

History B

Advanced GCE **F981**

Historical Explanation - British History

Mark Scheme for June 2010

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 2010

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

Generic Mark Scheme for Unit F981

Maximum mark: 50

Each question is marked out of 25.

Allocation of marks within the Unit:

	AO1 Knowledge and Understanding
Level 1	41-50 marks
Level 2	31-40 marks
Level 3	21-30 marks
Level 4	11-20 marks
Level 5	1-10 marks
Level 6	0 marks

The same generic mark scheme is used for both questions:

	Marks	AO1 Knowledge and Understanding
Level 1	21-25	<p>Complex judgements supported by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent understanding of key concepts such as causation, consequence and significance • Explicit and effective use of two or more modes of explanation • Developed analysis of interactions between, or prioritisation of, key features and characteristics such as ideas, beliefs, actions and events • A wide range of relevant and accurate knowledge • Accurate and confident use of appropriate historical terminology • Accurate and effective communication. Effective and coherent structure
Level 2	16-20	<p>Sound judgements supported by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good understanding of key concepts such as causation, consequence and significance • Some explicit use of at least one mode of explanation • Some analysis of interactions between, or prioritisation of, key features and characteristics such as ideas, beliefs, actions and events; or sound explanation of more than one key feature • A range of mostly relevant and accurate knowledge • Mostly accurate use of appropriate historical terminology • Mostly accurate and clear communication. Generally coherent structure
Level 3	11-15	<p>Partly sound judgements supported by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfactory understanding of key concepts such as causation, consequence and significance • Some reasonable explanation of at least one key feature and characteristic such as ideas, beliefs, actions and events but also some assertion, description or narrative • Mostly relevant knowledge, some accurate knowledge • A limited range of historical terminology • Mostly satisfactory communication. Some coherent structure

	Marks	AO1 Knowledge and Understanding
Level 4	6-10	<p>Weak judgements supported by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some general, but mostly weak, understanding of key concepts such as causation, consequence and significance • Some limited explanation of at least one key feature and characteristic; mostly assertion, description or narrative • Limited relevant knowledge, some inaccurate and irrelevant knowledge • Little use of historical terminology • Some satisfactory communication, some weak communication. Limited and unclear structure
Level 5	1-5	<p>Irrelevant or no judgements supported by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weak understanding of key concepts such as causation, consequence, and significance • Assertion, description or narrative of at least one key feature and characteristic • Mostly inaccurate and irrelevant knowledge • No, or inaccurate, use of historical terminology • Poor communication, poor or non-existent structure
Level 6	0	<p>No judgements supported by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No understanding of key concepts such as causation, consequence, and significance • Inaccurate or assertion, description or narrative • Inaccurate and irrelevant knowledge • No use of historical terminology • Very poor communication/ Incoherent structure.

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
1 (a)	<p style="text-align: center;">Lancastrians and Yorkists, 1437-85</p> <p>The personal rule of Henry VI to 1450</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Why did the English struggle to keep their French possessions under Henry VI?</p> <p>This is what the key part of each answer might look like:</p> <p>L1 Divided leadership was crucial to the Lancastrian loss both of Normandy and Gascony. Who was in charge, the Duke of Somerset or the Duke of York – or the Duke of Suffolk? The latter certainly took the blame, but responsibility in the fifteenth century for national military affairs could rest only in the person of the king. Unlike his illustrious father, Henry VI was no soldier, and it was only in Gascony that strong resistance to the French resurgence was mounted, and that by the outstanding John, Lord Talbot. The failure lay at the top, and the ignominious retreat from Normandy was to have severe repercussions on home soil.</p> <p>L3 The French were on the rise after the miraculous appearance of Joan of Arc and they were now a much more serious force under Charles VII than they had been for a generation. There was unity now between Burgundy and the French crown and the English were on the back foot when Charles did attack in Normandy. The English had profited from their weakness and division but stood little chance when the French regrouped seriously.</p> <p>L5 It was all Henry's fault. He even married a Frenchwoman, and so he was only interested in peace with the French and not fighting them.</p>	[25]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
1 (b)	<p>Why did the religious devotion of Henry VI cause problems for his kingship up to 1450?</p> <p>This is what the key part of each answer might look like:</p> <p>L1 Sources at the time disagree on the exact nature of Henry's piety. Nevertheless, its effects were many. The king's lack of interest in secular matters to do with his lands, his finances, his possessions in France and at home and, above all, in military affairs, were puzzling and challenging to his nobles. They were given responsibilities which they could not, or would not effectively handle, for example Richard of York in Normandy and Ireland. Above all the king's devotions created a power vacuum and a crisis of confidence in the political nation which were to prove disastrous in both the short and longer terms.</p> <p>L3 Henry was a man of Christian virtues. He founded Eton and King's, Cambridge, which we can still visit today. Nevertheless he was so holy even by the standards of the time that he could not be a proper soldier and others had to fight for him in his own country and in France, and this caused problems.</p> <p>L5 It was alright to pray, but England needed a strong king, and we didn't have one. Henry was too busy praying to go out fighting.</p>	<p>[25]</p>

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
2 (a)	<p>The Wars of the Roses 1455-85</p> <p>How can the important role played by Richard Neville, Earl of Warwick, be best explained?</p> <p>This is what the key part of each answer might look like:</p> <p>L1 In terms of their own intentions, the classic ‘overmighty subject’ remains something of a mystery: we rarely have any hints from the sources about why they acted as they did. Judging them by their actions, we can discern ambition, greed and selfishness as we might expect. Warwick wanted lands, titles, retainers and influence, and acted to attain these ends, as did Richard of York. Yet this can at best offer a partial explanation. Successive kings allowed, expected and encouraged them to follow these desires and trusted that in doing so their influence and power would be wielded for the ultimate good of the ‘commonweal’, however much they themselves might benefit in the interim.</p> <p>L3 Powerful lords flourished because Henry VI was weak and Edward was opposed by too many people. You needed a strong king to keep these lords in check, and Henry in particular was too holy and interested in books and praying to keep Warwick under proper control. The only thing these men understood was power.</p> <p>L5 These powerful men just did as they pleased. They could even become kings themselves when they wanted to. No wonder there was chaos.</p>	[25]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
2 (b)	<p>Why did issues of lordship, affinity and 'bastard feudalism' become so important during the period 1455-85?</p> <p>This is what the key part of each answer might look like:</p> <p>L1 Fifteenth-century society at its highest levels depended on the exercise of patronage and clientage for its smooth operation. Rewards were sought and obtained, promises demanded and made, relationships built and severed, and the normal consequences were no more serious than disappointment at opportunities lost or frustration and petty rivalry. During these years, however, a spiral of feud and violence developed to which affinity and 'bastard feudalism' contributed. Nevilles and Percies competed for dominance of an area; great affinities like those of the Courtenays and Beauchamps disintegrated, leaving competition to fill the space. A weak king such as Henry VI stood by hopelessly and himself became a pawn as powerful interest groups turned against each other</p> <p>L3 In the end it all came down to the king. Henry VI did not inspire loyalty and did not have the skills to reward his followers without causing jealousy and hatred. He seemed to have his own favourites whom he rewarded and other able men were excluded, so they resorted to force to get what they wanted from the king with disastrous consequences.</p> <p>L5 The bastard feudal system all depended on the king. If he wasn't very good then the pyramid collapsed, and this is what happened with Henry VI.</p>	[25]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
3 (a)	<p>Why did Puritans cause problems for Elizabeth?</p> <p>This is what the key part of each answer might look like:</p> <p>L1 Thus one answer to this question focuses on a Puritan belief system based upon a predestined sense of an elect which denied man's ability to redeem himself through good works. This, however, links undeniably to the resultant actions of these Protestant dissenters in denying by words and actions an Elizabethan Settlement characterised by most as moderate, a middle way. This is not how many Puritans saw it – and a minority of separatists caused yet more trouble for Elizabeth and her authorities by forming separate congregations outside the Elizabethan Church altogether.</p> <p>L3 Such was the scale of the Puritan opposition to the Elizabethan Settlement that Archbishop Whitgift was appointed deliberately by the Queen to take strong action against them. Separatists were tried and hanged, and preachers were imprisoned or driven abroad. Puritans were, along with Catholics, a thorn in the Queen's side for many years.</p> <p>L5 Puritans would not accept what the Queen said. This was bound to cause problems for a strong ruler like Elizabeth who wanted no disobedience.</p>	[25]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
3 (b)	<p>How would you best explain the disappearance of the Catholic threat by 1603?</p> <p>This is what the key part of each answer might look like:</p> <p>L1 It takes a combination of reasons to explain fully why Catholicism, which at one point seemed unstoppable, failed to replace the moderate Elizabethan Settlement of 1559. Prime among them is the wave of xenophobia which swept the country after the defeat of the Armada, which in turn triggered a more active Catholic persecution than had been allowed up to this point. Less significant but still important was the absence of a single figurehead leader around whom the Catholics could unite. Lastly there was the idea that James VI might look favourably upon the Catholic Church once he came to power, a belief fuelled by some unwise comments of his to this effect.</p> <p>L3 Elizabeth got tough and took decisive action. She arrested and executed priests and laymen. In 1584 Parliament ruled that it was treason simply to be a Catholic priest in England, regardless of doing anything hostile. Such policies drove the Catholic Church deep underground and put off all but a few diehard followers.</p> <p>L5 Catholics disappeared because the Armada proved that England would never turn Catholic and welcome foreign rule.</p>	[25]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
4 (a)	<p>Why did Elizabeth refuse to marry?</p> <p>This is what the key part of each answer might look like:</p> <p>L1 Therefore I have taken issue in this answer with the term 'refuse', which begs many questions. I have preferred to focus on the wider diplomatic and political picture as offering the most incisive explanation: every possibility of an external alliance was fraught with dangers and risked upsetting the fragile equilibrium between France, Spain and Britain. Attitudes to marriage are difficult to recapture convincingly for sixteenth century aristocracy and royalty, but at this level a belief in serving the national interest and, to a degree, in fulfilling God's purpose, link closely with this point. Finally, the personal feelings of the Queen herself have to be noted, and here it is clear that Elizabeth would surely have married had she wished to, whatever the views of her Privy Council.</p> <p>L3 The explanation here is that Elizabeth was terrified of rebellion. Whichever candidate you look at, such as Dudley or Anjou or Philip of Spain, there was likely to be very strong opposition which might lead to a rising, possibly with foreign support. It was better for England and the future for Elizabeth to delay, and to be confident about the strength of the political system which would keep her in power. But one rash move and she could be toppled by one or a combination of rivals.</p> <p>L5 Elizabeth I was the Virgin Queen and she never got married because she didn't want to.</p>	[25]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
4 (b)	<p>How would you best explain the rebellion of the Earl of Essex in 1601?</p> <p>This is what the key part of each answer might look like:</p> <p>L1 The wider context for Essex's actions was that of the succession to the crown. Although in theory a supporter of James VI, Essex's motivation seems ultimately to have been to seize the person of the Queen and to alter the agreed path of succession. Allied to this was a long-standing rivalry with Cecil, and a tradition of rash and spontaneous military ventures which were as likely to bring disaster as glory. No single, simple explanation will tell us what tipped Essex over the edge after his disastrous behaviour in Ireland, but it is not just hindsight which judges that a simple lack of political and constitutional judgement characterised his final futile acts of rebellion in London.</p> <p>L3 It seems therefore that Essex always expected Elizabeth to save him from the consequences of his actions. She admired his successes like Cadiz so she would surely forgive him his errors such as his lack of discipline in Ireland. When Elizabeth refused to match his expectations he foolishly rebelled, thinking he could teach the ageing Queen a lesson.</p> <p>L5 The earl of Essex wanted power and would do anything to grab it, even rebel against the mighty Elizabeth.</p>	<p>[25]</p>

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
5 (a)	<p>How would you best explain the emergence of New Liberalism by the early twentieth century?</p> <p>This is what the key part of each answer might look like:</p> <p>L1 Key personalities such as Lloyd George and Churchill clearly played a role in giving New Liberalism momentum as an idea, but they in turn operated within a context of changing attitudes towards poverty and unemployment. For any movement to ‘emerge’ it needs an underpinning of ideas, and these came both from Germany and from social reformers such as Booth and Rowntree, who were prepared to offer statistical support for a ‘poverty cycle’ and pattern of unemployment which was not caused by the fault of an individual. The Labour Party needed little convincing that this was the way forward for social reform, but it took the Liberals longer to accept that political gain might also stem from these beliefs.</p> <p>L3 Governments had to start doing something to deal with squalor and poverty. ‘Laisser-faire’ policies were inadequate to meet the social challenges of early twentieth-century Britain. New Liberalism was one response, and it was not as scary or full-on as socialism, with its dangerous foreign associations. People could easily understand this concern for the poor and many recognised that old age pensions were now necessary.</p> <p>L5 It all started when the Liberals won the 1906 General Election...</p>	<p>[25]</p>

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
5 (b)	<p>Why was the Parliament Act passed in 1911?</p> <p>This is what the key part of each answer might look like:</p> <p>L1 The context here is one of the Lords blocking Liberal Bills for a generation. A Conservative majority in the unelected chamber operated on a party political basis, ignoring a popular 1906 mandate for change. It was the skill of Asquith which played a major part in the passing of the Act ending this situation. Asquith supervised the Bill and led the Commons in its passing. Arguably even more important was the action of the King, George V. He agreed to the creation of sufficient new peers if needed to steer the measure through the Lords. This promise mattered in my view even more than the spectre of Home Rule for Ireland.</p> <p>L3 It was no longer fair for the Lords to try to block laws, especially the People's Budget. The Lords was unelected and was dominated by the Conservatives. The public wanted a change and supported efforts to restrict the Lords' powers. Lloyd George was the people's champion and he was supported in 1910, too, when the Liberals were re-elected to take on the Lords, and they won.</p> <p>L5 In 1909 there was the People's Budget. This wanted to raise taxes on the rich to pay for old age pensions. Then came an election in 1910.</p>	[25]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
6 (a)	<p>Why was Home Rule an idea that no longer satisfied most Irish nationalists after 1914?</p> <p>This is what the key part of each answer might look like:</p> <p>L1 So, we have established that full independence came to supplant, for some activists, the formerly accepted belief in Home Rule. Why settle for a half-way house measure? To do so implied acceptance of the idea that political freedom and representation would be 'granted' by Westminster, whereas some Irish nationalists now argued that freedom could be seized on behalf of the people. Celtic Ireland represented a 'golden age' but one that could be recaptured by firm and decisive action independent of the political dealings in London which had afforded merely concessions and promises up till now.</p> <p>L3 Home Rule was popular because it gave the Irish a significant measure of control over their own affairs. Even as late as 1912 it might have succeeded but by 1914 the outbreak of war had made it seem like a halfhearted gesture.</p> <p>L5 Some Irish people didn't want Home Rule any more. They wanted to seize control using force. Guns were smuggled in.</p>	[25]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
6 (b)	<p>How would you best explain the outbreak of civil war in Ireland in 1922?</p> <p>This is what the key part of each answer might look like:</p> <p>L1 The 1921 Anglo-Irish treaty should not itself be held responsible for in some way causing the conflict which followed. It was an honest attempt to make concessions to both Unionist and nationalist positions. What made the treaty unworkable and what could not have been anticipated was the degree of personal animosity between Collins and de Valera and indeed that between Griffith and de Valera. This mistrust, rivalry and loathing ruined the chances of a workable agreement. Opposing IRA factions compounded the risks of an all-out war by violent clashes in Limerick and Kilkenny which served as preludes for the hostilities to come.</p> <p>L3 You need look no further than the partition of Ireland and the 1921 treaty to explain why Ireland went to war with itself. Breaking up the country was fatal. The Six Counties were mostly Protestant but had Catholic majority areas within them. The remainder of Ireland was not to be a republic but a 'free state' like Canada, neither one thing nor another. It was little wonder that the treaty pleased no one.</p> <p>L5 The IRA was divided. On one side was Collins and on the other was de Valera. They fought among themselves to be in charge.</p>	[25]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
7 (a)	<p>How would you best explain the defeat of the Labour Party in the General Election of 1959?</p> <p>This is what the key part of each answer might look like:</p> <p>L1 Labour found it hard to attack a period of Conservative economic progress which had seen two years of growth and stable prices. ‘Supermac’ was personally popular in a way which Gaitskell could not match. The Labour leader struggled, too, with internal divisions over Clause 4 and nuclear disarmament and, most important of all, with the future direction of the Labour Party itself. Should it move to the right, as Gaitskell wished, to try to overcome years of Conservative dominance under Churchill and now Macmillan, or should it return to core values and beliefs and offer a distinctive shift to the left?</p> <p>L3 Labour made promises which seemed unlikely to be fulfilled: not to raise income tax, nor purchase tax, but to build more hospitals and raise old age pensions. Their slogan was ‘Britain belongs to you’ but voters decided that ‘Life’s better with the Conservatives’ and they trusted Macmillan when he told them that they’d never had it so good.</p> <p>L5 Labour was split on too many things and voters don’t like voting for a split party.</p>	[25]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
7 (b)	<p>Why did the Profumo Affair damage the Macmillan Government?</p> <p>This is what the key part of each answer might look like:</p> <p>L1 There is a direct relationship between the Profumo Affair and the fall of the Macmillan government. The once-invincible Supermac resigned a month after the official report into the affair, claiming ill health. The real difficulty for the Prime Minister was that a member of his Cabinet had lied to the Commons, claiming that his relationship with Christine Keeler was an innocent one. He later had to go back on this. Added to this was the context of the Cold War which meant that whether or not Profumo had been having an affair, and whether or not the Russian naval attaché had been having an affair with the same woman, this scandal looked too dangerous for the security of Britain.</p> <p>L3 Macmillan suddenly looked old and out of touch. Most British people enjoyed reading about this scandal involving a prostitute and a spy, and comedians at the time poked fun at the government. The Conservatives looked old and tired and it was surely time for a change after so many 'wasted years'.</p> <p>L5 Profumo was a minister who had an affair with a woman who was also having an affair at the same time with a Russian spy.</p>	<p>[25]</p>

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
8 (a)	<p>Why was the Miners' Strike defeated?</p> <p>This is what the key part of each answer might look like:</p> <p>L1 Mrs Thatcher was confident that this time, unlike under a previous Conservative Prime Minister, Ted Heath, the conditions were right to take on the most powerful trade union of all. Coal stockpiles were high, and it would take months for the strike to be effective. Moreover, Arthur Scargill had lost public sympathy by refusing to hold a proper strike ballot of all miners to decide whether to strike or not. Thatcher's 'Iron Lady' felt that she could win the battle of ideas, the free market against a subsidised economy, and the political battle which lay ahead of her.</p> <p>L3 Arthur Scargill was the main causal factor behind the failure of the strike he led. He was a good speaker and a hero to many miners but he put off members of the public and refused to negotiate or to recognise when the strike had reached a point where it would never succeed. The miners needed a more moderate leader who was prepared to play the game of politics more.</p> <p>L5 The Miners' Strike began in March 1984. It began after Mr McGregor announce that he was going to cut 20,000 jobs.</p>	[25]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
8 (b)	<p>Why did Thatcher resign in 1990?</p> <p>This is what the key part of each answer might look like:</p> <p>L1 The third Conservative term saw no let up in the ground-breaking policies which Mrs Thatcher wanted to introduce. These included the poll tax, a hugely unpopular alternative to the rates, NHS reform and further education reforms. Less resolute colleagues had their loyalty tested, and they began to complain with increasing volume about their leader's autocratic leadership style. The issue of Europe was the spark, the catalyst which brought all these issues of personal leadership style and confidence into the open. Sir Geoffrey Howe's resignation speech was quiet but deadly in its impact.</p> <p>L3 Europe was the issue which brought down Mrs Thatcher. She refused to agree a policy for a single European currency with her Foreign Secretary, Geoffrey Howe, and this prompted his famous resignation. This in turn prompted Heseltine to run against her. The issue of Europe had wounded the Conservatives for years and now some felt that the party would stand more chance of re-election united behind another leader rather than divided behind her.</p> <p>L5 Mrs Thatcher had had enough. She was surrounded by complaining, disloyal ministers called 'wets' who never gave her the support they should have.</p>	[25]

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

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 2010

