

Mark Scheme for June 2013

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2013

Subject-specific Marking Instructions

Distribution of marks for each level that reflects the Unit's AOs
2 answers: Each maximum mark 60

	AO1a	AO1b
IA	18–20	36–40
IB	16–17	32–35
II	14–15	28–31
III	12–13	24–27
IV	10–11	20–23
V	8–9	16–19
VI	4–7	8–15
VII	0–3	0–7

Notes:

- (i) Allocate marks to the most appropriate level for each AO.
- (ii) If several marks are available in a box, work from the top mark down until the best fit has been found.
- (iii) Many answers will not fall at the same level for each AO.
- (iv) Candidates will demonstrate synoptic skills by drawing together appropriate techniques, knowledge and understanding to evaluate developments over the whole of the period

AOs	AO1a	AO1b
Total mark for each question = 60	Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.	Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; - the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied
Level IA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a wide range of accurate and relevant evidence • Accurate and confident use of appropriate historical terminology • Answer is clearly structured and coherent; communicates accurately and legibly. <p style="text-align: center;">18–20</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent understanding of key concepts (eg continuity and change) relevant to analysis in their historical context • Excellent synthesis and synoptic assessment • Answer is consistently and relevantly analytical with developed explanations and supported judgements • May make unexpected but substantiated connections over the whole period. <p style="text-align: center;">36–40</p>
Level IB	<p>Level IB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses accurate and relevant evidence • Accurate use of a range of appropriate historical terminology • Answer is clearly structured and mostly coherent; communicates accurately and legibly. <p style="text-align: center;">16–17</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very good level of understanding of key concepts (eg continuity and change) in their historical context • Answer is consistently focused on the question set • Very good level of explanation/analysis, and provides supported judgements • Very good synthesis and synoptic assessment of the whole period. <p style="text-align: center;">32–35</p>

AOs	AO1a	AO1b
Level II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses mostly accurate and relevant evidence • Generally accurate use of historical terminology • Answer is structured and mostly coherent; writing is legible and communication is generally clear. <p style="text-align: center;">14–15</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good level of understanding of key concepts (eg continuity and change) in their historical context • Good explanation/analysis but overall judgements may be uneven • Answer is focused on the issues in the question set • Good synthesis and assessment of developments over most of the period. <p style="text-align: center;">28–31</p>
Level III	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses relevant evidence but there may be some inaccuracy • Answer includes relevant historical terminology but this may not be extensive or always accurately used • Most of the answer is structured and coherent; writing is legible and communication is generally clear. <p style="text-align: center;">12–13</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows a sound understanding of key concepts, especially continuity and change, in their historical context • Most of the answer is focused on the question set • Answers may be a mixture of analysis and explanation but also description and narrative, but there may also be some uneven overall judgements; OR answers may provide more consistent analysis but the quality will be uneven and its support often general or thin • Answer assesses relevant factors but provides only a limited synthesis of developments over most of the period. <p style="text-align: center;">24–27</p>
Level IV	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is deployment of relevant knowledge but level/accuracy will vary • Some unclear and/or underdeveloped and/or disorganised sections • Mostly satisfactory level of communication. <p style="text-align: center;">10–11</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfactory understanding of key concepts (eg continuity and change) in their historical context • Satisfactory focus on the question set • Answer may be largely descriptive/narratives of events, and links between this and analytical comments will typically be weak or unexplained • Makes limited synoptic judgements about developments over only part of the period. <p style="text-align: center;">20–23</p>

AOs	AO1a	AO1b
Level V	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General and basic historical knowledge but also some irrelevant and inaccurate material • Often unclear and disorganised sections • Adequate level of communication but some weak prose passages <p style="text-align: center;">8–9</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General understanding of key concepts (eg continuity and change) in their historical context • Some understanding of the question but answers may focus on the topic and not address the question set OR provides an answer based on generalisation • Attempts an explanation but often general coupled with assertion, description/narrative • Very little synthesis or analysis and only part(s) of the period will be covered. <p style="text-align: center;">16–19</p>
Level VI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of relevant evidence will be limited; there will be much irrelevance and inaccuracy • Answers may have little organisation or structure • Weak use of English and poor organisation. <p style="text-align: center;">4–7</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very little understanding of key concepts (eg continuity and change) in their historical context • Limited perhaps brief explanation • Mainly assertion, description/narrative • Some understanding of the topic but not the question's requirements. <p style="text-align: center;">8–15</p>
Level VII	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little relevant or accurate knowledge • Very fragmentary and disorganised response • Very poor use of English and some incoherence. <p style="text-align: center;">0–3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weak understanding of key concepts (eg continuity and change) in their historical context • No explanation • Assertion, description/narrative predominate • Weak understanding of the topic or of the question's requirements. <p style="text-align: center;">0–7</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	<p>Candidates should focus on 'the development of German nationalism' and 'the impact of industrialisation' in their answers. The impact of industrialisation may be evaluated against the other dominant factors in the development of German nationalism during this period, for example the role played by German nationalists and by significant individuals such as Bismarck and Kaiser Wilhelm II. However candidates may also only analyse the impact of industrialisation, and either approach is acceptable. In support of the view in the question candidates are likely to explain the impact of industrialisation on the development of German nationalism, for example the impact of the founding and development of the Krupp Gusstahlfabrik (Cast Steel Works) from 1811 and the impact of the Zollverein after 1834. Candidates are likely to demonstrate an understanding of the link between industrialisation, Prussia's growing economic power and Prussia's pivotal role in the creation and development of the German Empire. The development of the railways may be seen as significant. Candidates are likely to understand how developments in the economy in the 1850s paved the way for the Prussian military victories of 1864, 1866 and 1870/71 and the creation of the Second Reich. Military strength depended upon industrialisation: 'Coal & Iron' rather than 'Blood & Iron' could be usefully debated. This though also had a limiting effect on the development of German nationalism as Prussia was able to exclude Austria, first from the Zollverein and then from Germany. This led to the creation in 1871 of Kleindeutschland, thus thwarting the ambitions of those nationalists who aspired to Grossdeutschland. The impact of the extraordinary developments in the German economy after 1871 should be discussed. By the late 1880s the manufacture of armaments represented around 50% of Krupp's total output, for example. Candidates may well argue that the quickening pace of industrialization led to urbanization and the development of increasingly radical socialism. Socialism gave the working class an alternative loyalty to patriotism and nationalism. Arguably this had a negative impact on the development of German nationalism. This in turn led Kaiser Wilhelm II to embark on a foreign policy aimed at distracting the workers from their grievances. It could be argued that this populist foreign policy fanned the flames of German nationalism. Candidates may also argue that this radical nationalism had a significantly negative impact on the development of German nationalism as entry into the First World War left the German nation defeated and deeply divided by 1919.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	<p>Candidates should compare the importance of the aims and ideas of German nationalism with the impact that Prussia had on the development of a united Germany. Candidates should focus on 'more important' in their answers. Candidates may well draw comparisons between the emergence of German nationalism in the Napoleonic period with Prussia's role in the defeat of Napoleon. Candidates are likely to show knowledge of developments in intellectual nationalism in the first half of the Nineteenth Century. Candidates may consider the impact that the Prussian Zollverein had on the development of nationalism, but may argue that in the period between 1815 and 1862 the emerging ideas of German nationalism were more important to the development of a united Germany than Prussian ambitions. Candidates may contrast this with the role played by Prussia in the 1860s in forging the new Germany. Candidates may discuss the impact of the 1871 Constitution. Candidates may demonstrate that they understand that the German Empire in 1871 represented Kleindeutschland and an enlarged Prussia rather than a united Germany. They may argue that it was a Prussian Empire rather than a German Empire. However not all German nationalists aspired to Grossdeutschland and it can be argued that the creation of the Second Reich was a crucial step forward for the aims of many German nationalists. Candidates could point to the mythical status of Bismarck in German history and/or to the popularity and mass appeal of increasingly radical nationalism in the reign of William II to argue that Prussia's creation of the Second Reich was consistent with the aims of many German nationalists. Candidates may well discuss factors that undermined the aims of German nationalists, for example their own divisions. The 1848 Revolution may be seen as a pivotal moment by such candidates. Candidates might argue that the aims and ambitions of Prussian militarism were to ultimately set the German nation on course for disaster and humiliation by reference to Germany's defeat in the First World War and her humiliation at Versailles.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	<p>Candidates should focus on whether wars were the main factor in the unification of the German people and evaluate whether this was accurate throughout the period from 1789 to 1919 in their answers. Candidates must show that they understand that wars were not the sole factor in the unification of the German people in this period. The importance of wars should be evaluated against the other dominant factors in the unification of the German people during this period, for example the economy and the role played by Bismarck. In support of the view in the question, candidates may argue that the common fight of people from different German states against the French, especially in 1813, gave strong impulses to nationalism and united the German people against a common foe. They may argue that the consequences of the Napoleonic Wars, the decisions about Germany taken at the Congress of Vienna, reinforced the desire of some Germans to unite the German nation. However candidates may argue that this had limited impact as subsequently only a minority of Germans, a few intellectuals, demanded the unification of all German-speaking people. Candidates are likely to demonstrate understanding of the debate about Grossdeutschland or Kleindeutschland in the period 1815–1871 to illustrate that all German nationalists were far from united in this period and that their views were hardly representative of the German masses. Candidates are likely to argue that after 1815 Austria had a controlling role over the other German states through the German Confederation and that, especially up to 1848, Austria was successful in ensuring that the German people remained divided. Arguably therefore, the consequence of the Napoleonic Wars had a divisive influence on Germany and the German people at least through to the 1860s. Candidates are likely to argue that the wars in the 1860s were an extremely important unifying influence on Germany. Candidates may well stress the importance of the victory over Austria in 1866 in enabling Prussia to overcome a major obstacle to unification. However, some candidates may stress that this was a war between the German peoples and that one consequence was to ensure that only a Kleindeutschland would emerge by 1871. Candidates are likely to view the Franco-Prussian War as of pivotal importance in the unification of Germany, though some are likely to argue that this, and the consequences beyond 1871 and the establishment of the German Empire, can be viewed more as a take-over of Germany by Prussia than as a process of unification.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Candidates may argue that although wars united the German Empire by 1871 they left the German people divided geographically. Candidates are also likely to argue that the continued divisions between the German people, for example on religious or social grounds, illustrate the fact that the wars of the 1860s may have been a unifying influence on Germany but they failed to unite the German people. Candidates may argue that the First World War united the German nation at first but that divisions soon arose and were entrenched by 1918. However, whilst Versailles divided the nation geographically it united the nation in condemnation and bitterness of the 'diktat'.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4	<p>The question addresses the importance of the organisation of armies in the period and the potential advantages that superior organisational structures gave in military operations. Candidates might address the development of permanent divisional structures in the course of the Napoleonic Wars and the development of corps composed of multiple arms. This organisational structure remained the basic system used by armies throughout the period. Early in the period Napoleonic France pioneered such organisational structures and, arguably, this is one of the reasons why they had the advantage over their opponents until their European enemies followed suit.</p> <p>Candidates might discuss the development of larger organisations such as the army group which first appears in the Russian campaign of 1812. Candidates might focus on the advantages of such larger groupings of soldiers demonstrated in the later wars of the 19th and 20th centuries. Candidates might also examine command and control systems – such as the French general staff – in relation to these organisational structures. This type of approach would argue that organisational efficiency gave rise to better command control and hence more effective war fighting capabilities on the part of the armies of the period.</p> <p>Alternatively, candidates might opt for another ‘main factor’ in determining the outcome of wars. Such responses must, however, address and challenge the basic precept of the question. Better forms of this type of response will engage the question in a synoptic fashion interweaving alternative ‘main factors’ into the basic precept of the question. For example, weapons technology was the ‘main factor’ but it was used more effectively by armies which had better organisational structures.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5	<p>Modes of communication might be dispatches delivered by men either on foot or horseback, the visual telegraph of the Napoleonic era, the electric telegraph, the telephone and radio. In a given conflict more than one of these modes of communication might be used and the nature, sophistication and efficiency of methods of communication developed across the period as technology became more advanced.</p> <p>Weaker responses might describe methods of communication and link them to developments in warfare. Better responses must, however, address the question in a synoptic manner evaluating the impact – or not – of communications on various aspects of war.</p> <p>Possible themes are battle management, the application of strategy, the coordination of armies at all levels. Better responses might discuss these themes in the light of developments in the nature of warfare across the period. With regard the nature and extent of the battlefield comparing the Napoleonic Wars and WWII. In the former runners might have been totally adequate, in the latter advanced communications such as radio were vital. More advanced communications helped the application of strategy and the co-ordination of armies across larger theatres of operations. Of course, candidates might point to the failings of strategy despite better communications technology.</p> <p>Another possible theme might be to discuss the effectiveness of communications in different military situations, for example the static warfare of the western front in WWII compared to more fluid styles of warfare.</p> <p>Transport will probably concentrate on the application of steam power in the form of railways (and steam ships where their use applies to land warfare – the Crimean War springs to mind) in the nineteenth century and the impact of the internal combustion engine in the twentieth. Candidates need to be aware, however, that railways also had a large impact on WWII. The response must use this knowledge in an analytical fashion with focus on the specific demands of the question set. Examples might be rapid strategic movement, the ability to mobilize large numbers of soldiers, its impact on concentration of force and movement across the battlefield.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>The obvious examples of the impact of railways are the 1866 Austro-Prussian War, the opening months of WW1 and the support of military activity on the Eastern Front in WWII. Better candidates might argue that the railway only took armies so far and once separated from rail networks soldiers moved as fast as their 18th century forebears had done. For the impact of the internal combustion engine in WW1 candidates might consider lorries, tanks and aircraft. The effect of this technology on WWII is obvious with true mechanised warfare dominating all European and North Africa fronts. For tanks, APCs and aircraft we might expect some discussion of use in battle. For pre-steam technologies use of waterways to transport troops or mass use of horse drawn carts were important. The former was a common feature of war in the later 18th and early 19th centuries, the latter was used on occasion by Napoleon, for example to move part of his army in 1805.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6	<p>The question invites candidates to evaluate battlefield tactics – as opposed to strategy – in the light of developments in weaponry. The question can be accepted, challenged or a compromise position adopted on an evaluation contingent on the point within the period being studied. No set conclusions are expected.</p> <p>Candidates who challenge the question might argue that battlefield tactics were always behind developments in weaponry. For example, the increasingly effective firepower of infantry weapons throughout the 19th century to at least the Russo-Japanese war and perhaps the opening phases of WWI were not reflected in the tactics of the period which remained linear and ignored the need to disperse soldiers and to utilise cover. Candidates might use types of weaponry as themes.</p> <p>Alternatively, the question might be accepted. Candidates might argue that weaponry dictated battlefield tactics and armies which entered wars with inappropriate tactics were forced to modify them swiftly in order to survive. A good example might be the Wars of Unification in the middle 19th century or WWI.</p> <p>A compromise position would be to assume both sides of the argument but specify the relationship of tactics to weaponry at a specific point within the time frame of the topic.</p> <p>Another possible type of response might be to argue that battlefield tactics were dictated by other factors, for example terrain, tactical situation or generalship. Alternatively, candidate might argue that tactics were dictated by the concepts encountered in the military theorists – concentration or force, maintenance of aim and the like – and were applied regardless of weapons technology.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7	<p>Candidates will need to establish some criteria for success in pacifying Ireland – law and order; winning hearts and minds for the Union; dealing with specific threats (rebellion; the problems posed by the Catholic association, the NRA, the Land League and Land issues, the nationalist challenge, obstructionism in Parliament, the threat of Civil War etc). It may be argued that earlier governments achieved pacification through coercion, being more prepared to do this than later ones, as the period 1798–1835 and the 1840s demonstrated. The Union itself was one such mechanism of pacification and there were few challenges to this until the 1820s. The Protestant Ascendancy soon settled into a Westminster mode. Candidates might point to Pitt’s handling of Ireland up to 1806 as an example of successful and original pacification – suppressing Wolfe Tone but then completely changing the basis of Anglo-Irish affairs by the Act of Union seeking to deal with economic, religious and reform issues (many Irish rotten boroughs were abolished). Wellington and Peel in 1829 succeeded in ending O’Connell’s Repeal Association and his campaigns of the 1820s by concession, with safeguards. The Whigs passed a Coercion Act in 1833, but in association with O’Connell presided over more catholic patronage, and significant reform of municipal, poor law, education and the Tithe. Peel’s government in the 1840s similarly faced down the NRA and dealt reasonably with the early stages of the Famine. In contrast post 1867 governments found land issues difficult to deal with, particularly Gladstone. The Land League and an organised Parnellite Irish Nationalist party at Westminster, noticeably embryonic or absent in the earlier period, proved especially taxing, with both a Land war in Ireland in the 1880s and obstructionism at Westminster to deal with, especially by Liberal governments that sought to avoid coercion. Home Rule, never considered by earlier governments, proved divisive politically after 1886 and was frequently damaging electorally. Ulster had not been an issue before 1886, except possibly in 1798, but emerged as an issue when Home Rule was posed as a possibility. It proved difficult for Liberal governments to deal with, especially Asquith in the 1910s. Much could also be made of government handling both of the Easter Rising and the ensuing Anglo-Irish war from 1918–1921. However candidates could equally argue that there is either continuity throughout the period 1798 to 1921 or that the contrast between pre 1867 and post 1867 should be reversed.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>All governments could be seen as enjoying a measure both of success and failure, or that the balance of success lies more with the later period. Certainly some issues were solved post 1880 (land for example). In the earlier period there was much failure – rebellion, 1798–1803, that could only be put down by military force. Pitt failed to include emancipation in his Act of Union. This was only reluctantly conceded by Wellington and Peel in 1829 and the Whigs were faced with a Tithe war in the early 1830s, again only resolved by concessions and deals with O’Connell. Much that Peel attempted failed (land and higher educational reform) and Ireland contributed to his downfall. Post 1846 Russell’s Whigs conspicuously failed to deal with the Famine. Gladstone’s liberal governments of 1868–1895 attempted pacification along Peelite lines, via land and religious reform, but faced intractable problems, sometimes misdiagnosing what was required. Home Rule could be seen either as a Gladstonian gesture that merely raised expectations or a genuine attempt to deal with Irish issues that merely polarised Ireland even further. A case could be made for Salisbury and Balfour’s governments being successful in terms of land reform and the democratisation of local affairs (killing Home Rule by kindness) whilst also cracking down on law and order. Lloyd George’s Coalition of 1916–22 dealt with rebellion and civil war by partition and the abandonment of the South to civil war. Was this a success? The question as a whole is open to a wide variety of interpretations as to government success in pacification.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8	<p>Answers need to be comparative in nature, considering Grattan, O'Connell, Butt, Parnell, Redmond and Dillon. An examination of the pros and the cons of leaders like these should form the basis of an effective answer. The focus is expected to be on O'Connell, Parnell and Redmond, particularly their relative effectiveness in mobilising support and establishing clear policy and tactics for attaining the ends of constitutional nationalism – emancipation, reform of the Union and ultimately its repeal and a restoration of a Dublin parliament. In O'Connell's case the achievement of Emancipation in the 1820s and reform within the Union in the 1830s are key areas. In the first two he achieved much, far more in practice than later leaders although, like them, Repeal and Home Rule remained elusive, arguably because, as Young Ireland argued, he was too tied into the Westminster process. Unlike Parnell, O'Connell did not see the need for economic or land reform, other than the ending of religiously based tithes. This meant an overreliance on the Catholic Church, any victory being seen as a blow to non sectarianism and the original vision of a united Ireland. Parnell was more effective on land issues, forcing Gladstone to reconsider this in the 1880s (linking Davitt's Land League to his cause). O'Connell's Roman Catholic Association became a model for 'constitutional' agitation in the 1820s but had less success in the 1840s. Like the Catholic Association in the 1820s the NRA mobilised large numbers but Peel had by then removed the Freeholders and O'Connell's tactics in the 1840s involved mere persuasion through the hint of a violence he was not prepared to carry out. He also had less success in creating a disciplined Parliamentary party than Parnell, whose aims were less focused on cooperation at Westminster than its 'obstruction'. He gained complete control of the Irish political process outside Ulster. However both he and O'Connell became divorced from Ireland itself, O'Connell creating division over his 'moderate' tactics, whilst Parnell never recovered from smears and the O'Shea Divorce case, splitting his party after 1890 as O'Connell had done in 1846. Nonetheless candidates could argue that O'Connell achieved more in association with the Whigs than Parnell did with Gladstone or Redmond with Campbell Bannerman and Asquith. Butt founded the Irish Nationalist party and began cooperation with the IRB, a fruitful policy. Some may consider him wrongly marginalised as a leader; Parnell gained a liberal commitment to Home Rule and substantive Land reform.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Redmond finally secured Home Rule from 1910 but not its implementation whilst Dillon ended up in alliance with Sinn Fein. Redmond could be accused of neglecting grass roots support in a way that O'Connell and Parnell rarely did. However O'Connell was never trusted in England or by PMs whereas Parnell and Redmond were more effective in gaining the trust of Gladstone and Asquith. All three were broken, O'Connell by imprisonment in 1843, Parnell by the O'Shea divorce case (which lost him much support) and Redmond by the Great War and the Easter Rising. Redmond made mistakes in overly committing Ireland to the prosecution of the War. All depended on the fortune of firstly Whiggery and then Liberalism and all ignored Ulster, Redmond at great cost. Most candidates will see either O'Connell or Parnell as the most effective leaders although all could be considered failures, or merely effective in different ways.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9	<p>Although one element of land reform was to preserve the Protestant Ascendancy (PA) the original land settlement of the late 17th and 18th century which underpinned the Ascendancy was progressively eroded after the 1830s. The Tithe Act placed landlords in the eye of the storm instead of the Church and anti landlord sentiment increased in the middle of the century, culminating in the Land League's tactics. Gladstone's land reforms were resisted by the Ascendancy as weighting the landlord-tenant relationship too much in favour of the tenant through conceding the three 'F's. However for many the increasing unprofitability of land meant that land reforms from 1870, and especially the later reforms culminating in Wyndham's Land Act of 1903, provided a financial safety net, enabling a tenant buy-out at subsidised rates and retirement to England. However it could be argued that the turning point economically was a failure to exploit industry and minerals like their mainland counterparts or the disaster of the Famine where a poor rate crippled some and made it difficult to adapt to a pastoral economy. Candidates will need to compare land reform with other factors determining Ascendancy decline. Politically they lost both their parliament in 1800 and many of their seats in the corrupt Irish boroughs of pre 1800. Those who transferred as MPs and Lords to Westminster lost a political base in Ireland that was vulnerable once emancipation was conceded along with parliamentary reform, especially in 1850 (restoration of the Freeholders, mostly catholic), 1867, 1884 and 1918. The rise of catholic freeholders and Catholic democracy, a replacement ascendancy after 1830, was to be fatal when combined with mainland governments that were prepared to undermine the ascendancy in the face of catholic or Ulster protest. One tactic was to run with the hounds, a minority in 1798 joining the United Irishmen and many more joining with constitutional nationalism under Parnell, himself from the ascendancy class. However local government reform at the end of the century undermined ascendancy control of the localities (the RMs) and was to be serious in the crises of the 1910s which saw terrorist attacks on the great estates. Nonetheless the Ascendancy remained powerful in the army (the Curragh mutiny), many losing their sons in the 1st World War. Religious emancipation in 1829 and Disestablishment in 1869 undermined their minority Anglican Church of Ireland, the former contributing to a gradual loss of office and patronage, although the police remained under their control until the 1890s. Another factor was the challenge of Dissenting Ulster nationalism.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>The Ascendency's basis was in the South and it increasingly lacked influence on Ulster after the 1870s. Ulster politicians became more influential with governments – Craig and Carson. It lost out in organisational and military terms to Ulster, especially in the 1910s. Much will depend on whether candidates see the PA's decline as economically or politically driven. Its basis in legal privilege was vulnerable to reform on the mainland and its political defence of these would be reliant on mainland parties.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
10	<p>Candidates should focus on ‘the October Revolution of 1917’ and the extent to which it led to changes in Russian government in their answers. In their answers candidates need to refer to the ways in which the October Revolution and any other chosen events changed Russian government. Changes to other aspects, for example the economy or society can only be rewarded if related to changes in government. Candidates who discuss aspects of Russian government such as reform and repression, the fate of opposition, changes in ideology, the absence of democracy, the one party state or the role of secret police are most likely to be successful. Candidates may argue either for or against the importance of the October Revolution but must do so comparatively in the context of other events. What follows is not an exclusive list, but consideration could be given to defeat in the Crimean War, the assassination of Alexander II in 1881, the 1905 Revolution, the First World War, the February Revolution of 1917, Stalin’s victory in the 1920s power struggle and his death in 1953. Examiners must not expect to find reference to all these examples in candidate answers and candidates may select other events in their answers. Candidates may argue that the October Revolution of 1917 changed Russian government more than any other in the period as it represented the triumph of Bolshevism and the establishment of communism. It was the event that crushed all possibility that a liberal democracy might emerge in Russia and transformed Russia into the Soviet Union. Candidates may argue that the end of over 300 years of Romanov rule in February 1917 was the event with the most important impact as it ended the 304 year old Romanov dynasty. Candidates may argue that the First World War was the event with the most important impact on the development of Russian government because it was the horrific impact of the war both at the front and at home that sealed the fate of both the Romanovs and, in turn, the Provisional Government. Arguably the appeal of the Bolsheviks in 1917 and the triumph of Lenin were directly related to the impact of the First World War. Candidates may argue that the 1905 Revolution changed Russian government because Bloody Sunday was a pivotal moment when Russians lost faith in their Tsar. They may argue that the main impact of the Revolution was the issue of the October Manifesto and the consequent abandonment of autocracy through elections to the Duma.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Candidates may however argue that the Fundamental Laws and the rigging of the elections to the 3rd and 4th Dumas suggest that little of substance really changed. Some candidates may well consider that Lenin's death in 1924 was the event with the most important impact, perverting the true course of the Russian Revolution because Stalin succeeded Lenin. Candidates who argue this are likely to suggest that Stalin's victory in the ensuing power struggle led Russia down a very different road than that being paved by Lenin. Other candidates may use a counter-argument based on more recent archival evidence to suggest that there was significant continuity between Lenin and Stalin and argue this. Candidates may argue that Khrushchev's secret speech of 1956 and subsequent de-Stalinisation was the event with the most important impact on the development of Russian government though others may argue that the continuation of communism way beyond 1964 somewhat negates that view.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
11	<p>Candidates should focus on 'the impact' Russia's rulers had on Russia's economy and society'. Candidates may argue either for or against Lenin but must do so comparatively in the context of other rulers. Candidates should argue both for and against the assertion in the question. Some candidates may more successfully differentiate between the impact rulers had on the economy and on society. When arguing in favour of Lenin candidates are likely to argue that his introduction of communism had the most profound impact on society of any ruler in this period. They may also argue that Lenin had a significant impact on the economy from his early decrees, to the imposition of War Communism in 1918 and the introduction of the New Economic Policy in 1921. When arguing against Lenin it is likely that candidates will consider the claims of Alexander II, Alexander III (though some candidates may struggle to differentiate between his reign and that of Nicholas II in terms of the economy as Witte's 'Great Spurt' straddles both reigns), Stalin and Khrushchev. Alexander II certainly made significant changes to society through Emancipation and the consequent legal and administrative reforms. Candidates are likely to assert that he did less that impacted on the economy. Alexander III's impact on society is likely to be seen as negative and reactionary whereas candidates are likely to credit him with the appointment of Witte as Minister of Finance and the consequent rapid industrialisation and urbanisation. Stalin, however, will be seen by many candidates as having had the greatest impact on the economy because of collectivisation and the Five Year Plans (both before and after the Second World War). Candidates may also argue that his impact on society was profound. Many may stress the negative impact of terror and the purges but others may balance this with consideration of reforms in areas such as health and education. Khrushchev is likely to be credited for impacting on society through his 'secret speech' and subsequent de-stalinisation and on the economy through his introduction of more consumer goods and flawed Virgin Lands Scheme. Some candidates may choose to conclude that one ruler had the most impact on society whereas another had most impact on the economy. Some candidates may choose to consider specific aspects of the economy and society in turn, assessing Lenin's impact against that of the others in each case. These aspects could include agriculture, industry, living conditions, working conditions, education or health.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
12	<p>Candidates may argue either for or against Alexander III but must do so comparatively. Candidates who adopt a comparative approach and demonstrate synthesis throughout the essay are likely to be most successful. Candidates may well see Alexander III, Lenin and Stalin as more successful at dealing with opposition than either Alexander II (who faced a growing tide of opposition and was ultimately assassinated) or Nicholas II (under whom the Romanov dynasty ended) or Khrushchev (despite his evident success in the power struggle after Stalin's death as he was forced to retire by the Central Committee in 1964) or Prince Lvov/Kerensky (who were swept aside in 1917). Candidates may well argue that Alexander III was very successful at dealing with opposition. He came to the throne after the assassination of his father, whose reign had seen opposition spiralling out of control. His imposition of 'the Reaction' drove opponents underground or abroad. Candidates who choose to differentiate between dealing with opponents and dealing with the reasons for opposition may see Alexander III in a different light. They may wish to argue that the granting of concessions was a more successful way of dealing with opposition than ruthless repression. It can be argued that his imposition of 'the reaction' from 1881 bequeathed Nicholas II a revolution. Candidates may well compare his achievements with the failure of both his father and his son to control opposition. Amongst these latter-day Tsars he was undeniably most successful at dealing with opposition. However, candidates must also consider whether other rulers dealt with opposition more successfully than Alexander III did. Most candidates are likely to concentrate their alternate arguments on Lenin and Stalin when considering whether Alexander III was the most successful ruler at dealing with opposition. Some candidates may well argue that Lenin was even more successful because he cut a swath through the other parties that aspired to power in 1917 and successfully defended his revolution during the Civil War. He created the world's first communist state and died with his party securely in power. Other parties were all banned, as were factions within the Communist Party. Stalin defeated all of his rivals during the power struggle with consummate skill and exterminated real and imagined opponents with bloodcurdling efficiency for the next 25 years and his chilling terror may well lead candidates to argue that he, rather than Alexander III, was the most successful ruler at dealing with opposition.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
13	<p>Candidates who agree with this proposition may consider a range of supporting evidence. Some candidates may discuss the use of intimidation and terrorism activities by the Ku Klux Klan and the Knights of the White Camelia (a group similar to, and operating at the time of, the KKK), the incidence of lynching (especially in the Reconstruction era and c1890 until c1940). There may also be discussion of the hostility of the Supreme Court (<i>Plessy v Ferguson</i>) and the use of state law to entrench segregation and the denial of civil rights to African Americans in the South following the end of Reconstruction in 1877. There might also be consideration of the Social Darwinian intellectual underpinnings of white racial prejudice, especially in the period from the late 19th century until World War Two. Responses might also discuss the strength and determination of Southern whites to resist the civil rights revolution of the 1950s and 1960s, including the White Citizens' Councils created in the wake of the 1954 Brown decision by the US Supreme Court and the violence meted out to civil rights campaigners. Some may consider the relatively small numbers of AA politicians at local, state and federal level for much of the period. Other candidates might discuss the continued <i>de facto</i> discrimination in housing, employment, political representation and social integration, and controversies over bussing and affirmative action since the 1960s. There may also be consideration of the Federal Government which was less supportive after 1968, eg Nixon, Reagan, some adverse Supreme Court decisions (1974: <i>Milliken v Bradley</i>, 1978: <i>Bakke v University of California</i>, 1984: <i>Grove City v Bell</i>, 1992: <i>Freeman v Pitts</i>); Conservative appointments to SC.</p> <p>Candidates should also weigh up the counter argument. They might analyse the support of the Federal Government for civil rights, especially during the Reconstruction period and after the Second World War: examples might include Supreme Court judgements (especially <i>Brown</i>, 1954), the various civil rights acts and the Voting Rights Act, supportive presidents (eg Johnson, Carter). There might also be consideration of the degree of white support for civil rights, especially in the early 1960s, the decline of the acceptability of overt racism, international pressure on the USA to change – the impact of the Cold War, decolonisation and the UN. Some candidates might discuss the greater profile of African Americans in US society in politics and business, the media, music</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>and sport, eg Jesse Jackson’s bids for Democratic presidential nominations in 1984 and 1988.</p> <p>Strong answers may also point out that the strength of opposition to civil rights has varied over time, contrasting the periods of progress (Reconstruction and c1954 to c1968) with the period of indifference and hostility (1877 to Second World War) and the contested nature of civil rights since 1968, eg Reagan hostile but Democrat-dominated Congress largely supportive.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
14	<p>In considering the 1890s, candidates may be aware of a number of negative developments, such as the background of economic depression following the Panic of 1893, the use of the 1890 Sherman Anti-Trust Act to gain Federal injunctions against strikers, Supreme Court rulings that unions were 'illegal combinations', the use of troops to break strikes, the Homestead steel strike 1892, the failure of Coxe's 'Army' in 1894 to lobby for a Federal programme of public works to provide employment, the violence of the Pullman Strike in 1894, and the continuing divide between white and black workers, between skilled, craft workers and the unskilled – divisions worsened by the growth of immigration from eastern and southern Europe.</p> <p>Some candidates may argue that the New Deal was more important in the development of union and labour rights, and consider some of the following: the alphabet agencies aimed to get the unemployed back to work, trade unions and workers gained the support of the Federal government for the first time, NIRA of 1933 (Clause 7(a) granted workers the right to join labour unions, and obliged employers to recognize unions and bargain with them), the Wagner Act of 1935 (which gave workers the right to join a union and to bargain collectively and created the National Labor Relations Board) and the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (which established a minimum wage). They may also consider the fact that union membership tripled between 1933 and 1939 (perhaps mentioning the creation of the CIO in 1935). There may be consideration of FDR and the fact that most state officials refused to intervene in strikes on the side of management. Some may point out that the New Deal gains were sustained during WW2 when an unprecedented expansion of American industry to meet the demands of war production gave considerable bargaining power to workers. Better answers may be aware that attitudes to workers' rights were not completely transformed by the New Deal – the NIRA was declared unconstitutional in 1935, there were serious, and sometimes, violent industrial disputes in 1934 and 1937 and some major employers (such as Ford) resisted recognising unions until the war.</p> <p>Candidates may also consider a variety of other turning points. There may be discussion of the immediate post-war period the New Deal gains were, to some degree, clawed back by Congress – the 1947 Taft-Hartley Act (passed over</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Truman's veto) allowed states to pass laws guaranteeing people's right to work (ie workers could ignore their union if it ordered them to go on strike) and banned the 'closed shop'; the 1959 Landrum-Griffin Act banned secondary picketing. Some may argue that despite the AFL-CIO merger in 1955, structural changes in the post-war US economy (the decline of heavy industry and blue-collar work) gradually eroded union power. Others might suggest that the New Frontier and Great Society programmes of the 1960s might be offered as a positive turning point for workers.</p> <p>Some might argue that defeat of the PATCO strike in 1981 can be seen as a major negative turning point for unions leading to a decline in membership and in the number of strikes and signalling the hostility of the Federal government to organised labour. Better candidates may place this in the context of changes in the US economy with the growth of the service sector and non-unionised, low-paid, part-time and immigrant labour.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
15	<p>Arguably, women were very little united. Throughout the period they have been divided on whether they wanted equality with men or to have their differences properly acknowledged. The notion that men and women occupied 'separate spheres' entered political discourse in the late 19th century and influenced activists campaigning for temperance and social reform in the Progressive Era. In the 20th century, campaigners wanting to stop the Equal Rights Amendment stressed gender differences. Radical feminists of the late 20th century campaigning against pornography, sexual harassment and for better protection against rape and domestic violence also wanted differences recognised. But equality and the removal of discrimination (over issues such as property rights, divorce, contraception, wages, access to education, the professions and politics) have been the goals of suffrage reform campaigners of the Progressive Era, the ERA, the National Organisation of Women (formed in 1966) and abortion reform. Better candidates will be aware that these campaigns, and campaigners, were not always mutually exclusive and sometimes overlapped.</p> <p>The aims of campaigners were not always united. In the late 19th century and early 20th century the Women's Christian Temperance Union and other campaigners pressed for a wide range of social reforms whereas suffrage groups wanted the vote. There were also differences over tactics between the various suffrage campaigners: the National Women's Suffrage Association (founded in 1869 and led by Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton) wanted a constitutional amendment, adopted a confrontational approach and campaigned for a wide range of women's rights, as did the 1913 Congressional Union (which became the National Women's Party during WW1). The American Women's Suffrage Association (founded in 1869 and led by Lucy Stone) was prepared to work with men and worked at state and local level, with links to the Republican Party. Although the NWSA and the AWSA merged (as the NAWSA) in 1890, they continued to be divided over whether to campaign at national or local level.</p> <p>Three of the most divisive factors throughout the period have been class, race and religion. Most pressure groups and campaigns have been founded and led by educated, middle class women whose concerns have not much interested</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>poor women in low-paid and/or part-time work. Racial issues were particularly divisive in the early part of the period as black women and immigrants were excluded from suffrage groups. White women were not much interested in black anti-lynching campaigns and there were many white women members of the revived KKK. Religion was also a divisive issue. Progressive Era campaigners were usually protestant evangelicals whereas urban immigrant women were often Catholic, socially conservative and less interested in female enfranchisement. The campaign against the ERA led by Phyllis Schlafly from 1972 and the opposition to the 1973 Roe versus Wade judgement on abortion were strongly influenced by religion, though in these cases protestant evangelicals were on the same side as Catholics.</p> <p>Candidates may also wish to argue that the degree of support that women were able to mobilise for their campaigns, such as franchise reform, the ERA and the changes of the modern era suggests that, despite tactical differences, there was considerable unity in favour of change.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
16	<p>The argument that the mass media were the most important factor is that governments noted its impact and sought to exploit it politically or moved to include groups affected by it across the period. The emergence of a powerful provincial middle class press in the 1860s, especially nonconformist and artisan, aided the Liberals at the beginning of the period and Gladstone exploited this in his Midlothian campaign. The new populist press of the 1890s aided Balfour and Lord Salisbury, despite their scathing view of its readership, and helped them use imperialism to gain votes (Khaki election during the Boer War). The Mass media had a negative effect on Labour politics and indeed remained its enemy, with the exception of the Daily Herald and later the Daily Mirror, until the 1990s. It could be argued here that the media were not the most important factor in the fortunes of the Labour party. Nonetheless the Guardian moved from Liberalism at the turn of the century to the Labour party after 1945, becoming almost its academic journal. The rise of the tabloid press in the 1960s and its attitude was widely held by governments to be crucial during elections, the 'Sun' in particular. Press barons were considered important whether they be Harmsworth, Beaverbrook or Murdoch. Examples could be cited of how it helped the Conservative party. The BBC helped Baldwin's Conservative government in 1926 when Labour and the Archbishop of Canterbury were refused the chance to broadcast. Candidates could examine some elections across the period to illustrate the importance of the media – 1874; 1880; 1906; 1924 (Campbell Case and the Zinoviev telegram adversely affecting Labour), 1945; 1964; 1974; 1979 (Labour isn't working); 1983 etc. Candidates will need to balance their answers with reference to other factors which could be seen as more important – the franchise, polarising policies, party organisation; governmental legislative records; the state of the economy, leadership etc.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
17	<p>Candidates will need to address the issue of 'steady decline'. Religious groups were important at the beginning of the periods but was the process a gradual one from the 1880s onward or was there a turning point coming either in the 1900–1914 period, the war periods (1914–18; 1939–45), the Inter War period or in the 1950s and 1960s? The religious groups – the Anglican Church, Nonconformists (and particular groups within – Methodists, Quakers, and Salvation Army etc) and Catholics – were very active in the period to 1945, either pushing for recognition or resisting the erosion of privilege. Arguably religious affiliation determined political affiliation (Anglicans were Conservatives; Nonconformists were Liberals or later Labour). Nonconformity pushed for civic and civil equality but also a wider political and social agenda. They championed Temperance reform, charity, international forums (later the League of Nations) and used the Liberal party as their vehicle. Religious groups also has a considerable impact on political methods – meetings, campaigns and political oratory were copied from preaching and dissenting practice and through this many gained a 'political' experience up to the 1950s. Liberalism and Labour gained much from this but Conservatism gained from the moral tone set by the Church of England (on issues like the Abdication). After 1918 however the Anglican Church and individuals within it could take a non conservative line – on the General Strike and on the Great Depression (the Red Dean). Candidates will need to examine when and why such influence declined – was it sudden, a product of the Great War or the Great Depression or the materialism of the 1950s and 1960s? Religious groups were very prominent in CND in the 1950s, revivalist meetings still had an impact in that decade and Mary Whitehouse's media campaigns mobilised much middle opinion well into the 1980s. The Churches could still command attention at the end of the period on a range of moral issues for example on the Falklands War or was it a steady decline from the 1880s, demonstrated in falling attendance figures at Church in favour of newly created leisure?</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
18	<p>A variety of views are possible on this issue. Candidates may well argue that before 1918 governments were resistant or doubted many aspects of mass democracy such as extension of the franchise to the residuum and women, the Secret Ballot at the beginning of the period, effective redistribution before 1885, electoral reform, reform of the Lord's Veto and to wider issues like education and the intrusion of the mass media. Conservative governments especially opposed many of the above developments before 1918 and both parties sought to restrict the development of a separate Labour party after 1900 (Liberal Trades Disputes Act; opting in on the political levy; the Campbell Case in 1924). Even after 1918 there was resistance to female equality, either electorally (to 1928) or socially (to the 1970s and beyond). In the work place there was little legislation before the 1970s. Mass education, at a secondary level, had to wait until 1944 whilst the Conservatives opposed the idea of a welfare state in 1945. There is more evidence that democracy was helped after 1918 – growing acceptance of the Labour party and movement from 1919 and especially during the 2nd World War; creation of the BBC and in the 1950s ITV. However it is perfectly possible to argue that, contrary to the assertion in the question, governments were willing to pass democratic reform throughout the period and were indeed a major factor in helping democracy emerge. A reference to the 1870s and 1880s would demonstrate this (parliamentary reform via the Ballot Act and the Redistribution and Corrupt Practices Act were willingly embraced by most Liberals, although Gladstone was reluctant on the Ballot in 1872; Local government reform were embraced by both Conservatives and Liberals in the 1880s). There is an argument that democracy was hastened by political competition between the parties, as the Conservatives extended the vote in 1867 to capture the upper working class, the Liberals extended it in 1884 to capture the rural vote and in 1918 and after all parties hoped to take advantage of a democratic vote that included women.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2013

