effectively across the ability range in this series of exams with GCE A Level paper 9HI036 that deals with Protest, Agitation and Parliamentary Reform in Britain, c1780-1928 (9HI036.1) and Ireland and the Union, c1774-1923 (9HI036.2). The paper is divided into three sections. Section A contains a compulsory question that is based on two enquiries linked to one source. It assesses source analysis and evaluation skills (AO2). Section B comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting five second order concepts - cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance. Section C comprises a choice of essays that relate to aspects of the process of change over a period of at least 100 years (AO1).

Most candidates appeared to organise their time effectively and there was little evidence of candidates being unable to attempt all three sections of the paper within the time allocated, although a very small number did not complete their response to Section C. As pointed out in previous reports, there continues to be an increase in the number of scripts where the legibility of the handwriting poses significant problems, in some cases being almost entirely indecipherable. Examiners are only able to give credit for what they can read. There was continued evidence this summer of a number of candidates abbreviating words that should not be abbreviated in formal written English, e.g. gov for government. This is not a development that is welcomed.

In Section A, the strongest answers demonstrated an ability to draw out and develop reasoned inferences from the source for both enquiries and to evaluate the source thoroughly in relation to the demands of the two enquiries on the basis of both contextual knowledge and the nature, origin and purpose of the source. Some candidates continue to use their contextual knowledge to describe events in great detail, sometimes with only tangential links to what is in the source, rather than using it to illuminate and to discuss the sources. This sometimes resulted in candidates not dealing with the source adequately. In other cases, candidates might offer up no contextual knowledge to support their arguments and analysis. It remains disappointing to have to report that a number of candidates did not explicitly address the focus of at least one of the enquiries or that candidates overlooked some element of the question. There seems to be a trend for some candidates to make generalised comments about the content of the source without linking this to one of the two enquiries. Another development this year appeared to be the response that lifted a succession of quotes from a source and then claimed that each quote demonstrated a particular point, without explaining how the quote and the point made were related.

In Section B, examiners were impressed by the number of responses that clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question and shaped their responses appropriately to meet the demands of the question. However, some candidates misinterpreted the focus of the question, and this limited their ability to achieve in the higher levels. It continues to be the case that a number of responses were seen that had a tendency to only deal with one side of an argument; some of these were very impressive in dealing with that one side, showing the links between the issues that were raised, but it is essential that candidates acknowledge the existence of a counter argument, where appropriate. Candidates need to be aware of the chronological parameters of questions and to ensure that they write across the chronology. Equally, the evidence that is presented should come from within the timeframe of the chronology of the question.

Section C requires candidates to answer a breadth question. The questions in this section are set to encompass a minimum of 100 years. Candidates are reminded that, as has been pointed out in previous Principal Examiner reports, this has important implications for the higher levels in bullet point 2 of the mark scheme. To access bullet point 2 at level 5 candidates are expected to have responded 'fully' to the demands of the question. The requirements of questions will vary and key developments relating to the question may be more specific to the entire chronological range in some questions and options than in others. However, it was judged not possible for candidates to have 'fully met' the demands of any section C question unless at least 75% of the chronological range of the question was addressed. To access bullet point 2 at level 4 candidates need to meet most of the demands of the question. It was unlikely that most of the demands of the question would be met if the answer had a restricted range that covered less than 60% of its chronology. There continues to be use made of the practice of 'bookending' the chronology this summer with little between those 'bookends'. This approach is unlikely to meet the demands of the higher levels in bullet point 2. It would appear that in this section of the paper in particular, there are some candidates who are not reading the question with sufficient care and who are using their own preferred question focus, often linked to a previous examination series, rather than the one that has been set on the paper. This clearly has an impact on achievement.

The candidates' performance on individual questions is considered in the next section.

## Question 1

Some candidates had not read the question carefully and this impacted upon their achievement. Their answers referred to 'reactions of the Chartist movement', which is what they wrote about. This is very different to the question focus, which was 'reactions to the Chartist movement'. A significant number of candidates took this question as an opportunity to present all their knowledge about the Chartist movement, with only tenuous and limited attempts to link this to the source. To discuss the omission of events such as the Birmingham Bullring Riots and the Newport Rising as weaknesses in evaluating the source, when neither event had taken place at the time that the letter was written, indicates the problem when candidates try to argue that a source is not valuable because of what it omits. Stronger responses were able to address both enquiries effectively and there was some impressive interrogation of the source seen. Such answers often appreciated that it was possible to identify and draw inferences about both positive and negative reactions to the Chartist movement and were able to develop an effective analysis using that as a starting point. The most impressive answers frequently integrated their interrogation of the source with valid supporting contextual knowledge and evaluation within the same section, rather than treating the bullet points separately.

A historian would find much value in the source ~~that~~ if looking to discover about the views of the Chartists in 1839 and the reactions of the public to their movement. It reveals some more positive and more negative responses from various groups of people, and defines into the aims and beliefs that the Chartists championed.

is particularly the  
reaction of more  
in positions of  
power

~~Reveals~~ The source shines much light on the reaction of the public to the Chartist cause. The purpose of the source itself is a letter in which a Chartist explains to a clergyman the reasoning behind Chartist demands: the fact that this clergyman took the time to inquire with the Chartists directly, especially when the source claims that often they are treated with "contempt", suggests that some in positions of relative power like the clergy did make an attempt to cooperate with and understand the Chartists. However, the source goes on to mention how the Chartist movement in Nottingham had been growing for "seven months".

with public meetings and demonstrations, and yet the clergymen had "not taken the trouble" to make contact with them. This adds ~~to~~ another dimension that those in power may have interacted positively with the Chartists, but they only did so when pushed to by circumstances, and would ~~then~~ naturally have just ignored such organisations and forms of protest. This is reflected by the treatment of the Chartist petitions by MPs - on the first attempt at ~~passing~~ setting the Chartist into law (in 1839, the very year this source was written), half of the MPs didn't even show up to debate on or vote on the bill. It is clear that the source is very valuable for revealing how those in power reacted to the Chartist movement, with there being some attempt at establishing understanding, but an overarching ignoring of Chartist activities and demands.

The source also holds value as it shows how ordinary people reacted to the Chartist movement. It appears to show how there was some significant support for the Chartists - both in this parish and beyond. It references the "unprecedented" number of people who

signed the first national petition. The use of the word "unprecedented" implies that perhaps the support was not only large, but disproportionate to the amount of support the Chartists may have expected. The first Chartist petition amassed an impressive 1.2 million signatures, a number that may well have shocked even devoted Chartists. These signatures <sup>were</sup> even ~~to~~ across demographics -  $\frac{1}{4}$  of those signing the first petition were women. Evidently, there was a lot of and varied support for the Chartist nationally, perhaps surpassing anything the Chartists expected. The fact that there was backing for the Chartists amongst the people is also evident in the nature of this source, which deals with content published in a "handbill" on the Chartist aims. This suggests that, at a time of low literacy, enough people in this region were supportive enough of the Chartist cause to purchase or read the literature produced by the movement - suggesting a significant reaction of support from the local people. Overall, it is clear that, though some "criticized" or ignored the movement, the Chartists also found a lot of support amongst the people, particularly at this early stage.

The source also holds value as it reveals much about the views of the Chartist members, particularly that their cause is steeped in the basis of the constitution and ~~that~~ <sup>that their best way to achieve their demands</sup> ~~that~~ <sup>moral force</sup>. The fact that this letter comes from a Chartist themselves, attempting to explain the cause to <sup>one</sup> who may not believe in it, proves it valuable as it is most likely to contain arguments that they truly believe in. One may claim that the persuasive tone may reduce this value<sup>2</sup>. However, the fact that it may be attempting to persuade him doesn't detract from the fact that these are Chartist views as they would be spread throughout the country by activists and missionaries, allowing a historian to see their views and message. And the overarching view is that <sup>the</sup> demands of the Chartist are "legal and constitutional" to demand of ~~the~~ the government. The reference to the legality of the methods used by the Chartist shows that these Chartists did consider <sup>logical and educated arguments</sup> ~~to~~ <sup>to</sup> best way ~~as~~ <sup>to</sup> achieve their goals, much like the methods advocated by William Lovett. By alluding to the constitution,

perhaps they aimed to make clear that they were respectable, educated men, presenting logical arguments with basis in the law, proving their suitability for a political voice. ~~And like~~

~~the source also maintains however that they also claim that to deny them this right is~~

~~to put "the nation at risk"~~ - Therefore it is

clear that a Chartist view was that the right to demand was enshrined in law, and that they should use the law and logic to win people over to their cause.

A final point of value in the source is in revealing the Chartist view on force as a final resort. The source claims that to deny them their right is "to put the nation at risk" - suggesting quite clearly that, by their hand or otherwise, peace will be threatened should their demands not be met. This inference is furthered by the claim that at a time may come where they will be "compelled...to use force."

This points to the fact that ~~some~~ Chartists may not have been solely in favour of moral force, but understood the necessity of physical force should it come

to it, as Feargus O'Connor did ~~when~~ with his slogan of "peacefully if we can, forcibly if we must." The use of the word "compel" also implies that the Chartists believe that, should force be needed, it will be the fault of the establishment that pushed them to do so, and not their overall. It is clear that the source not only demonstrates the Chartists' more rational views, but their views on the course of action should all else fail.

In conclusion, the source is very valuable in revealing the reactions to the Chartist movement - both positive and negative - and the views of the Chartists themselves, offering both sides of the moral v. physical force argument. The provenance also makes it especially useful, as it provides a comprehensive explanation of Chartist views, as a letter to an inquiring clergyman, and as it sheds light on both the communication <sup>with</sup> and ignorance of those ~~at~~ in power.



This response clearly demonstrates level 5 reasoning in the way in which it interrogates the source in relation to the enquiries and supports this with appropriate contextual knowledge. There is evaluation evident within this response.

## Question 2

Candidates generally demonstrated an understanding of the issues that were raised by this source. It is important that candidates read the question carefully. The first enquiry asked about the 'Irish people' and although it was valid to focus on the poor, the source does indicate other groups. In terms of addressing bullet point 3, some candidates wanted to describe the various aspects of the famine that were not represented in the source. It is only valid to discuss what is missing if there is an intentional reason on the part of the author for omission. Time spent listing all the things the source does not deal with would be better spent focusing on what the source does actually say and evaluating it. Weaker candidates often argued that the source was more (or less) valuable because it was published in London, with little explanation for this assertion. Some candidates misinterpreted the section dealing with the Board of Works, reading the reference to 'hardworking body' as applying to the labourers rather than the authorities. Stronger responses generally identified the source's sympathetic tone towards the plight of the Irish, which was then well integrated into a broader evaluative commentary. This commentary often considered not only the source provenance but some of the information contained in it, including testing the claims of Smith O'Brien. The most impressive answers frequently integrated an interrogation of the source with valid supporting contextual knowledge and evaluation within the same section, rather than treating the bullet points separately.

The source Source 2, being written using ~~by a~~ <sup>from</sup> newspapers in Ireland, does add value to the source. Because they are ~~there~~ using publications that came straight from Ireland and therefore will be ~~the~~ direct sources from the Ireland in 1846. However, the source contains a letter by O'Brien, ~~and~~ who later organizes and leads the Young Ireland Rebellion in 1848. Because of this he may be bias against Britain especially when writing, "the government is not sufficiently aware of the urgent need to prevent the misery". Because ~~he~~ to O'Brien later goes on to fight against Britain it may overstate how much of a role Britain played in the Famine and is therefore not as accurate. Also due to ~~it~~ <sup>the</sup> source being a summary of Irish

newspapers they may have overrepresented or cherry picked problems that the Irish faced during 1846 and therefore overrepresents the hardships.

Source 2 is certainly valuable for revealing the conditions of the Irish people in 1846. It mentions how many people were in workhouses stating, "788 paupers in Galway workhouse" and ~~4,200 paupers~~ "Cork Workhouse has 4300 paupers" this is accurate as many needed relief in Ireland in 1846 due to the famine, as a result ~~Peel introduced~~ created a Relief Board in 1846 that would employ ~~140,000~~ by establishing workhouses and had employed 140,000 people by 1847, this cost despite it being an attempt at a long term solution to the problems it cost 157,000 in the first year to give relief to the poor, this is stated mentioned in the source, "It is £6,000 in debt".

~~of this accuracy, the source is~~  
~~under clearly useful and valuable~~  
~~for~~ The Source also mentions,  
then goes on to mention the  
working conditions and ~~first~~  
of the people in work houses, and  
also the requirements to get to work  
from the Public Works Act. "reduction  
in wages ... and for delays in providing  
work employment" This is accurate  
as Travelyon, the deputy treasurer  
in charge of the relief in Ireland  
in 1846, set harsh requirements  
for being ~~even~~ able to access the  
work houses, They ~~some~~ someone would  
have ~~a~~ ~~to~~ to be completely out  
of options and have no access to  
agricultural work, despite the  
Potato Blight destroying  $\frac{3}{4}$  of  
the harvest in 1846. Then the source  
mentions, "They work constantly",  
which demonstrates the conditions of  
the Irish in 1846 as they  
were required to work 12 hour  
days, 5 days a week and  
6 hours on Saturday. Because of these

accuracies, the source is clearly ~~valuable~~ useful and therefore valuable in revealing the condition of the Irish in 1846.

Source 2 is also ~~very~~ somewhat useful at revealing the challenges faced by authorities. The source states, "There are accounts of anger with the Board of works" and this is accurate as there was ~~big~~ a sentiment of anger towards the policies, ~~especi~~ This is because of ~~the~~ ~~at~~ ~~&~~ workers were payed by job and not per hour ~~in~~ which was incredibly harsh as many workers were starved and malnourished, Scurvy was rife due to the lack of nutrients of the Indian corn that ~~could be~~ fed was exported in 1845. ~~The source~~ ~~Despite this~~ ~~one exception,~~ The source is ~~it~~ <sup>as</sup> ~~that~~ valuable in revealing the problems faced by the authorities. It fails to adress the actual problems like attempting to relive the famine, but also adresssing

the key cause of the famine like the monoculture, as well as extremely inefficient landholdings and size. Instead, the source focuses on the dissatisfaction of the people like with when mentioning the "1200 petitions". \*1

Overall, the source is very valuable at revealing the conditions of the Irish people in 1846 as it focuses in on the poor working conditions and famine that they faced, however it is slightly less valuable in revealing the problems that the authorities faced, instead the source focuses on the reaction of the people as a result of the authorities failing to address the problems they faced ~~dealing with the situation~~. \*2

1  
\* The source also reveals the money problems faced by the authorities when dealing with the Famine. It states, "Board of Guardians, to avoid closing the doors, had to draw £3,000 from

their resumes." this is not just accurate  
in revealing the ~~Gov~~ Boards problems  
but ~~also~~<sup>is</sup> also a reflection of the  
problems that <sup>some</sup> Land Lords ~~at also~~ faced.  
~~to~~ As a result of the Poor Relief  
Extension Act in 1846, the  
responsibility of ~~the~~ relief was given to  
Landlords and the Board of Guardians,  
as a result many went into debt  
and even 10% of Landlords  
went bankrupt in an attempt to  
relieve the poor. Because of this  
accuracy in its ~~deft~~ depiction of the  
~~mere~~ financial problems the Source  
is valuable in revealing the problems  
faced by authorities.

#2 Also due to O'Briens ~~involvement~~<sup>no</sup> involvement  
in the source, the problems that  
the authorities faced ~~to~~ may be  
overstated as a result of the ~~lack of~~  
~~involvement by the British to help~~  
~~alleviate these problems.~~ O'Briens discontent  
with Britain's government and their  
lack of involvement and 'laissez-faire'  
Malthusian stance on the famine.



This response interrogates the evidence of the source in relation to both enquiries with confidence and discrimination, using contextual knowledge to illuminate what can be gained from the content of the source. Whilst it is not a requirement of the mark scheme for candidates to 'distinguish between the degree of certainty with which aspects of the source can be used to support each enquiry', this response is doing this in the conclusion. This is a very secure level 5 response.

## Question 3

This was the less popular of the two questions in this section of the paper. Some candidates took the government response to apply exclusively to legislation. It was certainly possible to produce an effective answer based on this if it was well developed, but generally analysis benefited if it also looked at other aspects of the government's response, e.g. its use of imprisonment, the army, and spies. Most candidates were aware that this question required them to discuss the effectiveness of the government's response to the radical reformers and then weigh it against other factors, which was most commonly the weaknesses of the reformers. Some responses did not engage in any counter factors and this weakened the overall response as it meant the response did not meet the demands of the question. A common shortcoming was a tendency to drift into descriptive accounts, lacking clear prioritisation or critical assessment of the stated reasons. The chronological parameters of the question were c1790-1819. A significant minority used evidence almost exclusively from the years 1816-19; the lack of evidence from the entire period impacted on achievement.

Chosen question number: Question 3 ☒

Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒

Question 6 ☒

Govt. Response. → LCS, Pentridge / spies,  
Context.

Weakness of the movement. → <sup>Cobbett</sup> Peterloo, LCS members

The main reason for the failure of radical reformers can be assessed through consideration of the effectiveness of the government's response, the weakness of the movement, and other contextual factors. The main reason can be defined <sup>as</sup> the one ~~off~~ without which, the radical reformers may have succeeded and it is evident that the government response was the principle ~~of~~ reason.

The effectiveness of the government response can be considered the main reason for the failure of the reformers due to it undermining the strength of protest ~~and~~ consistently throughout the period. Then Tom Paine's 'the Rights of Man' became popular in Britain in the 1790s, selling almost 200,000 copies within three years and discussed the unnatural and unjust system ~~for~~ of British politics which "contends for the authority of the living over the dead." This led to a huge politicisation of the masses such as the

and the growth of movements to enable political discourse such as the London Corresponding Society. However, the royal proclamation against seditious writings in 1792 and the strength of repression implemented by the government including the Treason Act which made it treasonous to even contend for parliamentary reform showed the effectiveness of the government response in dismantling the tools used to advocate for reform (politicisation through literature/discourse and protest with the 1795 Seditious Meetings Act proving equally effective). This convincingly reveals the swift and suppressive nature of action during Pitt's 'reign of terror' to quickly deter radical activity, compellingly illustrating the effectiveness of the response. During the second key era of radical reform in the post Napoleonic<sup>war</sup> years (1816-19), Lord Liverpool established a Committee of Secrecy which established and deployed a ~~uniggg~~ network of spies to infiltrate radical reforming movements. The most effective example of this was the Pentridge rising in 1817 when a spy called 'Oliver' convinced a group to march in protest ~~as~~ near Derbyshire, as would be the case ~~in~~ across England. ~~How~~ This led to the arrest of 80 of those reformers on account of treason and showed the ~~simplicity~~ but ~~sophis~~ sophisticated and highly effective response of

the government to quell radical activities. Thus, it is clear that based upon this analysis, the government response effectively eliminated and undermined opposition at every possible opportunity and thus can be seen as the main reason.

Comparatively, it could be argued that the weakness of extra-parliamentary protest ~~was~~ was the key reason why the movement failed to reform parliament. The movement significantly lacked unity of purpose with each key radical reformer proposing alternative ~~was~~ modes of reform. Whilst there was a general agreement that with Cartwright's maxim to "hold fast by the laws", each reformer envisioned alternative modes of reform - some like Henry Hunt advocated for universal manhood suffrage whereas others believed that ~~gradual change~~ the less-radical gradual change was the best course. This severely weakened the movement's unity and thus the disparate factions became particularly easy to suppress. ~~For~~ This lack of unity of purpose stemmed from a lack of leadership within the movement - whilst there are ~~var~~ a variety of key figures, none took<sup>on</sup> the challenge of leading the masses but each individually inspired. This lack of clear leadership aided the government's suppression considerably as the movement never really functioned as an effective pressure group

that could negotiate and challenge the government. Whilst this is not inaccurate, it fails to recognise aspects of great internal strength and how the government was able to effectively undermine this. In 1819, 80,000 individuals gathered at St. Peter's field to protest for parliamentary reform showing the huge successes linked to mass-mobilisation but this was effectively crushed by the government with the 'Peterloo massacre' which killed 11 and the subsequent <sup>arrests of leaders</sup> six acts which ~~en~~ acted as further censorship of the radical reformers. ~~sho~~ This evidence serves to underline that the movements weren't in fact weak but that the government was strong and effective in its response. This is furthered by the increase of stamp duty from 1792-1815 of 1.5d  $\rightarrow$  4d showing further the effectiveness of undermining the spread of political ideas. Thus, it is clear that it was in fact the effectiveness of the government response that was the principal reason through making ~~weak~~<sup>a</sup> strong movement appear extremely weak.

Finally, it could be argued that it was ~~the~~ contextual factors which explain the failure of radical reformers to achieve their aims.\* Firstly, ~~ear~~ the context was pivotal in undermining the ~~the~~ ability to sustain radical protest and thus weakening the

movement. The Napoleonic wars acted as a significant disruption to radical reformers in the middle of this period as it promoted national unity in the face of an external threat to defend British institutions. This completely damaged campaigns for reform as the masses were acting to protect what they had previously opposed through attempts to reform parliament and this huge interruption limited the ability to apply sustained pressure onto the government which may have been more successful in encouraging the government into action. However, further, as even this difficulty to sustain mass campaigns extended beyond wartime, as Cobbett himself noted, because it was "difficult to agitate people on full stomachs." This reveals how the movement lacked its support in times of economic stability and so ~~the period~~ during economic upturns such as brief spells in late 1817 and 1818, radical protest lost its popular support. While this is true, by following burden tax in 1816, the Corn Laws in 1815 and a bad harvest in 1816, economic conditions did take a downturn and strong pressure was equally applied - e.g. the Spa Fields Meeting which attracted 16,000 supporters. ~~The~~ Perhaps reform was <sup>not consistent</sup> ~~sustained~~ always but economic fluctuations were frequent and <sup>more important was that</sup> in these times it was the effective response of the government which can be seen as the principal

reason for its failure to bring tangible reform.

Thus, in conclusion, it is clear that the effectiveness of the government's response through its swift implementation of suppressive policies when radical dissidence peaked during the frequent downturns which did present considerable threats to the system.



This is an impressive answer to the question. It ranges widely across the period to support the analysis. The analysis is sustained throughout, and the response weighs the comparative significance of different factors that have been identified. It achieves a secure level 5.



It should be ensured, as is the case with this answer, that evidence comes from across the time frame of the question.

## Question 4

This was the more popular of the two questions in this section of the paper. Most candidates who attempted this question had relevant contextual knowledge that could be used to address the focus of the question. Achievement was often determined by the way in which such material was handled. Stronger candidates engaged in a sustained evaluation and often showed an awareness of the changing approach to tactics taken by the WSPU after 1908, which they were able to link to their analysis regarding whether the organisation was a help or a hindrance. The best responses discussed the political situation, the attitudes of Asquith and Lloyd George, other pressing domestic matters and the failure of the Conciliation Bills weighed against the impact of militancy. At the same time the positives of the WSPU actions were weighted in final judgements. Some candidates relied too heavily on describing the actions of the WSPU without linking this fully to the focus of the question. Such answers often strayed beyond 1914 in their narrative of events, despite the timeframe of the question.

Chosen question number: Question 3 ☒ Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒ Question 6 ☒

Between the years 1905-14, the WSPU campaigned for the equality of electoral rights with men. The Suffrage campaign gained mass-support and publicity, however, a shift in militancy from 1908 perhaps hindered progress. In order to examine whether the campaigns ~~gained~~ helped or hindered by WSPU actions, we must consider the widespread reaction to militancy, the effect to bring about legislation and the ability to achieve support.

Firstly, I believe the WSPU helped the campaign for votes, especially from 1905-1908, because they raised awareness amongst the British population and gained public sympathy. Headed by Emmeline Pankhurst, the WSPU utilised moderate militancy from 1905-08 in order to shift awareness for the campaign, as peaceful attempts had failed. Accentuated by the motto, 'deeds not words' the group engaged in political disruptions and heckling, which greatly improved public awareness of the campaign to vote. Additionally, the inclusion of high status women within WSPU militancy raised great help for the campaign, due to their wide social reach.

and ability to draw in investment for the cause. Unlike the civil nature of Fawcett's work, the WSPU bravely inticed mass support for the movement, as well as appealing to MP's. On the whole, the work of the WSPU from 1905-1908 greatly helped the campaign for votes by boosting public awareness through low level militancy and the inclusion of high-status women within political protest.

Alternatively, the WSPU perhaps hindered progress for the campaign to vote from 1908 to 1914 due to an extensive heightening of militancy, in response to a lack of political movement. Most notably, Christabel Pankhurst became an embodiment of militancy by engaging in arson, violence, window smashing and hunger strikes. Whilst her inspirational dedication became a symbol of commitment to campaign, the reckless nature of this militancy alienated support for the suffrage movement. As a result, MP's began to shift away from associating with the cause, and their antisocial behaviour only accentuated the naïve view of Asquith, who as PM deemed women too irresponsible to vote. ~~the increasing, increased militancy post 1908 perhaps~~ Additionally, the rash nature of WSPU behaviour perhaps hindered the campaign by dividing leadership. Unfortunately, the devotion of Emmeline and her

daughter Christabel led to them spending time in jail, which harmed the efficiency of suffrage campaigns, due to their engagement with reckless behaviour.

Additionally, the heightened militancy and autocratic nature of WSPU leadership led to the departure of Sylvia Pankhurst from the WSPU. Committed to bringing about universal suffrage, as well as class equality, the nature of the WSPU frustrated Sylvia who left in 1913 to pursue working-class rights in East London.

In evaluation, the nature of WSPU militancy post 1908 perhaps hindered the campaign for women's votes because it alienated public support, and divided their leadership at a time of political importance.

On the contrary, ~~however~~ the WSPU's increased militancy from 1908-1914 did perhaps help the campaign by gaining awareness and public sympathy. Most significantly, the participation in hunger strikes and force feeding gained sympathy for the campaign by accentuating commitment to suffrage and the brutal nature of the government in response to this. As a result, the political movement received greater importance in society, which aided the pursuit of legislation. In addition, the heroic actions of Emily Davison in 1913 gained huge awareness for the ~~reg~~ movement. At Epsom racecourse, she ran onto the track to hang

a WSPU banner to the King's horse, but sadly died in the process. This sheer bravery and dedication to the Suffrage campaign demonstrated its importance to the public, which helped raise sympathy for the cause. On the whole, increased militancy post 1908 did perhaps help the campaign for women's votes because the heroic commitment of WSPU members gained awareness for the movement. As a result, it applied political pressure to the government to pass later legislation.

In conclusion, from 1905-1914 the WSPU displayed heroic dedication to gain support for the campaign to vote. Whilst increased militancy alienated their campaign, the actions of WSPU members throughout this period helped the campaign to vote by gaining sympathy, support and awareness. This being said, it is important to recognise that the delay of universal suffrage until 1928 perhaps was due to the criticism reckless WSPU behaviour caused. The awareness and the WSPU gained for the campaign ultimately helped to pass legislation, thanks to their bravery and dedication.



This candidate clearly establishes the growth of militancy from 1908 as a pivotal date in the development of the WSPU and its impact on the campaign for votes for women. It raises a range of issues, although it could be slightly stronger in weighing the relative significance of these issues. Nonetheless, it is doing sufficient to achieve level 5.



It aids analysis and evaluation if a response weighs the relative significance of different issues.

## Question 5

This was the more popular of the two questions in this section of the paper. Most candidates attempting this question had some knowledge about the role played by Daniel O'Connell in the campaign for Roman Catholic Emancipation. Candidates at the lower levels tended to describe O'Connell's contribution with only limited links made to the focus of the question and often with no counter factors identified. More effective answers developed an analysis of his contribution, most usually weighing it against the contribution of 18th century legislation and of Henry Grattan, although reference was also seen to the direct role of Peel and Wellington in the passage of the 1829 legislation.

Chosen question number: Question 3 ☒

Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒

Question 6 ☒

plan

Define most significant - Emancipation would not have occurred without O'Connell

P1 - O'Connell ~ Catholicism  
Catholicism ~ Catholicism ~ Catholicism  
~ accidental  
has always  
been  
in the end

P2 - Grattan

1801

1819

bill bringing emancipation closer

P3 - Pitt

~ 1801 Act

Catholic relief acts

In 1829, the Roman Catholic relief act was passed. This allowed Catholics the ability to sit in parliament and become an inextricable part of British domestic politics. ~~The~~ In order to be the most significant contribution, the emancipation for Catholics would not have occurred

without O'Connell. Therefore, despite the actions of O'Connell, certainly accelerated the cause for emancipation. He was not the most significant contribution because fundamentally Catholic emancipation had always been on the cards which is evidenced in the actions of figures like Pitt, William Pitt and Henry Grattan, therefore emancipation would have likely occurred without O'Connell, just in a lot longer of time.

The actions ~~of~~ made by Daniel O'Connell ~~did~~ were important for the emancipation campaign because he ~~as~~ put pressure on Westminster and forced them to consider the issue. For example in 1823 O'Connell led the Catholic Association, which was ~~an ass~~ designed to win full political rights for Catholics. This was funded via the Catholic rent, where members would pay a penny a month to join. This allowed O'Connell and the ~~ass~~ Association to ~~see~~ earn the money to ~~the~~ carry out monster meetings.

For example in 1823 the Catholic Association carried out a meeting ~~at~~ in Tara

With over 70,000 people. The mass meetings was designed to intimidate GB into granting emancipation. As a result the actions of O'Connell through the monster meetings were important by putting pressure on Westminster, therefore certainly contributed to the campaign for emancipation. Furthermore, the significance of O'Connell can be evidenced in the 1828 County Clare election. This was where O'Connell was elected to be a MP in Westminster. Not only did he beat a protestant by 2017 votes to 982, but also this made Catholic emancipation a forefront issue in GB. Therefore this put more pressure on GB to grant emancipation because a Catholic had been fairly elected and not been able to take his seat. Hence forced GB to consider the issue, on this basis, O'Connell clearly accelerated the issue of emancipation, hence was an important contribution to the emancipation campaign. However, O'Connell cannot be labelled as the most significant contribution because he only acted as a catalyst for the relief Act. Catholic

emancipation had been promised and attempted by previous figures like Pitt and Grattan, ~~therefore~~ meaning emancipation had always been a prominent issue and that needed to be dealt with. Therefore O'Connell certainly accelerated the cause but was not the most significant contribution. Overall, despite pressure O'Connell put on Westminster, he was not the most significant contribution to the campaign.

The actions of Grattan certainly continued to the emancipation campaign through his attempt in the 1800s and 1810s. Grattan had been a leading Irish political figure since the 1780s and ~~he~~ wanted legislative independence and emancipation for Catholics. He acted for Catholics in acts such as in 1808 which granted emancipation for Catholics but with a veto that GB could reject appointments or proposed Catholic bishops. Although, this was rejected, the attempt itself shows Grattan was willing to work with Catholics and GB for emancipation which made it more likely. ~~In comparison to~~

~~O'Connell who demanded full emancipation, which~~  
~~may have been unreasonable with GB.~~ Also,  
it showed how emancipation had always been  
on the cards. Moreover, Greyton attempted  
again in 1819 <sup>for</sup> with emancipation ~~but with~~  
with the veto again. Despite this  
failure, its significance comes from  
it ~~a~~ only failed by 2 votes. This  
in comparison to 1808 which was heavily  
~~it~~ defeated. This serves as a clear  
example of how in Westminster, they were  
more willing to consider the issue  
of emancipation. Thus this was done  
4 years prior to the Association and  
O'Connell setting up. Therefore it showed  
emancipation was getting closer regardless  
of what O'Connell. On this basis, O'Connell  
was not the most significant contribution  
for the campaign because it showed  
how over time ~~the~~ <sup>from</sup> efforts ~~from Greyton~~  
emancipation was getting closer. Therefore  
O'Connell accelerated the act but the emancipation  
would likely have occurred without O'Connell  
just a prolonged campaign, than if  
he wasn't there. Hence not most significant  
contribution. Overall, the act is a

Crutton clearly shows the emancipation movement was progressing without O'Connell, therefore ~~he was~~ O'Connell not most significant contributor to the campaign.

The actions of William Pitt (PM 1783-1801) can also be argued to have contributed to the campaign for emancipation. Pitt introduced the Catholic relief act in 1793 which granted Catholics the rights to vote. This was a significant step forward for the emancipation campaign because it was repealing the terms of the penal laws of 1695. ~~Also ultimately~~ Therefore should emancipation campaign was progressing. Moreover, Pitt in 1801 in the Act of Union, as well as joining the two countries in a closer bond. In the union Pitt promised full emancipation for Catholics. This is a clear example of how British attitudes towards Catholics had relaxed, and the fact a PM promised emancipation shows how close emancipation was for

Ireland. Although this term was rejected by George III. The attempt itself showed the dividing barriers to Catholics were slowly being broken. Also, it ~~made emancipation a real possibility~~. On this basis, it is clear O'Connell was not the most significant contributor because ~~ultimately the~~, this showed how willing GB were to emancipation. Therefore it is likely emancipation would have occurred as more sympathetic attitudes were shown on Catholics, therefore more likely to grant emancipation in the future. Therefore, Pitt progressed the campaign for emancipation and made it a ~~far~~ feasible possibility. Overall, the actions of Pitt fundamentally show that emancipation had always been an issue to be dealt with, O'Connell just accelerated these demands, therefore it is likely emancipation would have occurred without O'Connell.

Therefore by definition was not the most significant contributor to the emancipation campaign.

In conclusion, despite O'Connell the

actions of O'Connell certainly putting pressure on Westminster with the help from the Association to fund Monster Meetings. He was not the most significant contributor to the Campaign because he only accelerated the movement and evidence through the actions of William Pitt and Henry Grattan, show that Emancipation had always been on the cards, therefore it is likely it would have been granted in the future. Therefore the Campaign may have achieved emancipation without O'Connell (just in a prolonged period), therefore he was not most significant contributor to the Campaign in the years 1776-1829.



This answer is within level 5. This candidate has taken a line of argument that is different to that taken by most responses. Although it acknowledges the importance of Daniel O'Connell in the campaign for Roman Catholic Emancipation, it argues that the contribution of other individuals is more significant. In both the section about Henry Grattan and the section about William Pitt, this response clearly weighs the significance of the contribution of each of these individuals against the other.

## Question 6

This was the less popular of the two questions in this section of the paper. Most candidates were aware of the need to set the stated factor of the impact of the 'long depression' against other factors in order to determine its significance. They were able to develop key arguments around the impact of the 'long depression' on tenant farmers and the need for legislation to combat falling incomes. Some candidates were not confident in their deployment of relevant knowledge pertaining to the impact of the 'long depression' although most were confident with a consideration of the role of the Land League. Some weaker candidates went beyond the failings of the 1870 Land Act as a factor into a detailed description of how that Act came to be passed. There were some candidates who did not pick up the significance of the dates in the question and directed their comments exclusively to the passing of the 1881 Land Act without considering the 1882 Arrears of Rent Act.

Chosen question number: Question 3 ☒

Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒

Question 6 ☒

The passing of the land legislation, both the 1881 Land Act and the Kilmainham Treaty in 1882, were a consequence of varying factors. Those factors deemed as significant are ones which, without them the legislation would not have occurred. Arguably, the 'long depression' led to a vast economic downturn which ~~and~~ fuelled discontent of Irish tenant farmers. This contributed to the Land wars which pressurised the British government. However, there were other factors which also encouraged the legislation, for example the failure of the 1870 Land Act and the how the Irish Land League dictated Gladstone's dual policy. Thus, arguably the 'long depression' was a product of other factors (the ineffective 1870 Act could not deal with its effects), but it was also a pivot which accelerated other factors, such as the Land League.

The 'long depression' was a global economic downturn where a combination of the American Civil War and Franco-Prussian war contributed to fewer investments.

This heavily impacted Irish agriculture, whose trading activity was effected.

This was exacerbated by the competition of cheap American wheat, lower butter prices and the decrease in series of poor harvests between 1877-9. The

consequence of the poor agricultural position meant that the discontent of the poor increased simultaneously. With no protection from the 1870 Land Act, evictions rose because not only could the tenant farmers not pay rent, but land-

lords were also affected by the depression. They could not sustain a lack of income from irregular or absent rent payments. Thus, the effect of the ~~poor~~

long depression ~~me~~ led to increased polarisation between tenants and

landlords, in addition to general economic discontent. When the currents combined, the scapegoat <sup>was</sup> ~~were~~ landlords.

This led to the Land Act in 1881 and

further Kilmainham in 1882 because it encouraged the populace to further challenge landlords and challenge legislature which was perceived as acting as an impediment to a fair relationship between the two.

④ For example, the 'minifamine' in West Ireland where smallholdings were the majority, like Connacht where 89% of <sup>holding</sup> land was less than 5 acres of land.

Therefore, by polarising the landlord-tenant relationship and exacerbating the economic struggle the long depression led to the land wars, the formation of the land league (who mobilised tenant farmers against landlords) and eventually provided the impetus for further reform in 1881-2.

However, the failure of the 1870 <sup>Land</sup> Act also contributed to the need for further reform in 1881. Despite ~~the~~ The Act was able to have punitive consequences of landlords and increased the cost of eviction from 1 years rent to

7 years rent which were positive effects. Its negative limitations forced the government to readdress issues later. Additionally, by Gladstone passing the 1870 Act, it showed that land was on the liberal parties agenda and that the government could be influenced by demonstrations. Partly, Gladstone was influenced by the 1870 Dublin Land Conference and was persuaded to pass the 1870 Act to address issues raised at the conference. This recognition and pursual of a land policy emboldened later movements, like the Land League as it is feasible to indicate that if the government could be influenced once, why not another point later. Moreover, the limitations: for example customary rights had to be fought at court (which further polarised landlord-tenant dynamic) and the way landlords could exploit loopholes - by extending leases to over 31 years or increasing rent after the yearly lease expired - meant that the 1870 failed to provide meaningful change. It failed to initiate

protection for tenants who were still vulnerable to eviction and rarely could afford to go to court to fight for customary rights. Overall, the Act exacerbated the issues faced by the Long Depression because tenants were not protected, and further encouraged this further encouraged people to demand more change.

Furthermore, the Irish Land League were the most significant factor which drove the passing of land legislation. They not only responded to the Long Depression and mobilised the hostilities from the 1870 Act in order to produce a mass movement, but they also determined the trajectory of British government policy. In particular, Gladstone's dual policy of as historian Paul Bew described "Carrot and Stick." By Davitt creating a national movement which drove the Land Wars through ostracism, boycotts and rent strikes, the Land League was able to elicit greater support for the movement. For example, the British response to Captain

Boycott's incident highlighted the inequality response. Where, the British spent £3500 to collect his £350 harvest, it emphasised that further change was needed which protected tenant farmers, just as much as the government had protected landlords like, Boycott who had evicted members of the Land League. This amounted to greater support for the Land League which simultaneously meant more pressure on the government. In addition, the New Departure agreement between the Land League, constitutional nationalists and republican nationalists also enabled a ~~great~~ wider base of support for the Land League and even more so, Irish MPs who advocated for Home Rule could also pressurise Westminster for Land reform. Moreover, in addition to the wide base of support the League generated, the League also (partly due to this substantial support) were able to dictate Gladstone's policy. Their actions, for example the murder of Lord Mountmorres, stimulated the passing of the Coercion Bill in 1881.

This was Gladstone's stick, to deter radical elements of society in order to maintain control. However, Gladstone was also committed to concession (the carrot aspect to continue Bews metaphor.) Thus it can be argued that the Land legislature was passed because Gladstone had to simultaneously appease moderates in order to maintain support for the union. Thus, the 1881 was "more of an ~~economic~~ political stroke than an economic policy." The pragmatic compromise was directly linked to the pressure from radical aspects of the land league.

In conclusion, the most significant factor was certainly the land league because they determined Gladstone's policy. Although, admittedly it is worth considering the House of Lords rejection of the Forsters Compensation Bill shows Gladstone's policy was also moulded by internal demands. Moreover, the long depression and 1870 Act set the precedent to demand more

and the logical constitutional consequence ~~was~~ was the 1881 land act which addressed more of the grievances like statutory security of tenure for tenant farmers.



This answer explores a wide range of issues that are relevant to the question and clearly understands the overarching demands of the question. It is less effective in weighing the relative significance of these issues against both the stated factor and each other. Overall, this answer is doing sufficient to be within level 5.



It aids analysis and evaluation if a response weighs the relative significance of different issues.

## Question 7

This was the most popular question in this section of the paper. Some candidates paid insufficient attention to the terms of the question and attempted to use material that they had previously used in a different question. The focus for this question was firmly on the issue of the extension of the franchise and any material beyond this that was not made relevant to this question could not be credited. Some candidates did not engage sufficiently with the notion of a turning point. Most candidates were able to range across the period quite effectively, considering the five major pieces of legislation that extended the franchise. Some candidates who were running out of time did not consider the stated factor in this question. Rather, they examined the other factors which they favoured first and did not go on to consider the focus of the question. Among some of the weaker answers seen there was confusion about the precise terms of specific pieces of legislation. Some impressive answers were seen. It was especially pleasing to note those responses which were able to draw on their knowledge to mount effective analysis, e.g. to point out the loss of some of the qualifications in 1832, such as the potwalloper vote, had actually disenfranchised the working class in those boroughs.

Chosen question number: Question 7 ☒

Question 8 ☐

Question 9 ☐

Question 10 ☐

The 1867 Representation of the People Act was indeed a key turning point in the extension of the franchise c.1815-1928. While it may not have enfranchised the most people, or been the first, it was this Act that made the radical change in how eligibility to vote was determined, and set the precedent for all future acts to come. <sup>facilitated no change for women</sup> <sup>when measured against the number of people enfranchised by the 1832 Act, the 1867 Act enfranchised the working class, and no precedent set for other Acts. The 1867 Act beats all.</sup>

The 1867 Act established no principle of voting on tenure, nor on value of the house or property as had been the case for centuries. While this was only in the boroughs, it still made a significant change, with  $\frac{1}{3}$  <sup>of men</sup> now being able to vote as opposed to  $\frac{1}{5}$  as enfranchised by the 1832 <sup>Great Reform</sup> Act. ~~This was also important because it allowed for a large proportion of the working classes to~~ This shift was perhaps the biggest of all the Acts - while one could argue that the 1832 Act took the first step it still

maintained the property value as a qualification. While this Act changed this. Another key turning point under the 1867 Act was that working class men were now included in the electorate, many for the first time. This signals a turning point as it would have been the first time for many working class men that voting was available for them. Of course, not all were enfranchised, as the 12 months tenure requirement excluded the poorest <sup>the</sup> residuum - those who travelled often looking for work. However, the proportion of voters from <sup>the</sup> the most skilled workers earning the vote <sup>in 1832</sup> to a large proportion of men. In 1867 was undoubtedly a turning point. The 1867 Act did have some negatives, of course, and was not universal. Women remained excluded, as did men who were not classified as the "householder". More importantly, this law didn't extend to the counties, where a large majority of rural working class men lived. However, the 1867 Act established the precedent for the counties, while the 1884 Act simply extended such rules, in a way that was most likely inevitable. Overall, it is clear that

the 1867 Act did signify a turning point, despite its weakness, as it took the biggest step towards democracy in abolishing the property qualification. One could set things in motion for all the acts subsequently.

~~One could even argue that it was this act that led to acts further strengthening Great Reform~~

The 1832 Act is another one could plausibly argue is the most significant of the Acts extending the franchise. It signified a huge shift in the amount who could vote - up from 3% of the population - and was the first step in the set of reforming Acts.

However, it is hard to link this Act to the others and identify a running precedent <sup>unlike</sup> with the 1867 Act. It established rules that simply built upon the already existing principles of property qualification, whereas the 1867 Act brought in a new qualification entirely. One could even argue that the 1832 Act wasn't a turning point, but actually set the franchise back by abolishing borough rules like the Potwalloper borough, which had allowed working class

men generally a vote. Under the new rules, young men who might've expected to vote soon may have been stripped of this right. Overall, it is clear that while the 1832 Act may have been the first act, it cannot be called a turning point as the 1867 Act can be as it didn't provide a running head for all the acts to follow, and ~~therefore~~ didn't radically change anything in the franchise at all despite handing the vote to some of the middle classes.

Another Act that one might consider the greatest turning point is the 1918 Representation of the People Act. This Act was the first after 1867 to bring something new to the franchise: all men over 21 $\frac{1}{2}$  could now vote, as well as some women over 30, fulfilling conditions such as being university educated or a householder. This Act did oversee the largest change to the electorate, with millions being allowed to vote now. It also diversified the electorate arguably as much as the 1867 Act had, as 42% of voters were now women. In regards to the criteria of the number of those enfranchised,

and if the precedent being established for female suffrage, one could plausibly argue that perhaps this was the most significant turning-point in the franchise in the period. However, one must again look at the precedents set by the 1867 Act - would it be plausible for all men to be enfranchised without first the abolition of property qualification? ~~The~~ The 1867 Act which ~~was quite already~~ drew on the 1832 Act, established the change that had made universal male suffrage simply a matter of time. Another thing to consider in the significance of this turning point is the extent of change: the 1867 Act established a new criteria for the vote entirely, while the 1918 Act arguably only scrapped the requirement for a 12 month tenure, ~~which~~ a move that seems not radical but logical after WWI. ~~The 1867 Act can even be spotted when inspecting the requirements for women's enfranchisement, as they too were held to a~~ While the 1918 Act did enfranchise women also - a complete difference from the 1867 Act and all others, ~~it~~ it is clear that the influence of the 1867 Act in all other measures of the

franchise both influenced and went further than the 1918 Act for its time.

In conclusion, while the other Acts, especially the 1918 Act, did ~~mark~~ signal significant turning points in the extension of the franchise, it was the 1867 Act that marked the greatest shift from the previous system and established a procedure that all other Acts would follow. Though it had its limits - particularly in regards to women - it was undoubtedly the most radical of the Acts for its time and responsible for all acts subsequently.



This response achieves level 5. There is a sustained analysis of the key features; this response successfully weighs the significance of three other pieces of legislation against the 1867 Representation of the People Act, namely 1832, 1884 and 1918. It can only be assumed that the candidate ran out of time as there is no mention of the 1928 Act. This puts the answer right on the cusp in terms of its chronological coverage, although it just has sufficient to access level 5 in bullet point 2.



It is probably a good idea, as this answer does, to start with the stated factor. This means that if there is insufficient time to complete a response, the focus of the question has been considered.

## Question 8

This was the least popular question in this section of the paper. Candidates must read the question carefully. The chronological spread for this question was c1780-1918, and there must be material from across the period. A number of candidates did not acknowledge the years c1780-1831 in their response and this limited these responses to just accessing level 4 in bullet point 2. Many candidates did identify the initial slow, and then more quickened, decline of aristocratic influence in Parliament. Most candidates focused on the counter arguments in their responses to this question. Stronger responses were seen from candidates who were able to offer an analysis that appreciated the ways in which the aristocracy did maintain at least some degree of power across the period and were able to appreciate their differing position in the House of Commons and the House of Lords. Where done well, this question rewarded those candidates who had a firm grasp of constitutional developments and an ability to evaluate power dynamics within the aristocracy.

It would not be accurate to say that the aristocracy maintained a considerable influence over Parliament 1780-1918, as whilst initially it was the dominant demographic, the increased democratisation of Parliament undermined its structural powers and objective influence. With democracy leading to a large reduction in terms of influence in the Commons, the gov (and the PM) and legislatively overall.

The increased contestability and redistribution of seats had a large reducing impact on the aristocracy's influence. Yet, initially, they retained a significant degree of power over seats and therefore in the Commons. Indeed, such control allowed them to almost automatically gain influence in the Commons, with such power being retained in the early parts of the time period. In 1785 Parliament and the Commons rejected Pitt's 1785 bill to redistribute 70 seats, meaning they retained influence as it was not expanded to others. Other acts still had a small impact so influence over seats and therefore the Commons, indeed despite change in the 1832 Great Reform Act, still 70 seats were held by 42 great aristocratic land owners. So in the early time period they did have influence as they still controlled many seats. Yet redistribution and increased contestability reduced this, as structurally aristocrats would no longer

hold these seats and they would be in Urban not rural (and therefore predominantly aristocratic areas). Indeed despite some stagnation, the 1832 act got rid of 145 small boroughs, the 1867 Great Reform Act 45 were abolished, both reducing the influence of the aristocracy as they removed the direct structural and uncontrollable power they had over the Commons. Furthermore, the 1885 Redistribution Act was implemented in the "Pursuit of the People" so reduce Commons seats in aristocratic rural areas and afforded greater direct parliamentary influence to more urban and therefore more middle-class and working class MPs. Overall, whilst initially the aristocracy retained considerable influence of the Commons, the later legislative and democratic changes reduced their objective control of seats, and therefore structurally had less influence as they could not absolutely control these seats such as they had with other boroughs like 'Old Swin' which returned 2 (aristocratic) MPs from 7 voters. The structural power was not consistent across the whole time period, therefore did not maintain considerable influence.

They also had initial considerable control over Parliament in that the aristocracy controlled the executive as the PM and therefore the gov, as the PM was typically chosen from the Lords and the monarch chose them. Indeed, when the Fox North coalition collapsed in the wake of the defeated East India Bill 1783, the PM was selected

by George III, and he chose Pitt, from a significant land-owning and aristocratic family. Therefore, as the PM was an aristocrat, he would have a tendency in past to support them and let their views dominate and maintain considerable influence over Parliament. Furthermore, Queen Victoria selected Lord Rosebery, another aristocrat after Gladstone's retirement in 1894, suggesting a continued aristocratic influence over the executive and therefore parliament. However, in reality this structural influence was undermined by an increased democratisation. Indeed, after 1832 and the increased electorate ~~the reality~~ of 60% of the male, the reality was that the monarch had to take notice of electoral result, so could not just pick anyone, so less guaranteed aristocratic influence. Indeed, throughout the 1860s, 1870s, and 1880s, despite many pushing for his removal, Victoria did not remove Gladstone from office, so no chance of greater aristocratic influence in the form of a landowner getting replaced by him, as no replacements were structurally possible without an election. Overall, whilst initially the PM was often controlled by the monarch and made to be a new-aligning aristocrat, later democratisation undermined this and removed its political "de jure" ability to be a structural power. So once again, this influence whilst considerable initially, was drastically reduced across the time period until it was a structural power no more, so as the PM was not consistently aristocratic, the aristocratic influence was not maintained.

Fundamental to the influence of the aristocracy is the

absolute influence

influence of the Lords, intrinsically linked due to the structural reality of ~~the~~ <sup>hereditary</sup> peers during this period being

afforded their influence due to land owned, an inherently aristocratic feature. Indeed, during this period the equality in power between the Lords and Commons was far more widespread, so called more consistent power. For example, this equality was prevalent throughout, in 1783, despite the Commons passing the East India Bill, the Lords rejected it 95-76, and therefore was rejected from Parliament as a whole, drastically influenced by an ~~unpredominant~~ almost exclusively aristocratic House of Lords. Furthermore, the Lords rejected the Death Taxes Act in 1894 which aimed to increase inheritance tax, thus showing a dramatic influence of the aristocracy as the structural powers and equality to the Commons of the Lords allowed them to influence parliament over issues directly specific to them.

However, this may have been its downfall with it admitting like it highlighting the unfair influence of the unelected and unrepresentative (aristocratic) Lords. As a result of this, the 1911 Parliament Act was passed, which removed the structural power of veto of legislation by the aristocratic dominated Lords, as they could now only delay legislation for two years and could not reject money bills. As a result of this, the aristocracy in the Lords now objectively had less structural influence over the Parliament and was structurally subservient to the Commons. ~~As~~ Overall, whilst for a large period of time, the Lords had an

equal and therefore considerable influence in Parliament, the suggestion it 'maintained' it would be erroneous as it was not consistent across the 'whole' period such as the aristocratically linked lords dominated lords after 1911 were not equal in structural power so could not exert considerable influence. Whilst codes prevail was not totally consistent therefore so cannot be deemed to have maintained ~~the~~ their influence.

In conclusion, whilst the aristocracy had great initial influence, even spanning across the whole much of the period in some cases, the objective power of the aristocracy over Parliament were not consistent through, and the absolute ~~suggests~~ consistency that 'maintained' suggests is not met. Initial control of seats, and therefore the Commons was strong, but the implementation of significant democratisation in the 1832 Act set off a gradual decline that reduced the aristocracy's structural influence over the Commons due to greater contestability and fairer redistribution, so diminished their influence over time and did not maintain it. Similarly, initial structural realities of the monarch controlling PM appointments meant they were often aristocrats, so there was a structural and direct aristocratic influence over the PM and therefore often times the direction of parliamentary behaviour, however, once again increased democratisation removed this structural power from the monarch and therefore the likelihood and ability of the aristocracy to influence the ~~PM~~ executive diminished and therefore was not consistent so not maintained. The ~~link~~ structural link between

the aristocracy and the Lords means they consistently maintained considerable influence over this branch of Parliament, yet their influence over Parliament as a whole was not consistent as the 1911 act imposed structural limitations that meant the Lords (and therefore the aristocracy) no longer had an equal and therefore considerable influence, as the Commons (not dominated by the aristocracy) was more structurally powerful. Whilst it had much influence over the period due to equal structural powers, the Lords and subsequently the aristocracy's influence was not totally consistent, so cannot be considered to be maintained. Whilst the aristocracy did have structural influence, it was not absolutely consistent across the period, therefore did not 'maintain' considerable influence over Parliament.



This is an impressive level 5 response that engages with the concept of maintaining power throughout the answer. It has clearly understood the focus of the question and has excellent contextual knowledge to support the analysis.



It is not good practice to abbreviate key words such as government to gov in academic writing.

## Question 9

This was the most popular question in this section of the paper. Candidates were able to present varying amounts of relevant material in response to this question. Most responses concluded that there was more success experienced in the later period, although the justification for this varied between candidates. Some candidates, who attempted to approach this question through a chronological description of key events with some linked comments struggled to complete their answer in the available time. It is important that candidates do think about the approach they take in these breadth questions. Despite the question beginning in 1782, most candidates began their answer in 1798. This meant that they did not consider the importance of the Constitution of 1782. There were some strong responses that considered the extent of success within each time frame, for instance differentiating between constitutional nationalism and political success in the 1870-1923 period. Some very strong answers considered both periods simultaneously, considering different forms of Irish National success e.g. impact on legislation and on awareness of the cause.

In the years 1870-1923, Irish nationalists experienced more success than in the years 1782-1867. This is due to how constitutional nationalism in the years 1870-1910 saw Irish politics gain a greater representation in parliament under the Irish Parliamentary Party, and caused one of Britain's largest parties, the Liberals, to become committed to Irish independence after 1886.

Furthermore, radical nationalism in the years 1910-23 saw much success as, for example, the Anglo-Irish War meant that Britain passed the 1921 Anglo-Irish Treaty that granted Irish nationalists in the south dominion status. However, in the years 1782-1867, nationalists did not experience much success, partly due to their failed uprisings, such as the 1798 United Irishmen Uprising and the 1867 Fenian uprising, that saw Ireland become a more integral part of Britain.

It is accurate to say that Irish nationalists experienced more success in 1870-1923. In the constitutional nationalism years of 1870-1910, the new nationalist agenda of Home Rule

increased in popularity, which was the demand for Ireland to remain a part of Britain but have a parliament that handles domestic affairs. This was sought after by parliamentary means, first by the Home Rule League under Isaac Butt and then under Parnell when he assumed leadership in 1879. Parnell renamed the League to the IPP in 1882 and under his leadership, the party gained significant influence and saw much success due to their policy of obstructionism. The IPP's success among Ireland was seen in 1886 when the party won 86 out of the 103 parliamentary seats reserved for Ireland. As a result, the IPP gained prominent power among British politics as they held the balance of power. This is because when William Gladstone was forming his Liberal administration in 1886, his party won 335 seats with the Conservatives winning 249. Therefore, as the Liberal party did not have a majority, Gladstone became committed to Home Rule in order to gain the IPP's support. The success of the IPP and Irish nationalism meant the largest party in Britain became supportive of Home Rule as their top priority. Soon, Gladstone introduced the First Home Rule Bill in April 1886, yet it failed to pass through the commons by a vote of 311 to 341 opposed. The failure of the Home Rule Bill saw the decline in the IPP, also due to accusations of murder and an affair

surrounding Parnell, but the party still cause the British parliament to consider home rule as the top priority. The Liberal party would, therefore, be committed to home rule in the future and so this can be classed as a success for nationalist politics.

Moreover, the years 1910-23 can also be regarded as being a period that saw more success in nationalist politics. After 1900, there emerged a more radical form of nationalism that favoured a more direct and aggressive form of obstructionism called the Sinn Féin Party. They sought complete independence from Britain and were willing to achieve this by any means necessary. The success of the party significantly increased after April 1914. The ~~the~~ Ulster Unionist Party, led by Edward Carson who wanted to prevent home rule and retain Ulster as a part of Britain, and the Ulster Volunteer Force (UVF) saw the militarisation of the unionist movement in 1914 when they acquired a German cache of 25,000 rifles and 3 million rounds of ammunition, called the Larne gun running Incident. This event saw Sinn Féin's military wing the Irish Volunteers, become armed in order to defend the nationalist movement from the UUP and UVF. Furthermore, the Sinn Féin party acquired 73 out of the 103 Irish parliamentary seats and thus Irish

politics gained a greater representation in parliament. The first successful account in this time period took the form of the 1916 Easter Rising in April that saw Irish Republican Brotherhood members (IRB) and Irish Volunteers stage an uprising. However, the rising was poorly coordinated and the British knew about it due to intercepting radio communications. 10,000 British soldiers were therefore sent to Ireland and soon, the rising was put down and the insurgents were executed. Despite this event not going successfully, it saw the creation of martyrs that aided the nationalist cause. Following this event, the Sinn Féin party organised themselves into an illegal parliament called the Dail Eirean. Furthermore, in January 1919, two police officers were killed in County Tipperary by ~~the~~ Irish Volunteers, now called IRA. As a result, British forces were sent to Ireland to subdue the illegal parliament and defeat the IRA. However, IRA attacks soon overwhelmed the British forces and so two Auxillary units, the Auxiliaries and Black and Tans were sent to Ireland. This Anglo-Irish War was brutal and on 21 November 1920, IRA forces killed 14 undercover military officers, called the Cairo gang. In response, the Black and Tans drove an armoured vehicle into Croke Park Stadium and fired on the crowd, killing 14 people. This became known as Bloody

Sunday, and made the British realise that their occupation in Ireland was becoming increasingly indefensible as anti-British sentiment increased. As a result, two pieces of legislation were passed by the British: the 1920 Government of Ireland Act and the 1921 Anglo-Irish Treaty, which granted dominion status to the 26 nationalist counties in the south of Ireland. This can therefore be regarded as a success as nationalists gained the independence they sought.

However, in the years 1782-1801, Irish nationalists experienced little success. In 1782, the Irish Volunteers sought legislative independence from Britain. Due to their intimidating 60,000-strong militia, the British granted them the 1782 Constitution. Despite granting independence, the Lord Lieutenant still had considerable influence over the Irish parliament as he controlled the patronage that the MPs favoured, so Britain still controlled Ireland. This is therefore not a success. In 1798, the United Irishmen staged a rebellion of 15,000 forces. However, it was poorly organised and important towns like Dublin and Belfast could not be taken. Moreover, 20,000 British forces were sent to Ireland and saw a decisive victory at the Battle of Vinegar Hill. Following this, the British felt the Irish parliament could not be trusted so passed the 1801 Act

of Union that made Britain a more integral part of Ireland. This is not a success as it is the opposite of what the nationalists sought. In 1867, the Fenians sought to create an Irish Republic and so staged a rebellion. However, it was poorly organised and it could not amount an effective enough resistance as they only had 6,500 weapons. Furthermore, Fenian leaders turned themselves in as government informants when they knew defeat was near. As a result, the British forces were able to arrest 200 Fenian leaders and put down the uprising. The nationalists failed to achieve their aims which shows little success.

Overall, the period 1870-1923 saw more success as the nationalists actually achieved a degree of independence through the 1921 Anglo-Irish Treaty and meant that nationalist politics gained a greater representation in parliament.



This response explores key issues through a sustained analysis. It offers consideration of the extent of the success of Irish nationalism in both the periods 1870-1923 and 1782-1867. It is clearly more developed in its very impressive section on the later period, but it acknowledges the earlier period and, in a brief, but pointed paragraph, it identifies key events of the earlier period with a comment to link each of them to the analysis. The combination of the two sections is sufficient to award this response level 5.

## Question 10

This was the least popular question in this section of the paper. Those candidates who tackled this answer chronologically sometimes struggled to link the events that they were looking at to the conceptual focus of change and continuity. Weaker candidates had a limited grasp of the appropriate knowledge to use and tended to describe the material that they deployed. Often this material was located more in the later part of the chronology and such answers often did not demonstrate sufficient breadth. Stronger answers tended to be seen among those candidates who took a theme and followed it through the period. Some impressive answers were seen that took this approach very successfully.

Chosen question number: Question 7 ☒

Question 8 ☒

Question 9 ☒

Question 10 ☒

p1 - maintain British control  
1801 Act of Union - United Irishmen  
response to 1867 and 1916 suppression of repeal response to 1848  
Anglo-Irish War  
p2 - goodwill University - Gladstone Church  
p3 - political necessity - 1885 general election  
1912: Home Rule Gov of Ireland Act  
Anglo-Irish treaty

In the years 1801 - 1923, the British approach to the government of Ireland was not consistent. It is clear that throughout the period, different Prime Ministers took different approaches and the context of each policy affected its motivation. British motivations changed between the aim to maintain British control, the moral obligation (or the desire to <sup>improve</sup> strengthen Anglo-Irish relations), and the motivation of political necessity for the government. Therefore, it is not accurate to say that from 1801 to 1923, British approaches to the government of Ireland remained unchanged.

To evaluate the changing approaches of the British towards the Irish, it is first necessary to discuss the motivation behind many of their policies: the desire to maintain British control in Ireland. For example: the 1801 Act of Union was introduced in response to the 1796 and 1798 uprisings of the United Irishmen. William Pitt the Younger aimed to keep Ireland in the British Empire and therefore felt a major <sup>repressive</sup> reform was necessary to subdue Irish nationalism and strengthen Britain's control over Ireland by removing their legislative powers and their government granted in 1782. The desire to maintain British control is also evident in Britain's responses to various nationalist uprisings in Ireland throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> century. For example: the suppression of the repeal movement and Association in 1843. This shows that the mass numbers at the monster meetings (up to 750,000 by 1843) threatened the British government and they banned the meeting to maintain the control granted by the Act of Union (also reflected in their refusal to repeal the Union, as the movement demanded). This constitutional response is contrasted by the repressive and violent responses to further uprisings, such as the 1848 uprising, in which

10,000 British men were sent in and the leaders were arrested. This theme is continued into 1867 where the Fenian leaders were arrested and executed - becoming the Manchester Martyrs. Also reflected by the response to the 1916 Easter Rising, with 3000 arrests and 15 executions of rebel leaders. The ~~for~~ increasingly violent <sup>British approach</sup> response to nationalism reflects the growing radicalism of the nationalist movement. Therefore, even within the policies enacted driven by the desire to maintain British control, there are changes in approach as the British react to the increasing radicalism of the Irish nationalists, adapting their approach to increase their efforts to maintain their control, an increasingly difficult task which grows to require a harsher response, peaking in ~~1920~~ 1918 when the British sent in troops to shut down the Dail Eireann and attempt to maintain control, something that they are unable to achieve in this final case. However, it is clear that the British approach to the government of Ireland changes greatly, even when comparing policies all motivated by the desire to maintain British control in Ireland.

It is also important to consider a different ~~motivation~~ ~~behind~~ approach taken by the

British during this period which is a conciliatory approach, in efforts to improve Anglo-Irish relations or simply efforts to improve the lives of the Irish. A key individual ~~at~~ and promoter of this approach was William Gladstone. This is evident in his land legislation of 1870 and 1881, an attempt to improve the rights of Irish tenant farmers. Another example of the British government's conciliatory approach to Ireland was in the 'Church Act' introduced which gave the Catholic Church the same status as the Protestant Church in Ireland, or the 'Universities Bill' which aimed to increase funds for Catholic education. As well as this, the Maynooth Grant, introduced in 1845 by Robert Peel is another example of the British government's approach of improving Anglo-Irish relations, especially focusing on the situation of Catholics within Ireland. These examples clearly reveal a contrasting approach to the repression previously discussed. Gladstone's conversion to home rule in 1885 can also be examined to reveal the changing nature of government policy as this comes after the repressive approach to radical nationalism, taken by previous administrations. It is clear that the British approach ~~was~~ towards Ireland was changed greatly

by the Prime Ministers in charge at the time, as well as the actions of the Irish who, at this time were concentrating their efforts into constitutional nationalism rather than rebellions, which made the British more likely to co-operate and less likely to use a repressive approach.

Finally, it is necessary to consider the importance of the British approach towards the government of Ireland when motivated by political necessity. For example, as previously discussed, ~~the~~ Gladstone's conversion to home rule reflects a conciliatory approach, ~~in~~ part motivated by the position of the IPP after 1885, having gained the balance of power in the general election. Therefore, the liberals had to take up the issue of home rule for their political agenda. This led to the attempted 1886 and 1893 Home Rule Bills, both rejected by Parliament. This theme is continued into 1912 as the IPP once more gain the balance of power to Herbert Asquith's administration, leading to the passing of the 1912 Home ~~Rule~~ Rule Bill, delayed until 1914 and then again by the First World War. Another example of concession forced by political necessity was the Government of Ireland Act of 1920 which separated the

Northern and Southern Irish governments. This was due to the pressure from the Ulster Unionist Party, the main Irish voice in Parliament since the withdrawal of Sinn Féin after the 1918 General Election. However, it is evident that Lloyd George took a harder line with the Unionists, as they voted against it but it was passed anyway. Finally, it is important to consider the ~~as~~ change in approach of the <sup>1921</sup> Anglo-Irish treaty, compared to the Anglo-Irish War. This event marked a shift in approaches from a violent one - the Black and Tans and auxiliaries were becoming increasingly repressive <sup>during the war</sup> - to one of negotiation. Despite the fact that Lloyd George dominated the negotiations and forced an agreement, it was still a significant shift in British approach, further showing the change in their approach.\*

In conclusion, it is evident that the British approach changed and evolved greatly from 1801 - 1923. It is clear that these changes were motivated by the ~~actions~~ actions of the Irish, ~~as~~ adapting to reflect the levels of violence and threat posed to the British government. The contrast between the conciliatory and repressive policies of Britain clearly marks

the shifting approach. This reveals that it is not accurate to say that British approach to ~~treat~~ the government of Ireland remained largely unchanged in this period.

\* even within the same administrations and under the same leaders. This exemplifies the importance of the context as Lloyd George was reacting to the decline of British public opinion towards the Anglo - Irish War.



This is a confident response to this question. It ranges across the chronology, with an impressive grasp on contextual knowledge. Where the answer goes beyond the chronology at the start, the material is made relevant to this question. The analysis always returns to the focus of the question. This response achieved level 5.

# Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

## Section A

- Candidates should read the question carefully, so that they ensure that they are dealing with both enquiries
- Candidates should aim to go beyond comprehension and summary of the sources by developing reasoned inferences that are fully discussed
- Candidates should read the caption carefully and make full use of it when evaluating the source whilst avoiding making stereotypical judgements
- Candidates should make use of relevant contextual knowledge to support inferences and evaluation. It is worth repeating that it is not the quantity of contextual knowledge that is key, but the use to which it is put.

## Sections B and C

- Planning of essays will help candidates develop an analytical approach
- It is really important that candidates read questions carefully, so that there is no possibility of misinterpreting its demands. This will enable them to answer the question that has been set, both in terms of its conceptual focus and its chronological parameters
- Candidates should avoid a narrative/descriptive approach; this often undermines the analysis that is required for the higher levels
- Candidates should aim to range across the breadth of the chronology in Section C questions.

## Grade boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:  
<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

