



Cambridge International Examinations
Cambridge Pre-U Certificate

HISTORY (PRINCIPAL)

9769/05G

Paper 5G Special Subject: Gladstone and Disraeli, 1867–1886

For Examination from 2016

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

2 hours

MAXIMUM MARK: 60

The syllabus is approved for use in England, Wales and Northern Ireland as a Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate.

This document consists of **11** printed pages and **1** blank page.

Special Subject: Source-based Question

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1, 2, 3 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question. Information about AOs can be found in the 2016–18 Cambridge Pre-U History syllabus.

Introduction

- (a) This question is designed to test skills in the handling and evaluation of source material but it is axiomatic that answers should be informed by and firmly grounded in wider contextual knowledge.
- (b) Examiners will be aware that the topic on which this question has been based has been notified to candidates in advance who, therefore, have had the opportunity of studying, using and evaluating relevant documents.
- (c) The Band in which an answer is placed depends upon a range of criteria. As a result not all answers fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases, a 'best-fit' approach will be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (d) In marking an answer examiners will first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

Question (a)

Band 3: 8–10 marks

The answer will make full use of both documents and will be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues will be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation.

Band 2: 4–7 marks

The response will make good use of both documents and will pick up the main features of the focus of the argument (depending upon whether similarity or difference is asked) with some attention to the alternative. Direct comparison of content, themes and issues is to be expected although, at the lower end of the Band, there may be a tendency to treat the documents separately with most or all of the comparison and analysis being left to the end. Again, towards the lower end, there may be some paraphrasing. Clear explanation of how the documents agree or differ is to be expected but insights into why are less likely. A sound critical sense is to be expected especially at the upper end of the Band.

Band 1: 1–3 marks

Treatment of the documents will be partial, certainly incomplete and possibly fragmentary. Only the most obvious differences/similarities will be detected and there will be a considerable imbalance (differences may be picked up but not similarities and vice versa). Little is to be expected by way of explanation of how the documents show differences/similarities, and the work will be characterised by largely uncritical paraphrasing.

Band 0: 0 marks

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Question (b)**Band 4: 16–20 marks**

The answer will treat the documents as a set and will make very effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It will be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material will be handled confidently with strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge will be demonstrated. The material deployed will be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument will be well structured. Historical concepts and vocabulary will be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected.

Band 3: 11–15 marks

The answer will treat the documents as a set and make good use of them although, depending on the form of the question, not necessarily in equal detail. There may, however, be some omissions and gaps. A good understanding of the question will be demonstrated. There will be a good sense of argument and analysis within a secure and planned structure. Supporting use of contextual knowledge is to be expected and will be deployed in appropriate range and depth. Some clear signs of a critical sense will be on show although critical evaluation of the documents may not always be especially well developed and may be absent at the lower end of the Band. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations may be expected. The answer will demonstrate a good understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary.

Band 2: 6–10 marks

There will be some regard to the documents as a set and a fair coverage, although there will be gaps and one or two documents may be unaccountably neglected, or especially at the lower end of the Band, ignored altogether. The demands of the question will be understood at least in good part and an argument will be attempted. This may be undeveloped and/or insufficiently supported in places. Analysis will be at a modest level and narrative is likely to take over in places with a consequent lack of focus. Some of the work will not go beyond paraphrasing. Supporting contextual knowledge will be deployed but unevenly. Any critical sense will be limited; formal critical evaluation is rarely to be expected; use of historical concepts will be unsophisticated.

Band 1: 1–5 marks

The answer will treat the documents as a set only to a limited extent. Coverage will be very uneven; there will be considerable omissions with whole sections left unconsidered. Some understanding of the question will be demonstrated but any argument will be undeveloped and poorly supported. Analysis will appear rarely, narrative will predominate and focus will be very blurred. In large part the answer will depend upon unadorned paraphrasing. Critical sense and evaluation, even at an elementary level, is unlikely whilst understanding of historical concepts will be at a low level. The answer may be slight, fragmentary or even unfinished.

Band 0: 0 marks

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Special Subject: Essay Question

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question. Information about AOs can be found in the 2016–18 Cambridge Pre-U History syllabus.

Introduction

- (a) The banding definitions which follow reflect, and should be interpreted within the context of, the following general statement:

Examiners will give their highest marks to candidates who show a ready understanding of the relevant material and a disciplined management of the discussion the question provokes. They will be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit will be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners will use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It goes without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners will also bear in mind that analysis sufficient for a mark in the highest band may perfectly legitimately be deployed within a chronological framework. Candidates who eschew an explicitly analytical response may yet be able, by virtue of the very intelligence and pointedness of their selection of elements for a well-sustained and well-grounded account, to provide sufficient implicit analysis to justify a Band 4 mark.
- (e) The Band in which an essay is placed depends on a range of criteria. As a result, not all essays fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases a 'best-fit' approach will be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners will first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

Band 5: 25–30 marks

The answer will be sharply analytical in approach and strongly argued. It will show that the demands of the question have been fully understood and that a conscious and sustained attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. It will be coherent and structured with a clear sense of direction. The focus will be sharp and persistent. Some lack of balance, in that certain aspects are covered less fully or certain arguments deployed less strongly than others, need not preclude a mark in this Band. The material will be wide-ranging and handled with the utmost confidence and a high degree of maturity. Historical explanations will be invariably clear, sharp and well developed and historical concepts fully understood. Where appropriate there will be conscious and successful attempts to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material critically and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the other criteria for this Band, limited or no use of such sources should not preclude it from being placed in this Band.

Band 4: 19–24 marks

The answer will be characterised by an analytical and argued approach, although there may be the occasional passage which does not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been very well understood and that a determined attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. The essay will be coherent and clearly structured and its judgements will be effectively supported by accurate and relevant material. Some lack of rigour in the argument and occasional blurred focus may be allowed. Where appropriate there will be a conscious and largely successful attempt to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. The material will be wide-ranging, fully understood, confidently deployed and well controlled with high standards of accuracy. Historical explanations will be clear and well developed and there will be a sound understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to at least some relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the criteria for this Band, very limited or no use of these sources should not preclude it from being placed in this Band.

Band 3: 13–18 marks

The answer will attempt an analytical approach, although there will be passages which do not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in large part, and that a conscious attempt has been made to respond to them. There will be an effective focus on the terms of the question and, although in places this may break down, standards of relevance will be generally high. Although it may not be sustained throughout the answer, or always fully supported, there will be a recognisable sense of argument. The material will be clearly understood, with a good range, and organisation will be sound. There will be a conscious attempt to draw conclusions and form judgements and these will be adequately supported. Some understanding of differing and competing interpretations is to be expected and some evaluation of sources may be attempted but probably not in a very sophisticated form. Historical explanations and the use of historical concepts and vocabulary will be generally sound but some lack of understanding is to be expected. Use of English will be competent, clear and largely free of serious errors.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is a possibility. Candidates should be credited for having used such sources rather than penalised for not having done so.

Band 2: 7–12 marks

The answer may contain some analysis but descriptive or narrative material will predominate. The essay will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in good part, and that some attempt has been made to respond to them. It will be generally coherent with a fair sense of organisation. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be uneven and there will be a measure of irrelevance. There will be some inaccuracies in knowledge, and the range may be limited with some gaps. Understanding of the material will be generally sound, although there will be some lack of tautness and precision. Explanations will be generally clear although not always convincing or well developed. Some attempt at argument is to be expected but it will lack sufficient support in places and sense of direction may not always be clear. There may be some awareness of differing interpretations and some attempt at evaluating source material but this is not generally to be expected at this level and such skills, where deployed, will be unsophisticated.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Band 1: 1–6 marks

The answers will respond in some measure to the demands of the question but will be very limited in meeting these. Analysis, if it appears at all, will be brief and undeveloped. If an argument is attempted it will be lacking in real coherence, sense of direction, support and rigour. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be very uneven; the answer is likely to include unsupported generalisations, and there will be some vagueness and irrelevance. Historical knowledge, concepts and vocabulary will be insufficiently understood and there will be inaccuracies. Explanations may be attempted but will be halting and unclear. Where judgements are made they will be largely unsubstantiated whilst investigation of historical problems will be very elementary. Awareness of differing interpretations and the evaluation of sources are not to be expected. The answer may be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is highly unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Band 0: 0 marks

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

- 1 (a) To what extent, and why, does the impression given in Document B of the Turkish presence in Bulgaria differ from that given in Document A? [10]

Candidates should show awareness of the grounds on which *The Times* (Document B) attacks Gladstone (Document A) to indicate differences of perception about the Turkish presence in Bulgaria. Candidates should make use of the content of the headings and attributions, as well as the text, of the documents. Document A makes Gladstone's views clear. Candidates should conclude that Gladstone is making an unequivocal attack on Turkish policy and that he does not see a legitimate presence for Turkey in Bulgaria. Candidates might note that his attack is in wildly intemperate language, especially for a politician: 'extinction of ... executive power', 'bag and baggage' and civilisation 'affronted and shamed'. *The Times* (Document B) attacks both the substance and the style of Gladstone's argument. It takes on the totality of Gladstone's attack, suggesting that he is traducing not only the entire Turkish Empire but Islamic civilisation as a whole. Document B implies that this is both an unwise and a dangerous move, since 'Mohammedanism' 'implies no slight force in human history'.

On the question 'To what extent', candidates are likely to argue 'fully'. The views offered on the Turks in the two documents seem diametrically opposed. Both agree that the Turks are maintaining a significant presence in Bulgaria but, beyond that, virtually everything seems to stress difference. Document B points out that Gladstone's argument is exaggerated. The tone of the newspaper's response is measured and not apparently exaggerated. It stresses the long-lasting force of 'Mohammedanism' and implies that its cultural heritage is significant. The intention is to undermine the forceful language which Gladstone presents.

On the question 'Why', candidates can note Gladstone's strong hostility to the Turkish presence and should infer his strong support for 'Christian' methods which are implied to be so much more civilised than those of the 'Mohammedan' Turks. They might note that pamphlets such as this were often used as the vehicle by which polemical literature was launched. They should use contextual knowledge to expand on Gladstone's Christian principles and also, perhaps, a domestic political agenda in which Gladstone was trying to outflank the government by this intervention. *The Times*, candidates should know and can certainly infer from the argument in Document B, was a long-standing opponent of both Gladstone and most Liberal causes. The newspaper was probably exaggerating Gladstone's case to suit its own political ends. Candidates may note that Gladstone calls here just for the Turks to get out of Bulgaria, not for the end of 'Mohammedanism' as a whole. They could use contextual geographical knowledge to add another reason for Gladstone's intervention about the Turkish presence. His concern seems to be for the domination of Christianity in Europe, not in Asia.

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by these documents for the view that the government's policy over the 'Eastern Question' in the later 1870s was in Britain's best interests? In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A–D). [20]**

From contextual knowledge, candidates should be aware of the key elements relating to the Eastern Question and of the heated debates to which it gave rise, some of which are directly represented in the selected documents. Candidates should note the divergent priorities which British statesmen had in respect of the Eastern Question. They should comment on Britain's overall objectives in the Mediterranean, including both the safeguarding of trade routes to India (especially where there is also an obvious imperial dimension) and to maintaining a balance of power in the Balkans which would prevent Russian expansionism in the area. These were key areas of debate concerning British interests. Candidates should also explain how, and why, South-east Europe had become a volatile region; why Britain's interests were perceived to be affected by developments there; and why Disraeli seems to have been prepared to risk another war with Russia. The religious issue – Christianity and Islam – was also frequently brought to the forefront. Candidates should note that, broadly speaking, the Liberals were more pacifist than the Conservatives. They might also note that one of Disraeli's long-standing criticisms of Gladstone was his insufficiently robust response to challenges in foreign policy. Candidates should explain that the Eastern Question was divisive within the two main political parties as well as across them. There was much criticism of Gladstone's intervention from within the Liberal party, and especially by those who suspected ulterior political motives and ambitions. On the Conservative side, candidates should note that Derby resigned as Foreign Secretary in 1878, believing that Disraeli's policies were not in the nation's interests and, indeed, risked wholesale war.

Document A makes a clear statement about the religious question and the use of extreme language is itself indication of the divisiveness of the question. Document C shows how the issue is controversial, and that Disraeli himself notes the risk of war if opponents of the Turks (like Gladstone) go much further than the government was doing in asserting the rights of Christian subjects in a region controlled by a Muslim power. Disraeli asserts that he was attempting to reach a settlement by diplomacy. Candidates can cross-refer to Gladstone's moralistic statements in Document A. Document D derives from the period immediately after the resolution of the Eastern crisis by the Treaty of Berlin 1878 and it provides evidence of Disraeli's apparent belief that this settlement suited British interests well, because Britain had reached an accommodation with Russia and also because the preservation of peace should provide the conditions under which British trading and commercial wealth could be advanced. Some candidates might cite the music hall song 'We don't want to fight, but, by jingo, if we do ...', and the much more defensive satire ending 'and the Russians can have Constantinople' which it provoked. Similarly, Document D refers directly to 'those who are our critics' even of a settlement at Berlin which Disraeli holds to be reasonable and to 'open a new continent to the civilisation of Europe'. He then attempts to attack Gladstone's position on the settlement, which can be cross-referred to his earlier position of 1876, as reflected by *The Times* in Document B.

Candidates should identify areas relating to the controversy, especially over 'Britain's best interests'. It is relevant to mention, for example, that the documents say little or nothing about divisions *within* the two political parties over the British interests which were at stake in the Eastern Question. It could also be argued both that relatively little is said about the Conservative position on Christianity versus 'Mohammedanism' and also that the documents are somewhat stronger on the earlier phase of the 'Eastern Question' as it developed during Disraeli's premiership than they are in discussing the extent to which the Treaty of Berlin was in British interests.

Candidates should make at least some comment on the usefulness of the documents in making an overall evaluation of 'convincing'. In particular, they may note that both Documents C and D derive from partisan political speeches. They might detect a suggestion of self-indulgent triumphalism from Disraeli as he addressed known supporters in Document D, and also the opportunity which his speech in Aylesbury gave (Document C) to explain and defend government policy. Candidates may focus on writing by Shannon and others about Disraeli, and also on recent work which discusses the 'moralism' of Gladstone's foreign policy statements, and the extent to which the Bulgarian Atrocities was merely a convenient excuse to return to the political fold.

2 Why did the Conservatives lose the general election of 1868 so comprehensively? [30]

AO1/AO2 – Answers require an explanation not just of the Liberals' victory but, more specifically, of why the Conservatives were so roundly beaten. Candidates should note the scale of the Conservative defeat. Gladstone's Liberals won over 100 seats more than Disraeli's Conservatives. The result is normally rendered as Liberals 382 and Conservatives 276. The Liberals won more than 60% of the popular vote. The outcome, although the balance had swung more to the Liberals, was not markedly different from that of 1865. Candidates may know that the Conservatives lost about 20 seats, while the Liberals gained about 20. Candidates should also know where the main political parties were relatively strong and where relatively weak, both across the nations of the UK and also in different types of constituency. They should know about the Liberals' relative strength in Scotland, Ireland and in most industrial areas, whereas the Conservative strength was concentrated in England, especially in rural areas and the smaller towns. Candidates may also mention contrasts in sectarian support for the two parties, with much more nonconformist support going to the Liberals.

Candidates should reach a judgement about the causes of the Conservative electoral defeat of 1868, and particularly the reasons why that defeat was so comprehensive. The main causes include: Liberals as the 'natural' governing party since 1846; the electorate returning to its 'usual' home; the strength of the Liberals in many urban constituencies; perceptions of Gladstone as a strong leader; the image of the Liberals as a party in favour of free trade, peace and prosperity. As Britain's industrial revolution became consolidated, more voters were concentrated in constituencies which became more numerous as a result of the electoral changes of 1867–68 and where, in normal circumstances, the Liberals would be expected to do well. By contrast, and despite Disraeli's attempts to change it, the Conservatives were often seen as the party which instinctively reacted against change; their strength was in relatively small constituencies. Candidates should comment on the scale of Disraeli's defeat. They may also argue that the 1868 election, although carried out under the new franchise, came too soon for the full implications of the changes to have worked through the system. In particular, there had been no massive expansion of electoral organisation and new techniques of 'guidance and persuasion' were being trialled in constituencies. So any anticipated 'pro-reform bounce' for the Conservatives was likely to prove premature as early as December 1868. Candidates may make a minor challenge to the assumptions in the question by pointing out that, although the Conservatives lost decisively, they did relatively well in Lancashire (including the defeat of Gladstone there) and in parts of London. Candidates may use this to demonstrate the electoral force of sectarian division and especially of anti-Catholicism in areas of relatively recent Catholic migration. Candidates may be aware of debates about the electoral appeal of Liberalism and about Disraeli's expectations in 1868. They might also know about the increasing influence of Irish issues in several constituencies.

3 “Disraelian conservatism” represented a coherent body of ideas.’ Discuss with reference to Conservative domestic policy in the years 1867–80. [30]

AO1 – Candidates should reflect on ‘Disraelian conservatism’ in the context of domestic policy and reach a judgement about the extent to which it represented a coherent body of ideas. They should follow the chronology and include material on Disraeli as leader of the opposition (1868–74) as well as Prime Minister. Candidates are likely to mention key issues related to Conservatism: support for the established church; support for landed society and especially perhaps for the ‘squirearchy’ by the 1870s; support for free trade. Within this broad, and fairly constant framework, candidates should know about the distinctive Disraeli contribution: the potency of his attacks on the Liberals as ‘exhausted volcanoes’; his attempt to capture the support of the newly enfranchised, especially the working classes in urban areas; and the ‘social’ initiatives related to Artisans’ Dwellings, Public Health, Sale of Food and Drugs Act, Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act; his use of imperialism (Royal Titles Act). Although imperialism and an ‘active’ foreign policy should not be given detailed attention (and, since the question concerns domestic policy, may well be ignored by candidates) it is legitimate to refer to expressions of patriotism and clear, proud statements of national identity as part of Disraeli’s domestic vote-winning strategy. Candidates might argue that Disraelian conservatism was primarily about making the Conservatives the natural party of government after a long period on the sidelines of power.

AO2 – Candidates should make a judgement about what represents a coherent set of ideas; they may concentrate on an adumbration of policies with some assertive comments on how well they linked together. Candidates may argue that if the prime purpose of Disraeli’s policies was to win and then retain the loyalty of the new voters, there was some merit in a ‘bread and circuses’ policy, backed up by a much more professional party organisation, which perhaps emphasised image over reality. Candidates might also note that facilitating a much more professional organisation from the early 1870s (albeit with detailed outworking in the hands of others) helped to push a basically populist message home and thus the policies deserved to be considered coherent, at least at the level of overall strategy rather than detailed tactics.

Some candidates might argue that many of Disraeli’s domestic policies were fairly blatant window-dressing (allowing peaceful picketing while leaving the legal deck strongly stacked against trade union action; giving local authorities powers to address the problems of slum housing which they were under no compunction to use and, given the cost, generally did not) and not, in themselves, coherent. There was criticism of Disraeli’s policies from within his own cabinet, not least from R. A. Cross who bemoaned the fact that there was no detail, merely ‘headlines’, in most of the ideas which came onto his desk. As policies, they were not inherently coherent but if the main purpose was to win elections, the overall objective might be seen as coherent – not that they seem to have won Disraeli many votes when the next general election came around in 1880. Candidates may be aware of debates about Disraeli’s overall objectives and might wish to follow Paul Smith’s line about the essential cynicism of the Prime Minister’s approach. They may make use of the high place which Disraeli still holds in the pantheon of Tory leaders and look to evidence both from the years in opposition as well as in government to explain why he is so highly regarded by Blake and others.

4 Why did Irish issues occupy so much of the time of the United Kingdom parliament in the years 1867–86? [30]

AO1 – The key issues on which candidates should focus include: the unpopularity of the Union of 1800 and the growth of violence as a means of shaking it; the so-called Fenian Outrages in Manchester and London (1867); the extent to which Fenianism ‘raised consciousness’ in Britain and perhaps convinced Gladstone that his ‘mission’ really had to be to pacify Ireland; the disestablishment of the Irish Church (1869); the Land Act (1870) designed to protect Irish tenancies; the foundation of the Home Rule League (1873) and its early success; the roles of Butt and Parnell; the foundation of the Irish Land League (1879) and the role of Michael Davitt; the policy of ‘Boycotting’; the Coercion Act (1881); the Land Act (1881); the Kilmainham Treaty (1882) as an attempt to end violence in Ireland; the Phoenix Park Murders (1882); the impact of the Reform and Redistribution Acts (1884–5); and Gladstone’s commitment to Home Rule and its short-term impact (1885–6). Candidates should use this and similar evidence to indicate that Ireland did play a central role in UK politics in this period. The relationship between initiatives, impact and consequence should be clearly identified.

AO2 – Key reasons which candidates should identify, and adjudicate between, will include the following: the impact of violence: how far Westminster initiatives were driven by the fear that Ireland was becoming ungovernable and/or that the majority community there was being systematically disadvantaged; the emergence of Irish nationalists as a significant independent force at Westminster, rather than a small, and sometimes deferential, minority within a previously dominant Liberal coalition. In 1874, Nationalists won 58 seats; in 1880, 65 and in 1885, after redistribution, 86 of the 101 Irish seats. Thus, while political opinion within Ireland was overwhelmingly in favour of nationalist solutions, the nationalists elected to Westminster were also becoming capable of denying Liberals and Conservatives a majority and could use their political powers directly. The Home Rule League and the Land League helped make the Irish question more critical. Policies of ‘boycotting’ and ‘filibustering’ led some to reflect that the Westminster parliament was being prevented from acting as an efficient legislature while Irish issues remained unresolved. The Phoenix Park murders, while producing widespread revulsion, convinced many that the Irish issue was not going to go away. Irish issues contributed to the growing division between parties. Although many Liberals were uneasy about ‘concessions’ to the Catholics, the Tory party was overwhelmingly Protestant and determined to support the Protestant interest, particularly in the north. Some candidates might argue that Gladstone was almost single-handedly responsible for keeping Ireland on the agenda. He had been the first leading British politician to think radically in terms of legislation designed to provide relief for Irish Catholics. His involvement in Irish politics had convinced him that Home Rule (in domestic affairs) was the only viable solution. This decision led to his removal from office, split his party and ensured that in 1885–6 Ireland was *the* key issue of the day. Candidates may be aware of debates about Gladstone’s personal commitment to Irish questions.

