

**History A**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **F961/02**: British History Period Studies. Option B: Modern 1783-1994

**Mark Scheme for January 2011**

---

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, 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 2011

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annesley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622  
Facsimile: 01223 552610  
E-mail: [publications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

Distribution of marks for each level that reflects the Unit's AOs and corresponds to the UMS

2 answers: each maximum mark 50.

	<b>A01a</b>	<b>A01b</b>
<b>IA</b>	21-24	24-26
<b>IB</b>	18-20	22-23
<b>II</b>	16-17	19-21
<b>III</b>	14-15	16-18
<b>IV</b>	12-13	13-15
<b>V</b>	9-11	11-12
<b>VI</b>	4-8	6-10
<b>VII</b>	0-3	0-5

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) Analysis refers to developed explanations; evaluation refers to the argued weighing up/assessment of factors in relation to their significance in explaining an issue or in explaining linkages between different factors.

AOs	AO1a	AO1b
Total mark for each question = 50	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: - 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
<b>Level IA</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses a wide range of accurate, detailed 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>21-24</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear and accurate understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic</li> <li>• Clear and accurate understanding of the significance of issues in their historical context</li> <li>• Answer is consistently and relevantly analytical with developed and substantiated explanations, some of which may be unexpected</li> <li>• The argument evaluates a range of relevant factors and reaches clearly substantiated judgements about relative importance and/or links.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>24-26</b></p>
<b>Level IB</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses accurate, detailed and relevant evidence</li> <li>• Accurate use of a range of appropriate historical terminology</li> <li>• Answer is clearly structured and mostly coherent; writes accurately and legibly</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>18-20</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear and accurate understanding of most key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic</li> <li>• Answer is mostly consistently and relevantly analytical with mostly developed and substantiated explanations</li> <li>• Clear understanding of the significance of issues in their historical context.</li> <li>• Substantiated judgements about relative importance of and/or links between factors will be made but quality of explanation in support may not be consistently high.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>22-23</b></p>
<b>Level II</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses mostly accurate, detailed and relevant evidence which demonstrates a competent command of the topic</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>16-17</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mostly clear and accurate understanding of many key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic</li> <li>• Clear understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context</li> <li>• Much of the answer is relevantly analytical and substantiated with detailed evidence but there may be some description</li> <li>• The analysis of factors and/ or issues provides some judgements about relative importance and/or linkages.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>19-21</b></p>

AOs	AO1a	AO1b
<b>Level III</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses accurate and relevant evidence which demonstrates some command of the topic 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 organised and structured; the answer is mostly legible and clearly communicated</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>14-15</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some/uneven understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and of concepts relevant to their historical context</li> <li>• Answers may be a mixture of analysis and explanation but also simple description of relevant material and narrative of relevant events <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 considers a number of factors but with very little evaluation of importance or linkages between factors/issues</li> <li>• Points made about importance or about developments in the context of the period will often be little more than assertions and descriptions</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>16-18</b></p>
<b>Level IV</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is deployment of relevant knowledge but level/accuracy of detail will vary; there may be some evidence that is tangential or irrelevant.</li> <li>• Some unclear and/or under-developed and/or disorganised sections; mostly satisfactory level of communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>12-13</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and the topic is variable but in general is satisfactory.</li> <li>• Limited and patchy understanding of a few relevant issues in their historical context.</li> <li>• Answer may be largely descriptive/ narratives of events and links between this and analytical comments will typically be weak or unexplained <b>OR</b> answers will mix passages of descriptive material with occasional explained analysis.</li> <li>• Limited points made about importance/links or about developments in the context of the period will be little more than assertions and descriptions</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>13-15</b></p>
<b>Level V</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some relevant accurate historical knowledge deployed: this may be generalised and patchy. There may be inaccuracies and irrelevant material also</li> <li>• Some accurate use of relevant historical terminology but often inaccurate/ inappropriate use</li> <li>• Often unclear and disorganised sections; writing will often be clear if basic but there may be some illegibility and weak prose where the sense is not clear or obvious</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>9-11</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General and sometimes inaccurate understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and of concepts relevant to the topic</li> <li>• General or weak understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context</li> <li>• Attempts at analysis will be weak or generalised, based on plausible but unsubstantiated points or points with very general or inappropriate substantiation <b>OR</b> there may be a relevant but patchy description of events/developments coupled with judgements that are no more than assertions</li> <li>• There will be some understanding of the question but answers may focus on the topic not address the focus of the question</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>11-12</b></p>

AOs	AO1a	AO1b
<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>• Answer may have little organisation or structure; weak use of English and poor organisation</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>4-8</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very little understanding of key concepts</li> <li>• Very limited understanding of the topic or of the question's requirements</li> <li>• Limited explanation will be very brief/fragmentary</li> <li>• The answer will be characterised by generalised assertion and/or description/narratives, often brief</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>6-10</b></p>
<b>Level VII</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No understanding of the topic or of the question's requirements; little relevant and accurate knowledge</li> <li>• Very fragmentary and disorganised response; 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>• No understanding of key concepts or historical developments.</li> <li>• No valid explanations</li> <li>• Typically very brief and very descriptive answer</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0-5</b></p>

**From Pitt to Peel 1783-1846**

- 1 'Pitt's handling of the radical challenge was the most important factor in its defeat.'  
How far do you agree? [50]**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. In order to reach the higher levels candidates will need to write at least a good paragraph on the named factor, even if they conclude it was not important. Many answers are likely to argue that Pitt's handling was a major factor in its defeat and point to events and legislation such as Radicals put on trial in 1793, Habeas Corpus suspended, creating a new party of Order in 1794 when the Whigs split, The Treasonable Practices Act and the Seditious Meetings Act of 1795 which targeted radical methods, the regulation via taxes of newspapers, which enable freedom to be maintained in theory, and formal bans on radical societies. However, some might argue that these actions drove radical activity underground, but even then it was infiltrated by spies and by financing and fostering loyalist associations. Pitt's success might also be challenged by reference to the danger in 1795 and in the naval mutinies of 1797, together with Fox's pro-revolutionary stance and therefore argue there were other factors. They may argue that the radical movement was defeated because it was weak as it was divided over aims and methods, associated with France and lacked genuine popular support. The repressive legislation in the 1790s was successful and candidates are likely to provide details of the legislation and are likely to attribute this to Pitt. Some might argue that Pitt faced a serious challenge because the nation was industrialising and urbanising, if this is the line taken candidates may conclude that Pitt was very important in the defeat of the threat, England did not face the unrest that France did in the same period. However, although the threat was defeated, or at least contained, there were corresponding societies, combinations, riots and machine smashing.

- 2 To what extent do the Tory governments of 1822-30 deserve to be called 'liberal'? [50]**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates are likely to focus on the philosophy and policies pursued by the government and consider whether they deserve to be called liberal. The question of how liberal the Tories were in the period after 1822 remains an open one, but most are likely to argue that they were more liberal after 1822. To support the view candidates could use: the appointment of younger politicians such as Canning, Peel and Huskisson after 1822-3, the economic legislation passed by both Robinson and Huskisson and the reforms of Peel at the Home Office. Some candidates might be aware that the government was divided by 1825-6 with some ministers barely on speaking terms. It was Liverpool's personal support that allowed the dominance of liberals such as Canning, Huskisson and Peel. However candidates might argue that there were also some illiberal measures such as the refusal to accept Roman Catholic Emancipation, the fact that the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts were forced upon them, and the refusal to entertain the issue of parliamentary reform. These issues might be contrasted with the measures of the earlier period in order to reach a conclusion.

- 3 How far was popular discontent the most important reason for the passing of the Great Reform Act in 1832? [50]**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. In order to reach the higher levels candidates will need to write at least a good paragraph on the named factor, even if they conclude that popular discontent was not important. Candidates might consider the influence of economic distress, the publicity of the radicals, the pressure of the Political Unions, particularly Attwood and the BPU and the NUWC. There might also be mention of the riots and disorder at Nottingham and Bristol in 1831 and the 'days of May' in 1832 to 'stop the Duke'.

Some may argue that the Whigs were concerned to pass reform in order to appease the middle class – ‘the wealth and intelligence of the country’. There was fear of a revolution with talk of a refusal to pay taxes and fears of an army mutiny if reform was not granted. However, it might also be noted that the actual pace of change was dictated as much by events within parliament as outside, hence the crucial importance of the break up of the Tory party after Liverpool. Candidates might note that the reform movement included Ultra-Tory discontents after Catholic Emancipation. Wellington’s determination to oppose reform forced the Whigs’ hand as Grey realised that the price of power and general law and order was a Reform Bill. He was aware that he would get cross-party support and therefore could be bold and established a committee of four which included prominent reformers, Russell and Durham.

### **Liberals and Conservatives 1846-1895**

**4 How successful were the reforms of Gladstone’s first ministry? [50]**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Better candidates might establish criteria against which to judge the concept of success and this could take a variety of directions. Many candidates might argue that the reforms were successful as it is usual to see this ministry as the great reforming ministry; however at the top levels candidates should produce a balanced answer. The Education Act, although it played an important role in providing education for working class children was an uneasy compromise between Anglicans and non-conformists and it created class divisions. Trade Union reform may have equalised the law between worker and employer but stopped short of what the skilled workers wanted (peaceful picketing and immunity from prosecution for strikes). Administrative reforms, such as the Civil Service and Universities, may have brought equality of opportunity, but there were still few who could take advantage of the changes. The Secret Ballot Act had a large impact, especially within Ireland. Irish legislation failed to have the required impact as the Land Act did not go far enough. The Licensing Acts annoyed temperance groups and the working class. Some candidates might approach the question by looking at the success or failure of the reforms in satisfying Liberal support and conclude that most of the reforms alienated some group of supporters; for example, they might argue that the Education Act failed to please the non-conformists. Some might argue that the reforms were not successful and point to defeat in the 1874 election and link this to the comment about ‘gin and beer’.

**5 Assess the reasons why Disraeli became Conservative leader. [50]**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates might look to weigh up the strengths of Disraeli as a leader against his weaknesses and other possible contenders before reaching a balanced conclusion. They might argue that Derby had not been interested in leading the party and was more at home horse-racing, whilst other possible contenders, such as Gladstone, had left the party. It might be noted that Derby had led the government in 1852 and 1858-9 and it was only ill-health that saw him resign. This argument may be further developed by looking at the weaknesses of Disraeli; he was after all an outsider for the Conservative party, not an Anglican. However, some might argue that he was their best speaker, had managed to pilot the Second Reform Act through parliament after Gladstone’s failure and had shown himself to have appeal. It might be argued that his successful guidance of the Reform Act through parliament was what guaranteed him the succession. Disraeli was responsible for many of the changes that helped bring the Conservatives back to power; he taught them that it would be pointless to try to win support for the reversal of the Free Trade policy, promoted reform when in office in the minority government, developed ideas on the need for social reform, appointed Gorst to reorganise the party machinery and appealed to the electorate as the spokesman for a party that would offer a strong foreign and imperial policy.

These positive qualities should be balanced against the claim that there were no alternatives once Derby resigned in February 1868.

**6 'Gladstone's attack on Disraeli's foreign policy was the most important reason for the Conservative defeat in the 1880 election.' How far do you agree? [50]**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. In order to reach the higher levels candidates will need to write at least a good paragraph on the named factor, even if they conclude it was not important. It is likely that many answers will focus on the return to politics of Gladstone and the importance of his attacks on Disraeli's 'inhuman' Eastern policy and the attacks on imperialism in the Midlothian campaign which portrayed it as aggressive, immoral and expensive. Disraeli failed to counter this and it clearly outraged Christian and humanist sentiment in the country. Candidates may weigh up the relative importance of the failings of the Conservative administration of 1874-1880 and compare this with the return to politics of Gladstone in affecting the outcome. There may be mention that social reform appeared to have ended after 1876 and that the reforms had been quite limited. Some may also argue that with the onset of economic depression and the growing problems in Ireland it was not surprising that reform ended, but that these two factors also influenced the election as Disraeli, the earlier champion of Protection, now resisted every demand for aid and as a result the more militant agricultural interests eventually abandoned the government for the Liberals. The impact of the Depression was particularly severe in Ireland where the collapse in production and rents resulted in the formation of the Land League and a more obstructive party in the Commons. Some may point to Disraeli's ill-health and tiredness which meant that he failed to campaign effectively.

**Foreign and Imperial Policies 1856-1914**

**7 'The expansion of trade and empire was the most important factor influencing British foreign policy in the period from 1856 to 1902.' How far do you agree? [50]**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. In order to reach the higher levels candidates will need to write at least a good paragraph on the named factor, even if they conclude it was not important. This is a wide question that encompasses much, so full or detailed coverage of every aspect is not expected. Candidates should discuss some of the main factors that influenced foreign policy, such as the Balance of Power, the promotion of trade and the Empire, concern over Russia and France and a limited preference for constitutional states. Challenged by the US and Germany on Trade, Britain remained committed to Free Trade and Sea Power as a means of securing markets. Candidates might argue for a change on Empire, from Free Trade Imperialism to a formal Empire, although some see this as a reluctant change, imposed by others. The principle of balance of power saw considerable change, this was particularly noticeable over Austria as Britain supported Italian and German nationalism at the expense of Austria. A commitment to the Treaty of Paris had failed by 1870. The balance was now one of 5 or 6 and one could argue that Britain now withdrew into splendid isolation. Russia and France remained constant, curbing Russia in the Crimea and the Balkans and France in Italy, Africa and the Far East. As for supporting constitutional states there was a Gladstonian morality that supported a nation struggling to be free but this depended upon the behaviour of any individual state or its oppressor rather than any consistent preference for constitutionalism per se.

**8 Assess the reasons for British concerns in the Balkans and the Mediterranean in the period from 1856 to 1902. [50]**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The Balkans was important in the struggle for supremacy between Russia, Austria and Balkan nationalism; the issues of the Straits, most pressing in 1854-6 and 1875-8 and Egypt and the Middle East. These issues should give candidates a variety of reasons to consider and make a judgement as to how far the fear of Russian expansion was the most important reason for British interest. As this was a vital area for Britain because of the route to India and trade with the east and Mediterranean trade it may be argued that this was Britain's main reason for concern. Russia was a threat to the Mediterranean following the invasion of the Danubian provinces and an attack on the Ottomans. Russia also championed the Bulgarian Christians following the massacre in 1875. Their growing power was seen as a menace, not just in Europe but in Asia to the British Empire. Another concern for Britain was how to deal with the declining Ottoman Empire, whether to prop it up, regardless, as an economic and strategic investment. This raises the question of the balance of power and candidates might consider this in relation to the decline of Turkey and the rise of Russia. There was fear that a weak Turkey might be unable to prevent a Russian advance towards the Mediterranean and Suez, with implications for trade and security. Interest in the Balkans was also stirred up by Gladstone and his pamphlet attacking the murder of Christian Slavs, although this may have had more to do with election opportunism.

**9 Assess the reasons why relations with Germany declined in the period from 1902 to 1914. [50]**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. In order to access the higher levels candidates must weigh up the relative importance of the factors discussed. Some candidates might suggest that it was the growing power and fear of Germany that caused Britain's attitude to change; there might be reference to the development of the German navy and the threat this posed to Britain with the Kiel Canal; there may also be mention of the naval race and the agreement reached with France. Candidates might argue that this was due to the resolution of areas of dispute with France, particularly in colonial issues following the Fashoda incident. They may argue that this led to the Entente Cordiale and some might develop this and suggest that relations with Germany changed following the Entente as Germany feared what might have been agreed. German economic growth, particularly in terms of steel and coal appeared to give Germany economic dominance in Europe and threaten British trade. Imperial issues were also a source of tension as Germany gave support for the Boers and also developed the Berlin to Baghdad railway. There might also be mention of German policy to dominate middle Europe and the consequences of this for Britain. Some answers might also consider the role of the Kaiser in this deterioration.

### **Domestic Issues 1918-1951**

**10 How far were the mine owners to blame for the General Strike of 1926? [50]**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates will need to address the role of the mine owners, even if they conclude that other parties were more to blame. Employers might be blamed as they argued that a competitive price could be achieved only at the expense of the miners. The owners, with their response to adverse terms in world trade which saw British coal as increasingly uncompetitive, prompted wage-cutting or the demands for longer working hours and this provoked the unions. The government was also intransigent, combined with an economic policy that was in part mistaken by returning to an overvalued currency backed by gold in 1925.

The government was certainly determined to stand by private ownership and lower labour costs. Candidates might also point out that it was the government that precipitated a strike on 3 May by calling off negotiations, not the Unions. Candidates are also likely to consider the role of the Trade Unions, especially the NUM. The role of the Daily Mail could also be considered as the trigger for the strike. The case for Union unrest as the main cause is the growing power and influence of the Unions up to the First World War and their reaction to changed economic conditions after it. Some candidates might make a distinction between the Miners, led by Smith and Cook, and the leadership of the Union movement in general who were reluctant to act and certainly unprepared to stage a General Strike. The latter were prepared to accept Samuel's recommendation as a basis of settlement. The Miners were less prepared to compromise. Previously they had been the aristocrats of the labour market and long unionised they were especially hard hit by economic contractions, new fuels, and poor geological conditions and under-investment in mining technology. It might also be argued that having scored victories with the Sankey Commission and on Red Friday they were keen to make a stand on behalf of other well-organised, but struggling industries. It might also be noted that the Unions failed to see Red Friday as simply a government tactic to buy time and stockpile and prepare for a strike.

**11 How effective were the National Governments of 1931 to 1939 in dealing with the social and economic problems they faced? [50]**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. There were a large number of policies adopted by the National Governments and examiners should not expect all of these to be covered; what is important is the quality of the analysis. In order to assess the effectiveness of government policies better candidates are likely to identify the problems that the governments faced; this might include the need for a stable currency, tackling unemployment, relieving poverty and tackling the problems of the older, traditional industries, and then consider how effective the measures were in dealing with problems. They were effective in stabilising the Pound through Snowden's Budget and the end of the Gold Standard. It boosted exports and reinforced confidence although better candidates might point to external pressure in forcing this. 'Cheap Money' proved very effective in lowering costs, although Britain was lucky that prices dropped far more than wages, enabling those in work to feel better off and sustain the new industries. Protection was more controversial in its impact; it may well have had little impact unless linked to re-organisation, as with steel. The Ottawa Conference saw little gain for British industry. As for poverty relief, government continued with the Public Assistance Committees but was determined on cuts to avoid overspend; this resulted in the Means Test, later removed, which was very unpopular and candidates might therefore question its effectiveness. The government preferred to create the conditions to enable private enterprise to prosper and this was effective; there was some success in the Housing Boom in new suburbs. Its one attempt to tackle regional economic problems, the Special Areas Act, was on too small a scale to be effective. The 1936 Jarrow March was testament to token gestures on relief when faced with the near collapse of a large industry. Welfare payments did continue at a higher level than most countries and were effective as a palliative.

**12 Assess the reasons for the welfare reforms of the Labour governments from 1945 to 1951. [50]**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. There are a number of reasons that candidates might consider, but at the higher levels they should evaluate the relative importance of the factors. There may be some assessment of the government's commitment to social welfare. Some may look at the legacy of wartime and argue that much legislation was already being prepared even if little had actually been carried out. There had been the government message that the war was being fought to build a 'better Britain'.

The influence of Sir John Anderson who directed Civil Service plans for reconstruction might be considered whilst the Beveridge Report had done much to popularise the idea of 'cradle to grave' welfare legislation. The media had taken up the message so that by the time the war ended the build-up of expectation was such that no government could ignore it. Candidates might suggest that Cripps and the Treasury were committed to reform so there was no repeat of the Geddes Axe. Some policies, such as Bevan's National Health Service, went beyond wartime blueprints and therefore other factors were involved. Some might suggest that the reforms were passed because this was the first Labour government with a majority and was therefore able to carry out change. However, it should also be noted that the wartime government had accepted the main principles of the Beveridge Report. Labour had made promises, which were more sweeping and better worked out than those of the Conservatives in the election to bring about reform and felt obliged to honour them. The public believed that Labour had a positive commitment to social reform and supported them. The experiences of the war also meant that people wanted and expected change, evacuation had revealed the scale of deprivation and now people felt it had to be addressed.

### **Foreign and Imperial Policies 1945-1990**

**13 How similar were the foreign policies of the Labour and Conservative governments from 1945 to 1964? [50]**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. There are a large number of areas and issues that candidates might consider, but it is not expected that they will deal with all, what matters is the quality of the analysis. Candidates might choose to approach this by looking at either themes or their relationship with individual countries or the EEC. If they take the latter approach it is likely that they will focus on Britain's relationship with the USA and USSR and this might be linked to the issues of the Cold War. Some might argue that there was a significant change after the war because of Britain's financial position and point to the change seen in Greece. The development of a close relationship with the USA might be stressed, although some might argue that after Suez this did see a shift. The desire to remain a great power remained a constant and answers might mention Britain's place on the Security Council and the desire for an independent nuclear deterrent.

**14 'Economic concerns were the most important reason for the change in Britain's attitude towards Europe from 1945 to 1973.' How far do you agree? [50]**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates are likely to consider a number of reasons, but in order to access the higher levels they must write at least a good paragraph on the given factor, even if they conclude it was not the most important. Some answers might consider the economic success of the EEC and compare this with the failure of EFTA. This might be compared with Britain's 'go it alone' attitude up to 1960. Candidates may consider the perception that Britain had to make a choice between the Empire and Europe and 'the wind of change' shift to de-colonisation which arguably altered Conservative views. There might also be consideration of the perception that Britain had to make a choice between USA and Europe; this might also be linked to the new direction under Eden, and later application to join the EEC. There might be some consideration of Heath's attitudes. Many in Britain did not take European membership seriously until 1960, pointing to Britain's world status and her desire to shape Europe rather than be shaped by it. This might be linked to distrust of Schumann Plan and EEC.

**15 How successful was Thatcher's foreign policy? [50]**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Although her first three foreign secretaries have criticised her pro-American policy some have argued that, although unpopular, it did the UK no harm. Thatcher believed that it was in Britain's commercial, strategic and security interests and that through this the communist threat could be resisted. However, it can also be argued that she was not prepared to sacrifice what she considered essential UK interests. There was close co-operation over military and intelligence matters and she was able to acquire Trident on generous terms. It might be argued that the Foreign Office thought Thatcher was an American poodle and that this resulted in her being too anti-EU and too pro-US. It might also be noted that she was a strong British nationalist and this was seen in the Falklands crisis. She was anti-communist and her desire to bring down the Communist states was not influenced by the US, but it was in their interests to work together. She was keen to open up new relationships with the new states of Eastern Europe and have the EU expand to include them as this was in the UK's interest as they would be a counterweight to France and Germany. In considering her relations with the EU it can be argued that it was British interests that dominated Thatcher's policy. Thatcher was able to get back some of Britain's contribution to the EU budget and it might be argued that this helped Britain's standing in Europe, but this was at the expense of a good relationship with France and Germany and would cause problems in the future. Britain contributed to the SEA as it was consistent with her belief in free market economics. However, this might be balanced by considering the nuclear dependence Britain had on the US and mention might be made of the presence of US weapons in Britain. British willingness to work with the US in support for Kuwait and the Gulf War might also be used to show that Britain was a major power.

**Post-War Britain 1951-1994****16 How important was the popular appeal of Wilson in explaining Labour's election victory in 1964? [50]**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. In order to reach the higher levels candidates will need to write at least a good paragraph on the named factor, even if they conclude it was not important. Labour won in 1964 by the large swing in the popular vote but only by a narrow margin of seats-317 to the Conservatives 304 and only a 5 seat majority in the Commons. Candidates should weigh up the importance of Wilson in explaining Labour's victory against other factors. Some answers will point to the youthful leadership of Wilson and his identification with all things modern. This contrasted well with the new aristocratic Conservative leader Sir Alec Douglas Home, who ran an ineffective campaign and did not handle television well. Wilson promoted his image with much talk of planning and the opportunities offered by the 'white heat' of technology. The grey years of Gaitskell were over and Wilson exploited Conservative weakness, especially economic, with skill. However, many candidates will conclude that it was the Conservatives who lost the election in the years after 1959, rather than Labour or Wilson who won it. The Conservatives appeared too 'Establishment', the promotion of a peer to the leadership was a mistake given the satirists of the day. Party organisation lost its way after 1959; Butler replaced Hailsham and was in turn replaced by MacLeod. The affluence of the 1950s now appeared to be sluggish by comparison with elsewhere and the Conservative Chancellor imposed unpopular deflationary policies in 1961. Decolonisation and immigration unsettled some whilst a new economic policy, the New Approach, involving controlled expansion, was undermined by De Gaulle's veto of joining the EEC. A radical Cabinet reshuffle, the Night of the Long Knives, unsettled his ministerial colleagues when it was intended to create a fresh and dynamic government.

Macmillan's choice of replacement was botched, middle and working class voters were lost. Labour won on a modernising agenda. Some may consider the question of scandal, particularly the Profumo affair and its impact.

**17 Assess the reasons for Thatcher's electoral victories. [50]**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. There are a number of reasons that candidates might consider, but at the higher levels they should evaluate the relative importance of the factors. There are a variety of reasons that candidates might offer for Conservative electoral success. When considering the weakness of Labour they might consider the weak leadership of Foot and Kinnock as major factors or they might look at areas of policy that were not popular with the electorate, particularly defence. Candidates might also consider the 'Looney Left' as a factor in discrediting Labour with the electorate. Labour were also closely associated with the Trade Unions and the question of too much union power, following the 'Winter of Discontent' this might be seen as an issue. In the first period in office Labour weakness was an issue as with the economic problems of rising unemployment it should have been possible for Labour to have been a strong alternative. Against this candidates should consider the strength of the Conservative party. This might include the appeal of Thatcher as a strong leader, in contrast to the Labour party. Although she was controversial she appeared strong and willing to stand up to the Unions. The recovery of the economy helped later on, but crucial for the second term was the success of the Falklands War and restoration of pride that followed; the Conservative party were able to take full advantage of it as opinion polls beforehand were not good. Some answers might suggest that Thatcher had a strong set of ministers around her, others might comment on the reforms, particularly the denationalisation and selling of council homes which helped to create a new class to which Thatcherism appealed, particularly in the third election victory. There might be some consideration of changes in voting behaviour.

**18 Assess the reasons why Ireland remained a problem for British governments between 1970 and 1994. [50]**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Thatcher governments faced the problem of hunger strikers, which also led to an increase in support for Sinn Fein, suggesting the problem had not been solved. There were attempts at 'rolling devolution', but more successful were the increased links between London and Dublin and this culminated in the Hillsborough Agreement, which did have long term consequences for a solution. However, the increased amount of terrorist activity on the mainland during the 1980s also suggests that government policy did not work and there may be reference to events such as the murder of Airey Neave, the murder of Mountbatten, the Hyde Park bombs or the bombing of the Grand Hotel in Brighton, which came close to wiping out the Conservative leadership. There may also be reference to the murder of various ministers as evidence that the democratic process was not working and that the Irish problem remained as insoluble as ever. At the end of the period there was a continuation of political violence, continued political success for Sinn Fein, the existence of paramilitary groups on both sides and limited support for a lasting peace involving both sides of the community; it was only with the 1993 Downing Street Declaration that success appeared possible and this can be seen with the IRA and Loyalist declarations of ceasefire in 1994. Therefore it might be concluded that the more successful policies were towards the end of the period. Some answers might compare this with the situation earlier in the period to show that progress was being made, but examiners should be aware of candidates who spend too long on the early period.

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**14 – 19 Qualifications (General)**

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 2011