

**GCE**

**History A**

Unit **F966/02**: Historical Themes Option B: Modern 1789–1997

Advanced GCE

**Mark Scheme for June 2017**

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.

### Annotations

These are the annotations, (including abbreviations), including those used in scoris, which are used when marking

Annotation	Meaning
<b>BP</b>	Blank Page – this annotation <b>must</b> be used on all blank pages within an answer booklet (structured or unstructured) and on each page of an additional object where there is no candidate response.
<b>F</b>	Factor or Theme
<b>DET</b>	Description/Narrative
<b>C</b>	Continuity/Change
<b>X</b>	Error/wrong
<b>S</b>	Synthesis
<b>AN</b>	Analysis
<b>EXP</b>	Explains
<b>SC</b>	Simple comment, basic
<b>A</b>	Assertion
<b>J</b>	Judgement
<b>IRRL</b>	Irrelevant or not answering the Question
<b>EVAL</b>	Evaluation

**Subject-specific Marking Instructions**

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

	<b>A01a</b>	<b>A01b</b>
<b>IA</b>	18-20	36-40
<b>IB</b>	16-17	32-35
<b>II</b>	14-15	28-31
<b>III</b>	12-13	24-27
<b>IV</b>	10-11	20-23
<b>V</b>	8-9	16-19
<b>VI</b>	4-7	8-15
<b>VII</b>	0-3	0-7

Notes:

Allocate marks to the most appropriate level for each AO.

If several marks are available in a box, work from the top mark down until the best fit has been found.

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

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

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

## MARK SCHEME: FORMAT 1

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
1	<p><b>Key Theme 1: The Challenge of German Nationalism 1789-1919</b></p> <p><b>‘Napoleon influenced the development of German nationalism more than any other leader in the period from 1789 to 1919.’ How far do you agree?</b></p> <p>The thrust of the question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.</p> <p>The case for the Napoleonic era being a turning point rests on the ending of the Holy Roman Empire in 1806 and the consolidation of Germany into much larger units with the Confederation of the Rhine being a French dominated state alongside larger existing units like Prussia. The idea of a more united Germany and a Germany with an efficient modern administration, without serfdom and with a single law code might well have emerged. Even after 1815 the German states were reduced to 39 from the thousands which had existed in the C18. However, the domination of Austria as a result of the Napoleonic Wars with the Bund being linked to a multi-racial empire was a contra indication. Prussia emerged stronger with the military reforms inspired by the defeat by Napoleon and the administrative reforms and territorial gains, so in the sense that Prussia expanded and Prussia was ultimately responsible for unification, there is an argument for much turning on Napoleon. However, in terms of directly encouraging nationalism, the opposition he created must be considered. Was this strong enough for it to be a significant nationalist movement or merely traditionalist and anti-French opposition which did not lead to a strong nationalist movement after 1815. Looking forward the reaction against France probably did not create the sort of nationalism that resulted in the unification. The cultural and artistic movements did have some significance in building a sense of German-ness but they were not all associated with Napoleon and they did not lead to a strong nation emerging in 1848. The Napoleonic era, it could be argued strengthened Austria, strengthened Prussia which aroused the distrust of the other states and was limited in leading to the development of a pan German culture. 1848 might be considered a turning point in the sense of producing the first German assembly and raising hopes that were more genuinely national than anything seen under Napoleon. However, its limitations were all too obvious in terms of divided aims and continuing particularism. While nationalism was associated either with the ideas of the French or a dangerous radicalism, it was unlikely to succeed. Thus the strongest candidate might be the linking of Prussian military and economic might with national aspirations and the support given by the nationalist middle classes to Bismarck after 1866. Though to many Germans there was not much to choose in terms of foreignness</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader.



Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
2	<p>and alien traditions between Prussia and Napoleon, nevertheless Prussia offered the only plausible way forward to a nationalism without Austria and also the only credible protection against France. However, some may make a distinction between a purely north German nationalism for which the Austrian War and the North German Confederation and a nationalism encompassing both north and south. Here it may be that the Franco Prussian war is the turning point, though as with Napoleon, there were limitations. The lack of a national flag, currency and tensions between Catholics and Protestants may indicate that in the promotion of national feeling, the Bismarck era had limitations in a similar way to the Napoleonic period and that for true national feeling as opposed to simply territorial change and the creation of larger units, the Wilhelmine era of economic growth, better communications, the devotion to military and naval strength and Germany's increasing importance in Europe may be more important.</p> <p><b>'The Zollverein the single most significant economic factor in the development of German Nationalism.' How far do you agree?</b></p> <p>The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.</p> <p>Much can be said in favour of the importance of the Zollverein. A large-scale free trade area brought together North German under the influence of the most significant economic state, Prussia and excluded Austria. Economic growth helped the development of railways, which were a major unifier. It also helped the military development of Prussia and assisted it to wage effective war against Austrian domination. The Zollverein also involved a parliament, accustoming the member states to meet together and possibly anticipating the national institutions created after 1866 – the North German Confederation and the national Reichstag and Bundesrat created in 1871. However, the most obvious point to make is that the Zollverein did not mean political as opposed to economic cooperation. Despite the economic links with Prussia, its members so distrusted this large militarized state that in 1866 they sided with Austria. Also the basis of Prussian economic growth was the resources gained after 1815, its technological and scientific developments and not merely the free trade zone. Prussian railway development did not depend entirely on the Zollverein. Purely Prussian industrial growth and the vital coal and ore deposits on which they were based together with the economic weaknesses of Austria might be seen as more significant for the outcomes of the wars of unification. In addition the post-unification economic development of Prussian-dominated Germany with the growth of heavy industry, particularly steel, the growth of urban centres, especially Berlin and the calls for colonial</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
3	<p>growth as an outlet for exports might be seen as establishing nationalism. The rapid economic growth seemed to confirm the superiority of the new German nation and underpinned military expansion and, to an extent, cultural developments which made Germany so admired and vindicated national pride.</p> <p><b>To what extent did Prussia do more to help than hinder German nationalism in the period from 1789 to 1919?</b></p> <p>The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.</p> <p>Answers might show how the increasingly dominant role of Prussia evolved, comparing the various aims and ideas of German nationalism with the developing impact of Prussia on Germany. They might consider the impact that the Zollverein and the Prussian domination had on nationalism. The Prussian role in 1848 might be compared with the developments of the 1860s. There should be consideration of the Prussian aim of a Kleindeutsch solution and an enlarged Prussia and how that was manifested in the German Empire with its domination by the Prussian monarch, Bismarck and its influence in the administration and in the Reichstag. Though the Prussian domination did not represent all of German nationalist aims, nevertheless the earlier failures had demonstrated that only with strong military and diplomatic support could greater unity become a reality and many nationalists did after 1866 support Prussia. Some answers could discuss the mythical status of Bismarck and the popularity of the German nationalist agenda under Wilhelm II. The nature of nationalism changed and answers could consider the difference between the later nineteenth and earlier twentieth century nationalism which was associated with the Hohenzollern monarchy, colonial and naval expansion and militarism with the earlier nationalism which had much less links with Prussia. However it was Prussia which played a significant role in the ending of French rule. Prussia emerged as an alternative to the domination by the multi-national Hapsburgs. The hopes of 1848 were focused on the Prussian monarch and Prussia offered an alternative to the Bund in the Erfurt union. However Prussian ambitions and economic and military power were also feared, Most German states opposed Prussia in 1866 and only after its military success did mainstream nationalism see Prussia as the only way forward. Even so the Empire did contain views that nationalism had been betrayed and local loyalties died hard.</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader.

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
4	<p><b>Key Theme 2: The Changing Nature of Warfare 1792-1945</b></p> <p><b>‘The practical impact of military theorists on the conduct of warfare in the period from 1793 to 1945 was limited.’ How far do you agree?</b></p> <p>The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.</p> <p>The major military theorists of the period were: Jomini, who analysed the campaigns of Napoleon; Clausewitz who wrote about the nature of war as an extension of diplomacy and the concept of the nation in arms, based on the practice of the Revolutionary war. Candidates could talk about Drouhet and the development of air warfare and theorists like Liddell Hart and Guderian who wrote about the impact of mechanized vehicles and who led the way to Blitzkrieg. There is an argument that as the study of war increased in military academies and with greater development of staff work and professional leadership, the theories had more than limited impact. The studies of Napoleonic tactics were influential on the aspirations of many leaders in the period and the idea of a strategic battle achieved by rapid movement towards the front and effective deployment using artillery was the model in general terms for Moltke in the wars against Austria and France (1866 and 1870). The importance of maneuvering was shown in the campaigns of McClellan on the Potomac and by Lee’s advances northwards. The attempts to win a decisive breakthrough may have lain behind the attacks from 1914-1918 but other theoretic ideas were also important here, particularly the belief in rapid and purposeful advance – the doctrine of the offensive. Candidates may well argue that the greatest effects of particular theories came in the Blitzkrieg campaigns 1939-41 with Germany consciously following ideas that avoided the static trench warfare of the First World War. The counter view is that the conduct of warfare was based on the bitter lessons of battlefield experience. Given the initial failures in the Revolutionary War, for example, the only practical way forward was to use French superiority in numbers and the citizen army that had to be raised given the loss of the old royal army. There may have been theories to support this, but the dominant element was sheer necessity. Similarly, through Napoleon may have been familiar with the theories of Saxe, Gribeveau and so on, the dominant factor may have been the need to move quickly to take advantage of slower enemies and to make the best possible use of resources available. If the view that Napoleon ‘blundered to glory’ then it is his improvisation on the battlefield that is the key rather than following theorists. The same may be said of Grant’s resort to the March to the Sea and the dogged attritional battles on the eastern Front that used stronger resources and aimed to hit the economy of the South. The Napoleonic aspirations of</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader.

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
5	<p>the Generals of the First World War gave way to the response of heavily industrialised mass warfare for much of the war. More rapid tactics arose because of technical innovation (e.g. tanks) and the sheer necessity to overcome strong points by using smaller and more specialized forces. The strongest example of theory influencing warfare is Hitler's 1940 campaigns, but these were not applicable to the larger scale campaigns in the East. Sheer numbers and resources determined the outcome of the war and its conduct more than theory in the end. Theories of air power might be considered to have had an impact, but the development of technology was probably the stronger element – with the development of aircraft and finally the atomic bomb, the nature of warfare changed decisively.</p> <p><b>Was the impact of the development of weaponry greater before or after 1914?</b></p> <p>The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.</p> <p>Few would argue that weaponry had an enormous impact on the Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars. Light artillery with standardized parts had an impact but the musket with bayonet remained the standard weapon of war that it had been in the eighteenth century. If the nature, scale and conduct of war changed, then it was due to other factors. The turning points in the mid-century is sometimes seen as the needle gun; the development of rifled artillery, the magazine rifle and technical developments which led to large scale heavy artillery and machine guns and the development of the armour plated battleships. These developments did have considerable impact. The needle gun is said to have been a key factor in the Prussian victory of 1866 while the Krupps artillery was of importance in 1870. The more accurate and wide ranging rifles of the US Civil war together with greater artillery deployment led to the failure of frontal assaults for example at Gettysburg and the development of a attritional trench warfare such as was later seen 1914-18. However it could be argued that weapons technology as opposed to other factors such as railways, planning and tactical skills were more impactful in colonial conflicts against technologically weaker enemies before 1914 than in conflicts between states of relatively equal technological development. The huge development of heavy weapons and rapid firing rifles and machine guns could be said to have dominated warfare 1914-18 in a way not seen before or after and many may take that of the high point of the influence of weapons. After the initial war of movement and until it was able to resume in march 1918 the weaponry ensured a stalemate, heavy casualties and a failure for the war to achieve anything like a decisive victory. Gas compounded the advantage of the defence given by the exceptionally heavy artillery. The use of air power was not developed enough to offer a decisive advantage, but the</p>	60	<p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
6	<p>combination of airpower and mechanized warfare gave the allies an advantage in the last months of the war. However whether this alone without the weakening of the German home front and the collapse of its allies can be debated. The outcome of the Second World War to an extent depended on weaponry. The allied air superiority ensured some key developments while airpower supported the blitzkrieg campaigns. The development of tank warfare was important but it perhaps less the superiority of the weapons themselves than the industrial capacity which allowed the US and the USSR to produce technically inferior tanks in much greater numbers that was decisive. The role of aerial bombing is debated, though the development of the atomic bomb is a stunning example of weaponry confirming defeat and unique in the period. Most will argue for post 1914 but more thoughtful answers might consider that there is more similarity between 1939 and 1945 in a combination of factors being more significant with new weapons being rather less important per se than in the 1914-18 period.</p> <p><b>‘States were effectively organised for war only in the twentieth century’ How far do you agree with this statement about warfare in the period from 1793 to 1945?</b></p> <p>The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.</p> <p>States were obviously more organized for war in the twentieth century, but some may draw a distinction between the extent of organization and its effectiveness. The ‘nation in arms’ for example of the French Revolution was effectively simply because the enemies of the French did not organize themselves so totally. Most however will draw the distinction between the professional armies of the Crimea, the Wars of Unification and the Russo Japanese War and those wars where the entire nation was mobilized and there was little distinction between civilians and military. The First World War brought rationing, though not uniformly and large-scale conscription which raised mass armies hitherto unknown in actual numbers before in history. States were forced to commandeer economic resources and to try to undermine the economic resources of the enemy (This had been attempted by British naval blockades, the Continental System; Sherman’s campaign of destruction in the US Civil war and the British attempts to isolate the Boers from their farms and families after 1900). The power of the state increased in 1914-18 to an unprecedented scale. By 1939 it was expected that war would produce massive state controls and organization for war. Given the development of airpower more controls were needed – for example the evacuation of children. The USSR’s development of eastern industrial centres and the enlistment of massive armies highly controlled if not terrorized by a uniquely powerful state apparatus exceeded anything in the period before 1900 and was exceptionally effective</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader.

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
7	<p>in preventing defeat. Nazi Germany, buoyed by the initial blitzkrieg victories was slower to mobilise for total war, though by 1945 the SS state offered something like the Soviet model with an absolute disregard for any human costs. However, while there is no doubting the scale of organization, did it mean that organization was only effective before 1900? The nation in arms of the French Republic, which carried over into the Napoleonic era, could not match the level of organization of the C20 regimes but it did not prevent it from being effective. For all their total war, Nazi Germany did not organize as effectively in terms of outcome as Carnot's republic because of the different context. The Union did not organize as effectively as the US did I after 1941 but given the much looser organization of the Confederacy, the organization which allowed it to raised large conscript forces and to develop greater firepower was effective in bringing a victory even in a war of attrition. The development of railways and of an industrial base capable of meeting military needs together with conscription meant that Prussia was able to organize effectively enough to defeat its enemies in 1866 and 1870-71. The much greater organization shown in the mobilization of 1914 was not necessarily as effective. Answers which are able to demonstrate the nature and scale of organization and make effective comparisons throughout the period can go to highest marks but some may question the judgement.</p> <p><b>Key Theme 3: Britain and Ireland 1798-1921</b></p> <p><b>'The Easter Rising of 1916 was the most important turning point in the Union with Ireland from 1798 to 1921.'</b> How far do you agree?</p> <p>The thrust of the question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period. Candidates will need to compare the Rising and its aftermath in relation to other important events between 1798 and 1921, in particular with reference to the continued survival of the Union. When discussing the Rising candidates will need to put it into the context of a revolutionary tradition that periodically saw a rising as the way to achieve an independent Republican Ireland. Other 'turning points' tended, with the possible exception of the Famine, to encourage reform within the Union rather than its abolition. Most risings, (1803, 1848, 1867) including 1916, were marginalised and defeated, important only for demonstrating weakness. The aftermath of the Easter Rising was especially important. Although repression was not unusual the circumstances changed after 1916 ( despite democratic elections in 1918): there was an over-reaction, political and military, to what had been the rising of a minority within a minority; the proposal to introduce conscription to Ireland caused unrest; the weakness of Redmond's Nationalists (who lacked the militant roots of Butt or Parnell) could only</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader.

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
8	<p>offer a call to join the British Army together; the growing impact of an Irish conscription was exploited by Sinn Fein. Candidates could usefully focus on the British government's response in comparison to the 19th century when more careful concession had been adopted like Disestablishment and land reform 1869 –1870. Like the Secret Ballot in 1872 which helped the electoral growth of the nationalists, the 1918 Reform Act underlined the importance of the events of 1916 – 18, especially the collapse of the Irish Nationalists. De Valera was the heir of Parnell, not Redmond. Although the ensuing events (coercion) were not inevitable two versions of Home Rule might have been possible. Other candidates for a turning-point might be: Roman Catholic Emancipation in 1829 which conceded on the religious nature of the Union and led to office holding for a potential successor group to the Ascendancy, the Catholic Tenant Farmer; the Famine which focussed cultural and social resentment against the Union and created an influential group of Irish expatriates in the US (Fenians) who became the centre and financial source of terrorism aimed at the Union; the Home Rule Bills of 1886, 1893 and 1912 which indicated a major political party was committed to constitutional reform of the Union although it also reinforced the status quo by strengthening Conservatism and Unionism in Ulster; the Anglo-Irish War and the settlements that followed. Candidates could also focus on particular trends and their origin as possible alternatives to the Easter Rising.</p> <p><b>Assess the reasons why British governments changed their policy towards Ireland during the period from 1798 to 1921.</b></p> <p>The thrust of the question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period. Some candidates may argue that governments changed policy as a result of particular events such as the passing of the Act of Union (and the Wolfe Tone rising); the County Clare Election; Roman Catholic Emancipation; the Great Famine; the passing of Land Acts; episodes of Fenian violence; the First World War and the Easter Rising. The actions of pressure groups might be considered such as the Roman Catholic Association, the Land League and revolutionary and constitutional nationalists. Political figures such as O'Connell, Parnell and De Valera might be assessed with respect to how, individually, their actions prompted responses from British governments. For example, Peel in the 1840s was determined to resist pressure from O'Connell's Monster Meetings and move on his own terms over land and religious issues. Irish MPs influenced Whig governments in the 1830s and on Liberal ones in the 1880s and 1910s over electoral issues with some success. However, change also came about as a result of internal influences within governments (rather than external pressures). Many Liberal Tories and Whigs backed Catholic Emancipation before 1829 for ideological reasons.</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader.

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
9	<p>Gladstone's mission to pacify Ireland could be seen on its own moral terms, the result of a liberal conscience, although equally one could argue he was forced into it by the 'direct action' of Fenians. Home Rule could either be seen as the result of Gladstone's moral conversion. Conservative economic and local government reform was partly due to a genuine desire to strengthen the Union by Wyndham and others. However, it is difficult to see post-1916 governments as having to respond to the forces of change from 'outside'.</p> <p><b>'Ireland's problems arose entirely from economic change in the period from 1798 to 1921.' How far do you agree?</b></p> <p>The thrust of the question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.</p> <p>This is a wide-ranging question so detailed examples are not expected, although candidates should assess economic problems in relation to political and religious ones. Candidates may start by stating a case for the assertion in the question. Governments feared the linking of <b>economic issues</b> with religious and political ones and moved, as Balfour said, to uncouple the Land Reform engine from the Home Rule train. For most Irish, whether they were landless labourers or landlords, economic problems loomed large. Only at the end of the 19th and early 20th century did Irish poverty recede. In the first half of the 19th century agricultural backwardness, over-population, over-dependence on the potato and poor relations between landlord and tenant, (made worse by difficult conceptions of 'tenant rights') hindered Irish economic development (linked to a rapidly industrialising mainland in the grip of laissez faire). The Famine took the pressure off, at great human expense, accelerating emigration, but left untouched poor landlord tenant relations which culminated in Davitt's Land League and agrarian violence. These were addressed between 1870 and 1903. It was these issues that Irish leaders used to rally support for political causes and which later British governments wished to 'kill by kindness'. From 1903 the problems were less economic (Ireland did well out of the 1st world war) and arguably became more political.</p> <p>It might be argued that <b>political issues</b> concerned only a few (for example, Tone, O'Connell, Butt and Parnell) and thus the political systems only represented that minority (there were no parliamentary or franchise reform campaigns to match that on the mainland during the period; witness O'Connell's disappointment over his failure to 'raise a cry' over the disenfranchisement of the Irish freeholders). However the Monster Meetings in the 1840s over repeal did demonstrate popular interest in political solutions. Politics was of much greater interest from the 1880s onwards (Home Rule). Home Rule</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader.



Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
10	<p>created more aggression in Ulster than in the rest of Ireland. <b>Religious issues</b> could be seen as important (and were in the 1820s), although Disestablishment in 1869 was hardly the result of popular Irish pressure.</p> <p>.</p> <p><b>Key Theme 4: Russia and its rulers 1855-1964</b></p> <p><b>‘The Communists were more authoritarian than the Romanov Tsars.’ How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1855 to 1964?</b></p> <p>Candidates should focus on the nature of Russian government under the Tsars and the communists. Candidates might consider some of the following themes: autocratic government and the two regimes’ use of the secret police, propaganda, censorship and terror. A case might be made for arguing that the Russians swapped an increasingly ineffectual and outdated form of authoritarianism for a more ruthless and efficient Twentieth century variant. Comparisons might also be made at a personal level and candidates might, for example compare Alexander III and Stalin. Some might argue that both Nicholas II and Alexander II were inadequate or ineffectual autocrats. Some might argue that both regimes were similar in their authoritarian intent, but there were real differences of scale in the use of terror pre and post 1917. Some answers might argue that even the control of the economy was centralized under the Communists and control of the workers through that was more repressive. It might be argued that both regimes only reformed when under pressure and that both regimes aimed to crush any opposition. Candidates might discriminate between the rule of Lenin, Stalin and Khrushchev and argue that it was more repressive and authoritarian at certain periods.</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader.
11	<p><b>‘Change in Russia was caused only by involvement in wars in the period from 1855 to 1964.’ How far do you agree?</b></p> <p>The focus should be on what caused change to happen in Russia in this period and the extent to which war was the main factor. In support of the statement answers might argue that significant reforms followed defeats in war, as in 1905 and 1917. The impact of the First World War in terms of the overthrow of the Tsar and then the Provisional Government. Some might also argue that the Civil War brought about change with Kronstadt and the abandonment of War Communism. It might also be</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
12	<p>argued that Stalin justified the introduction of the Five Year Plans because Russia was constantly defeated in war and that this must never happen again. There might also be some who argue that Alexander II brought in change after defeat in the Crimean War and comment on the Emancipation of the serfs and the reform of the army. However, in arguing against the view some might note that significant change was introduced at other times and when Russia was not at war; they might use the examples of Witte's Great spurt, the Five Year Plans and collectivization. Some might argue that defeat in war was rarely the sole reason for reform, although some might suggest that Emancipation and the October Manifesto were only introduced because of defeat. Some may argue that the revolutions of 1917 were not simply due to war but were multi causal and cannot be explained simply in terms of defeat in war.</p> <p><b>How similar, socially and economically, was Tsarist Russia to Communist Russia in the period from 1855 to 1964?</b></p> <p>The focus should be on the similarities and differences between Russian society and economy under the Tsars and Communists. In arguing that there were similarities answers could include the central control of the economy, for example during Witte's Great Spurt and Stalin's Five Year Plans. The experience of industrialization was grim for most during both periods of the 1890s and 1930s. Under both regimes the peasants were squeezed to finance industrialization, but some might also argue that there were periods under both regimes when there were reforms and improvement in the lives of the peasants, making reference to the Emancipation and the Virgin Land Scheme. Some answers might also argue that the non-Russian peoples of the Empire were denied self-determination under both systems. In arguing that there were differences some might discuss the fate of the old elite and the destruction of the hierarchical and predominantly feudal nature of tsarist society. Some might also argue that the nature of Tsarist society changed during the period of their rule with Emancipation and also during the reign of Nicholas II. Some might argue that the communists became the new elite after 1917. Some answers might consider the changes in education, the role of women and the Orthodox church. It might also be argued that life under both regimes was harsh, but that there were considerable differences of scale, in terms of economic progress.</p>	60	<p>Team leader.</p> <p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
13	<p><b>Key Theme 5: Civil Rights in the USA 1865-1992</b></p> <p><b>‘The 1960s was the most important turning-point for the development of African American civil rights in the period from 1865 to 1980.’ How far do you agree?</b></p> <p>Candidates might well stress the importance of the 1960s in the development of African American rights. They could mention the Civil Rights Act 1964, the Voting Rights Act 1965 and the Civil Rights Act 1968 as important milestones in the achievement of full political rights. They can also mention the Supreme Court cases associated with ‘bussing’ and the end of segregated schooling such as the Holmes case of 1969. They may also mention the development of affirmative action by the Federal government. In addition, the Great Society programmes greatly aided poor African Americans in inner cities. Candidates may also mention the Civil Rights Movement; the role of King, CORE and SNCC as important agents for change. Candidates should compare the 1960s with other possible turning-points. These might include the Reconstruction era (1865-1877) when African Americans received the right to vote, participated in elections for the first time and when some were elected to State legislatures and the US Congress. It was also the time when the Freedmans’ Bureau gave help to ex-slaves to acquire education and land. Another possibility is the New Deal (1933 to 1950s) when, arguably, the economic rights of African American were enhanced. The Second World War is another candidate as it resulted in: jobs in war industries being provided to African Americans, the introduction of antidiscrimination employment regulations by the Federal government in war production plants, African Americans receiving military training and life experience outside the segregated South and the achievement by some African Americans of higher status through officer training and gallantry during the war. A popular choice of turning point. The 1950s may be a popular choice of turning point by candidates as it involved: the. Brown Case of 1954 which ended segregation in education, the Montgomery Bus Boycott which ended segregation on buses, the rise of Martin Luther King and Southern Christian Leadership Conference and the Little Rock Central High case in 1957 which tested the desegregation judgement concerning high schools.</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader.

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
14	<p><b>‘The most important influence on the development of trade union and labour rights from 1865 to 1992 was the New Immigration.’ How far do you agree?</b></p> <p>Candidates are likely to start with the named factor, discussing how ethnic divisions within the movement resulted from the New Immigration (from the 1870s to 1920s). Splits occurred between Old Immigrants (Germans, Scandinavians and British/Irish) with New Immigrants (Italians, Eastern Europeans and Jews). These developments clearly impeded the development of trade unionism. Disputes arose over the impact on wages and wage bargaining, acceptance of poor working conditions by some immigrants, different skill levels, the varying aspirations of immigrants, separatism and the motivation to become politically active.</p> <p>Candidates may balance discussion of New Immigration against internal divisions within the trade union and labour rights movement by discussing the splits between the Knights of Labor; the International Workers of the World and later the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organisations. These divisions occurred across the period from the 1870s to 1950s. The creation of the AFL/CIO in 1955 brought a degree of unity to the trade union movement; however individual unions such as the Teamsters kept considerable autonomy. Consideration might also be given to the different strategies and tactics employed by unions and the labour movement which did not always engender support from the public and sympathetic treatment from governments.</p> <p>Other influences that might be discussed are the power and strength of Big Business, the role of the Federal Government in impeding the development of trade union rights and the general state of the economy. With respect to the latter, some candidates may point out unions and other labour organisations benefitted most when the economy was growing; this was when the demand for labour was high thus providing workers with greater bargaining power</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader.
15	<p><b>‘Divisions within the women’s movement were the most important factor hindering the attainment of full civil rights for women in the USA in the period from 1865 to 1992.’ How far do you agree?</b></p> <p>Candidates should start their answers by discussing the nature of women’s rights and point out the lack of unity about what ‘full civil rights’ meant in practice. Full civil rights encompasses not just political rights but those pertaining to the economy and society more generally.</p> <p>Most candidates should be aware of the different, and sometimes competing, women’s organisations. They may refer to the different strategies adopted by the NWSA and the AWSA (both founded in 1869)</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
	<p>and to the founding in 1913 of the militant Congressional Union. However, they will possibly balance this by pointing out that the NWSA and the AWSA merged (as the NAWSA) in 1890 and may attribute the passage of the 19th Amendment in 1920 (which granted women the vote nationally) to the campaigning of the NAWSA and the Congressional Union. They might characterise the women's suffrage movement (as well as the temperance campaigners and those agitating for Progressive Era social and economic reform) as essentially middle class and they should also be aware of divisions among women over race. Black women were excluded from the NAWSA (and so formed their own campaign group) and Elizabeth Stanton opposed allowing blacks to vote. White women were heavily represented in the membership of the revived KKK in the 1920s. Some women opposed the post-war civil rights movement for its failure to campaign for women's issues. Most candidates should be aware of the divisions over abortion (Roe versus Wade, 1973) and the role of Phyllis Schlafly in opposing the Equal Rights Amendment.</p> <p>Some candidates will probably not get much further than outlining the divisions within the women's movement, but others should be able to weigh up the importance of these divisions in relation to other factors. They could refer to the impact of economic and technological change (the development of factory work, the typewriter, the expansion of retail trade in the late 19th century and the development of domestic appliances in the 20<sup>th</sup> century) in changing women's lives and prospects. They could also refer to the power of male opposition to gender equality, initially in resisting female suffrage, but also in trade unions. The ablest candidates may also be aware that some advances in gender equality had little to do with women's agency. The granting of female suffrage in certain western states (eg Colorado in 1893, Idaho in 1896, Washington in 1910 and California in 1911) had more to do with encouraging westward migration than enlightened attitudes to women's roles in society. Similarly, after the Second World War, some Southerners advocated women's rights as a tactic to divide, and thus defeat, the civil rights campaign.</p>		<p>Team leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
16	<p><b>Key Theme 6: The Development of Democracy in Britain 1868-1997</b></p> <p><b>Assess the reasons for the reform of the electoral system from 1868 to 1997.</b></p> <p>The thrust of the question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period. Candidates are likely to attempt a thematic approach and reach a judgement about the relative importance of factors. Political factors were undoubtedly very important. There might be discussion about Disraeli’s motives in 1867 (did he ‘dish Gladstone’, or was he swayed by external pressures for reform?), the consolidatory nature of the Third Reform Act, the giving in to pressure group activity in 1918 and 1928, and the removal in 1948 of ‘bias’ in a voting system that seemed to support the Conservatives. However, it could be argued that franchise reform was generally a reflection of social change, making reference to class based politics, the changing role of women in society, developments in education and media influence. It is also possible to put a case for economic influences being most important, especially when linked to social stratification (as in 1862 and 1884) and war (as in 1918 and 1948).</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader.
17	<p><b>Assess the reasons for the changing fortunes of the Labour movement and party in the period from 1868 to 1997.</b></p> <p>The thrust of the question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period. Candidates may take a fairly broad view of the labour movement. They are likely to discuss the role of trades unions, other pressure groups and grassroots protest (for example, hunger marches). Reasons of an ‘internal’ nature might include the emergence of class consciousness, the role of leaders (for example, Tillett, Hardie, Macdonald, Attlee, Wilson, Foot and Blair), changing tactics and strategy (for example the use of strikes, the closed shop, collective bargaining, nationalisation), communications and the availability of finance. Discussion of ‘external’ factors is likely to focus on the strengths of other political parties (especially the Liberals and Conservatives), political trends in general (for example, the extension to the franchise), economic performance (for example a strong economy often meant a strong union movement), social change (for example, the swinging 60s and the Wilson regime) and foreign affairs (for example the Russian Revolution, the rise of Hitler and appeasement).</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader.

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
18	<p><b>‘Developments in education were the main reason for the development of democracy in the period from 1868 to 1997.’ How far do you agree?</b></p> <p>The thrust of the question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.</p> <p>Many are likely to agree with the statement, arguing that developments in education partly occurred out to ‘educate our masters’ (i.e. the electorate). Thus, the 1870 Act succeeded the Second Reform Act; the 1902 Act was partly a response to a more politically empowered electorate demanding more secondary education; the 1918 Fisher’s Act went hand in hand with the Representation of the People’s Act of the same year. Later reforms in education were less closely tied to electoral reform, but were still generally to do with educating the ‘people’ to make informed choices. Some may go further and discuss the role of non-state provision (e.g. ‘self-help’ methods, the Church, the media, trades unions, Mechanics Institutes), and how this politicised the nation further.</p> <p>The question demands that other factors be considered, and candidates should measure the importance of educational reforms against other political, economic and social developments. These might include extensions to the franchise, changing electoral methods, the influence of political parties, reforms of the Commons and Lords, the rise of Trades Unions, the importance of religious groups and the influence of the mass media.</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader.

**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](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://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 2017

