

# **History A**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **F962/02**: European and World History Period Studies  
Option B: Modern 1795-2003

## **Mark Scheme for June 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: <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, 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>

<p><b>Level III</b></p>	<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>
<p><b>Level IV</b></p>	<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>

<p><b>Level V</b></p>	<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>
<p><b>Level VI</b></p>	<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>
<p><b>Level VII</b></p>	<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>

**Option B: Modern 1795-2003**

Answer any **two** questions from either **one** or **two** of the Study Topics.

**Napoleon, France and Europe 1795-1815**

- 1** 'Napoleon's military successes were the main reason for his rapid rise to power by 1799.' How far do you agree?

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates will need to deal adequately with the given factor even if they wish to argue that other factors were more important. Candidates may argue that if it were not for his success as a general then little would have been heard of Napoleon – ie that his success as a general was a necessary but not sufficient cause of his rise to power. In support of his generalship candidate should draw on his rise as an officer and general during the 1790s, from the siege of Toulon in 1793, through his Italian campaigns in 1796-7 and his efforts in Egypt in 1798. However, his rise to power owes much to other factors such as the ambition, political talents and opportunism of Napoleon himself. They may point to his taking advantage of opportunities as they arose, including his relationship with Barras and marriage to Josephine de Beauharnais. Many will seek to place such factors in the context of the developments of the revolutionary years, particularly the increasing importance of military victory to the stability of the revolution, the significance of Napoleon's victory and peacemaking in Italy, and the weaknesses and increasing reliance of the Directory on the army. There may be some concentration on the developments of 1799 and the actions of individuals like Sieyes and Lucien Bonaparte before and during the coup of Brumaire.

- 2** 'Napoleon was nothing more than a dictator in his rule of France between 1799 and 1815.' How far do you agree? **[50]**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates will need to balance the claims relating to dictatorship against those that see Napoleon as more than this: as an enlightened ruler who introduced reforms to strengthen France and went beyond measure of repression and security. Candidates may also argue that over time Napoleon's rule became more dictatorial, or that dictatorship was there inherent from the start. Candidates are likely to discuss the significance of the various constitutions and plebiscites, the organization of administration and government, the measures of police, political prisoners, censorship and propaganda, the move to Empire. They may also discuss the significance and nature of reforms in the Church, education, the law and economy and how far they reflect dictatorship or something more.

- 3** **Assess the reasons for Napoleon's downfall in 1814.** **[50]**

No specific answer is looked for. In relation to the Russian campaign candidates should focus on the consequences of Napoleon's defeat – the loss of (irreplaceable) manpower and resources (particularly cavalry horses and artillery), the encouragement to resistance, the blow to French morale, and so on. They could make linkages with the decision of Prussia to take up arms and of Russia to continue the war, to the formation of the Quadruple alliance and so on. However, candidates will need to set this factor in the context of others such as the long term British opposition (candidates may refer to British naval supremacy, British diplomacy in organizing and subsidizing anti-Napoleon coalitions, British military action, especially in support of the Peninsular War); the impact of the Continental System; the growth of opposition to Napoleon, the Peninsular War, the arguable decline of Napoleon's generalship and armies, the improvements in his opponents' armed forces and officer corps, the adaptation to Napoleonic tactics, the decision of Austria to take up arms and so on.

**Monarchy, Republic and Empire: France 1814-1870****4 Assess the reasons for the 1830 Revolution in France. [50]**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates will need to identify and explain a number of reasons and evaluate their relative importance and/or links to access the higher bands. Candidates may identify and explain reasons in a number of ways. For example, some may distinguish between long term (such as the revolutionary heritage), short term (such as Charles X's policies towards religion) and immediate causes (such as the Ordinances of St Cloud). Candidates may also discuss reasons such as the legacy of the revolutionary and Napoleonic era, the Charter and the attitudes of Charles X and liberals towards it, the range and nature of Charles X's political and religious policies, the impact of economic problems, the extent and nature of opposition, the circumstances of 1830, and so on. Candidates may argue that Charles X largely brought his downfall upon himself or they may stress the difficulties of his position or that the longer term influences of the revolutionary years made further revolution/political upheaval more likely. Many may well argue that it was a combination of factors that brought about the events of 1830 – to be successful such an argument needs to be underpinned by effective analysis that may, for example, distinguish between direct and indirect causes, or contributory and necessary reasons.

**5 How successful was Louis Philippe's domestic policy? [50]**

No specific answer is looked for. Success may be assessed in terms of aims, outcomes and context. Candidates may examine some of the following areas in developing their argument: the repression of social unrest; the lack of significant social reform; policies toward government, the constitution and political change; political corruption; economic policy; the Railway Law; 'immobilism'; 'enrichissez-vous'; Guizot. Candidates may argue that politically Louis-Philippe did manage to stay in power for 18 years, but was eventually overthrown and that his approach did not neutralise the pressure for political reform. He failed to establish deep support for the Orleanist monarchy. They may also argue that the approach to the economy and social problems and unrest was ultimately unsuccessful as it was the failure to deal with the economic crisis that emerged in the mid-1840s was the precipitant of revolution. 'Immobilism' and 'laissez-faire' failed.

**6 How far did Napoleon III's rule of France become more liberal from 1852 to 1870? [50]**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates may well pick up on the apparent move away from dictatorship in the 1860s with the 'liberalisation' of the Empire. They may point to the nature of the constitution (how liberal was it from the start?) and the concessions that Napoleon had to make over time. Candidates may examine the sources of Napoleon's support and the adaptations he had to make in order to try and maintain that support and the impact of the growth of liberal opposition. However, candidates may argue that whilst there were some changes (such as the reforms of 1867/8 or the creation of a 'Liberal Empire' in 1869-70) it would be wrong to overestimate their significance and candidates may suggest that these changes were forced out of him as his policies failed; these reforms came towards the end of Napoleon's rule and were forced on him.

**The USA in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century: Westward Expansion and Civil War 1803-c.1900****7 Assess the reasons why the Native Americans lost their lands. [50]**

No specific answer is looked for. In relation to Native American divisions and their role, candidates may discuss the significance of the Tecumseh Confederation, and other attempts when relative Indian unity seemed to offer the prospect of some success, and may balance this against the evidence of differences or lack of cooperation between different Native American groups and the rivalries between them. They may point to the tensions between the Plains Indian tribes. They may also point to the impact of lack of unity within tribes in their attitudes towards White Americans and the weakness this demonstrated. However, candidates should balance such discussion against other reasons for the loss of lands. They may point to White American expansion and desire for land as fundamental, and to the role of settler pressure whatever federal policy was; they may discuss the failure of treaties, the lack of mutual cultural understanding, the military superiority of Federal forces and so on.

**8 Assess the reasons why westward expansion caused friction between North and South in the 1850s. [50]**

Candidates need to identify and analyse reasons and evaluate their relative significance and/or linkages. Candidates may argue that the question of westward expansion and the establishment of territories (and then states) in the West became intimately bound up in the growing tensions between northern and southern states. As the USA expanded westward the Missouri Compromise became increasingly untenable and the impact of the Mexican War was to shatter it. Central to their arguments is likely to be the issue of slavery and they may discuss some of the crises of the 1850s that made the issue of the possible westward expansion of slavery so contentious. In this context, candidates may refer to the Mexican War, Wilmot Proviso, Calhoun doctrine, the 'Compromise' of 1850, Kansas-Nebraska, 'Bleeding Kansas' and so on. Candidates may also discuss how westward expansion also played on the suspicions of 'Slave Power conspiracy' and 'northern aggression'. No specific answer is looked for.

**9 'The South never had a chance of winning the Civil War.' How far do you agree?**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates are likely to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of each side at the start of the war, and may well base a case around the North's superior resources in all areas. In relation to superior resources, candidates may compare North and South in terms of the relative size of populations, the degree and extent of economic development, economic resources and railways, merchant navy and trade and so forth, arguing that in the long term the North's superiority would tell in any war of attrition. However, candidates should range beyond the balance of resources, and consider the strategic situation and what each side needed to do to win/not lose the war. They may still argue that the South's defeat was probable, but should consider the difficulties facing both sides. They may point to the points in the war when Union morale seemed shaky (as in 1863) and consider whether the South ever had any chance of winning British and French support. They may also discuss the relative merits of the two armies and their generals.

**Peace and War: International Relations c.1890-1941**

- 10 Assess the reasons why troubles in the Balkans led to the outbreak of war across Europe in 1914. [50]**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates need to identify and assess a range of reasons. They should seek to draw the connections between events in the Balkans and the other causes of the First World War. They may focus on the nature of the 'Balkan Question' and the tensions created by ethnic nationalism and the strengthening of Serbia. Candidates may link this to the involvement of the great powers and the declining Ottoman Empire. They may point, in particular, to the interests of Austria-Hungary and Russia. Such concerns may be linked to the alliances and the growth in tension between the Great Powers for other reasons (imperial rivalry, arms races, domestic tensions and so on). Candidates may discuss the implications of events such as the annexation of Bosnia (1908), the two Balkan wars (1912,13) and the assassination of the Archduke Ferdinand. They may well link Balkan issues to other causes through an examination of the development of the July Crisis after that Archduke's assassination.

- 11 'As a peacekeeping organisation, the League of Nations was a total failure.' How far do you agree? [50]**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates will need to discuss the merits of the view given even if they wish to argue for a different view. Candidates may well argue strongly in favour of the view given and point to the structural weaknesses of the organization (no army, need for unanimity, absence of USA etc) and their impact whenever peace was seriously threatened. They may well seek to show the failure of the League of Nations in the face of Japanese and Italian aggression in the Manchurian and Abyssinian crises and its failure to secure disarmament or stop Hitler's aggression. However, candidates may balance such discussion against its successes in the 1920s in resolving relatively minor disputes that threatened peace and against the fact that the League retained much popular support as a source of hope for maintaining peace. At the very least it provided an organ for the weak to appeal for aid.

- 12 Assess the reasons for the outbreak of world war in Asia in 1941. [50]**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates need to consider a range of reasons and assess their relative importance, and/or links between them. Candidates may well focus on the ambitions of Japan in China and South East Asia more generally. They may point to the aggressive foreign policy pursued partly as a consequence of the Depression, the growth of nationalism and historic claims on the Chinese mainland. There may be discussion of effects of the successful invasion of Manchuria, the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese war, the alliance with Germany and Italy, the Co-prosperity Sphere and the decision to attack Pearl Harbour. Discussion of Japanese motives needs to be set in the context of the attitudes of the USA, Britain and France, the weakness and failure of the League of Nations, and the distractions of events in Europe. Candidates may argue that Japanese aggression met no realistic resistance and this encouraged her. It was only the direct attack on US interests (Pearl Harbour) that finally provoked the outbreak of war.

**From Autocracy to Communism: Russia 1894-1941****13 How far was Tsar Nicholas II able to restore his authority after the 1905 Revolution? [50]**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates may discuss the political repression that followed the October Manifesto and the Fundamental laws and the nullifying of the potential of the Duma as a check on Tsarism. They may point to these measures as ones that indicate the restoration of Tsarist authority. They may also point to the decline in agitation and the collapse in the membership of the RSDLP. They may also point to Stolypin's 'wager on the strong' as evidence of a different approach and the celebrations of the Romanov dynasty in 1912 of the Tsar's popularity that may suggest the restoration of authority. However, they may also suggest that whilst there was comparative quiet in the period after 1906 stability was more apparent than real and that the pressures that brought about the revolutionary crisis of 1905 were still unresolved, that the events of the Revolution and its immediate aftermath had severely injured the Tsar's authority and that the Tsar had, in any case, to concede the existence of the Duma, however, he limited its effectiveness.

**14 'Lenin's leadership was the main reason for the success of the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917.' How far do you agree?**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates must deal with the given factor adequately even if they wish to argue that other factors are more important. In relation to Lenin's role, candidates may discuss the significance of his return in April, the April Theses, the July Days, his pressing for a Bolshevik revolution in October and so on. They may balance such discussion by considering other factors, such as the extent of the 'social' revolution in 1917, the role of the St Petersburg Soviet, the loss of credibility of the other parties (like the SRs and the Kadets), through their association with the failed policies of the Provisional Government, the mistakes and weaknesses of the Provisional Government, the failure to resolve the issues of bread, land and the war, the impact of the Kornilov revolt, the role of the Bolsheviks in its defeat, the role of Trotsky and so on.

**15 'Stalin's economic policies in the 1930s were a disaster for the people of the USSR.' How far do you agree? [50]**

No specific answer is looked for. No specific answer is looked for. Candidates must address the quotation and answer 'How far?'. Candidates may focus their discussion on collectivization and the five year plans. They may argue that the policies enjoyed mixed economic success, but were a social disaster. They may refer to Stalin's desire to catch up with the West and destroy capitalist elements in industry and agriculture (and his targeting of Kulaks). In relation to the Five Year Plans candidates may discuss the differences between targets, propaganda claims and achievements, but may well still argue that results in terms of production were impressive. They may also suggest the second Five Year Plan learnt some lessons from the mistakes of the first (more reasonable targets and concern for infrastructure), whilst the third was dominated by rearmament. Candidates may also argue that whilst the economic results were impressive the social costs were high with highly controlled and disciplined workers and decline in living standards (at least in the early 1930s). In relation to agriculture, candidates may argue that the forced collectivization was successful insofar as farms were collectivized into Sovkhoz and Kolkhoz, but had a disastrous impact, at least in the short term, on agricultural production and led to famine in the countryside. They may also stress the social costs of the policy as the Kulaks were eliminated.

**Democracy and Dictatorship: Italy 1896-1943****16 Assess the reasons for Mussolini's rise to power by 1922.**

No specific answer is looked for. In relation to Mussolini's role, they may point to his leadership of the Fascist party, his ability to sense the Italian mood, his skills as a propagandist and orator, his playing on the fear of socialism, and his opportunism as significant. Such discussion may be linked to the growth of socialism, its electoral profile and the *biennio rosso* and the fears aroused amongst the middle and upper classes, the Church and the establishment by the 'red menace'. They may also consider the impact of unemployment, inflation, post-war economic restructuring, problems in the countryside and the north-south divide to illustrate the potential scale of the threat; the apparent failure of the liberal governments of Nitti and Giolitti to deal with the problems facing Italy effectively; the other weaknesses of the liberal governments (for example, the failure to gain a creditable peace settlement, the failure of *trasformismo*); the legacy of nationalism; the attitude of the King and the establishment and the fateful decisions of 1922.

**17 'Mussolini was able to consolidate his power after 1922 only because the opposition was divided and weak.' How far do you agree? [50]**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates must deal with the given factor adequately even if they wish to argue that other factors were more important. In relation to the given factor, candidates may consider both the socialist and the liberal positions. They may argue that fear of socialism meant liberals did not oppose, in fact supported the Acerbo Law, whilst the socialists were unwilling to do more than leave parliament in the wake of the Matteotti murder. Candidates may also discuss reasons to do with Mussolini himself: his abilities as a propagandist and orator; his leadership of/position in the Fascist Party; his political abilities. Such discussion may be related to other reasons: the outlawing of other political parties; the attitude of the King; the attitude of the Church; press censorship; OVRA; popularity and early successes.

**18 'Mussolini's foreign policy was successful in the 1920s but failed in the 1930s.' How far do you agree? [50]**

No specific answer is looked for. Success may be assessed by reference to aims, outcomes and context. Candidates may argue that Mussolini's foreign policy had no clear aims or direction until the mid 1930s beyond some grand aim of restoring Italian prestige. Discussion in relation to the 1920s may refer to the Corfu Incident, the acquisition of Fiume and the Locarno Treaties as evidence of some limited success, but that attempts to assert Italy's pre-eminence in the Mediterranean failed. Candidates may argue that in the 1930s Mussolini's foreign policy became more assertive and defined, They may argue that Mussolini achieved a success in 1934 over Austrian independence, but that success in Abyssinia and the Spanish Civil War was limited and exposed Italian weakness. The Abyssinian crisis may be viewed as a turning point. After 1935, increased cooperation and alliance with Germany undermined Italy's international prestige and freedom of action and led Italy into a war for which it was unprepared.

**The Rise of China 1911-1990**

- 19 Assess the reasons why the Nationalists under Jiang Jieshi failed to win popular support in the 1920s and 1930s. [50]**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates need to identify and assess a range of reasons. Candidates may consider Jiang Jieshi's aims and priorities, the context in which the Nationalists were operating; corruption; failure to deliver on promised policies; poor performance in war with Japan; his failure to deal with communists; lack of democracy; the limited degree of economic progress (industry, transport) and limited social reform (education, New Life Movement, women). These reasons may be contrasted with the attractions of the communist party, their role in the defence of China, the way they worked with the peasantry and the hope they offered them.

- 20 To what extent did Mao's policies in the 1950s and early 1960s bring benefits to the Chinese people? [50]**

No specific answer is looked for. In considering the impact of policies, candidates may consider some of the following areas: the establishment of communist rule including military rule and reunification campaigns, the use of terror, propaganda and the imposition of one party rule; the 'three' and 'five' 'anti-movements'; attacks on the middle classes and landlords; the first Five Year Plan; the Hundred Flowers Campaign; collectivisation; the Great Leap Forward. In considering benefits (and costs) candidates may distinguish between different social groups (peasants, landlords, the middle classes, intellectuals, ethnic minorities, women and so on). On the positive side candidates may point to significant general benefits such as the restoration of order and some stability after the war years and the ending of inflation, but are more likely to focus on the initial benefits to the peasantry in terms of land acquisition and the benefits often associated with collectivization. They may also point to benefits of education and in health care. However, these benefits are likely to be contrasted with the costs of communist rule, especially for landlords, intellectuals and the middle classes more generally. There may be reference to repression and terror and the costs of the Great Leap Forward and communes.

- 21 Assess the consequences of the Cultural Revolution. [50]**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates need to explain a range of consequences and assess their relative importance and/or linkages. In assessing consequences candidates may discuss the impact on Mao's authority, Jiang Qing, the Gang of Four and the Central Cultural Revolution Group, the significance of the Mao personality cult (swimming in the Yangtse), Red Guards and the Little Red Book, the impact on young people and the population more generally, the effectiveness of the attack on the 'four olds', removal of rightists (such as Deng Xiaoping and Liu Shaoqi), three in one committees, changes in education, medicine, agriculture, industry, culture, 'down to the countryside', self-criticism and struggle sessions, the 'cleansing the class ranks' campaign. Candidates may also discuss the fate of Mao's erstwhile ally Lin Biao, and, longer term, growing criticism of the Cultural Revolution in the 1970s and the return of Deng Xiaoping. Candidates may argue that whilst the Cultural Revolution reaffirmed Mao's dominance, in the longer term it did not ensure his vision of Chinese Communism as after his death Deng became dominant and the Gang of Four fell.

**Democracy and Dictatorship in Germany 1919-1963****22 How effectively did Weimar governments deal with the problems they faced in the 1920s? [50]**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates will need to identify a number of problems and assess the way Weimar governments attempted to deal with them. Effectiveness may be assessed in terms of how far problems were resolved in the short or longer term. Candidates may consider some of the following: political opposition and threats to the Weimar Republic; attempt to establish stable governments; payment of reparations; economic problems and inflation; problems of international relations. Candidates may argue that, given the economic, social and political context of the immediate post-war period, Weimar governments were in the end effective in at least reducing the problems they faced, pointing to, for example, the relative lack of political unrest after 1923, the relative stability of government after the mid 1920s, the securing of the Dawes and Young Plans, international successes, the stabilization of the economy in 1924 and the steady growth thereafter. However, they may also argue that the problems were still there: economic recovery was fragile and dependent on foreign investment; political extremism was reduced but not eliminated; not all benefited from economic recovery and so on.

**23 To what extent was Hitler's leadership the main reason why the Nazis came to power in 1933? [50]**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates must deal adequately with the given factor even if they wish to argue that other factors were more important. In relation to Hitler's leadership, candidates may refer to his re-establishment of control in the party after his release from prison, the impact of his oratorical skills, his ideas and propaganda, his ability to charm and win support of the right and key people, the loyalty he provoked, and so on. Such discussion will need to be supported with examples. Such discussion may be balanced against other factors such as, the role of Goebbels and the Nazi party machine, the significance of the Depression, the divisions on the left, the weaknesses of the Weimar governments, the role of 'backstairs intrigue', the legacy of the 1920s and Versailles. Candidates may argue that whilst Hitler's leadership was significant, the onset of depression was a necessary pre-condition for Nazi success, and that the breakdown of the 'Grand Coalition' created the circumstances which allowed the fractures in the Weimar system and German society to be exposed and exploited by Hitler. They may also suggest that at the end, the roles of a few top politicians who misjudged Hitler must also take some responsibility.

**24 How successful was Hitler's economic policy to 1945? [50]**

No specific answer is looked for. Success may be assessed in relation to aims, outcomes and/or historical context. Candidates may discuss some of the following in assessing success: the Nazis employment record (headline figures, employment schemes, exclusions, public works etc), the 'Four Year' and 'New' Plans, Mefo-Bills, agricultural policy (including suspension of peasant debts, Hereditary Farm Law), autarky, trade agreements, 'guns v. butter', Nazi policy towards small and big business, Schacht and Goering, Todt and Speer, war economy and 'total war'. Candidates may conclude that the Nazis claims of economic success were far from convincing, pointing to the flaws in unemployment figures, the levels of real wages, the balance of payments deficits, the 'chaotic' nature of the economy, the distortions caused by the preparations for war. However, others may point to the increases in production, the recovery compared to the years of depression, the production for war and level of resilience of economy in war years.

**The Cold War in Europe from 1945 to the 1990s**

- 25** 'American policies were the main reason for the development of a Cold War in Europe in the period to 1949.' How far do you agree?

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates will need to deal adequately with the given factor even if they wish to argue other factors were more important. Candidates may discuss American policy in general or focus on the Truman doctrine and Marshall Aid. Candidates may assess its relative importance by discussing links with and the role of other factors: the position in 1945 (Yalta, Potsdam and end of war, position of Allied forces), ideological differences as context, divisions over Poland, Germany etc, Soviet actions in Eastern Europe, Churchill's 'Iron Curtain' speech, Cominform, Czechoslovakia and developments in Germany and Berlin.

- 26** **How effectively did the Soviet Union deal with the threats to its authority in Eastern Europe in the 1950s and 1960s?** [50]

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates should deal with both the 50s and 60s to score well. Candidates are likely to assess effectiveness by focusing on outcomes in the shorter and longer term. They may focus on the crises in Hungary and Czechoslovakia, but many will range more widely to encompass East Germany, Berlin and Poland, for example. They may argue that in some ways the threats posed by nationalist and 'liberal' pressures were more or less effectively dealt with, pointing to the clampdowns in Poland and Hungary, for example, in 1956. However, they may qualify this by suggesting that the USSR's freedom of action was widened by the refusal of the West to get involved, and by the limited means available to protesters in the face of the Red Army or, in Poland's case, state authorities. They may make similar point in relation to the Czech crisis of 1968 and also point to the development of the Brezhnev doctrine.

- 27** **Assess the reasons why the overthrow of communism in Yugoslavia was followed by civil war.** [50]

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates should assess a range of reasons. They may consider the long term issues surrounding the creation and existence of Yugoslavia such as its multi-national/ethnic, Christian/muslim composition, the legacy of World War Two and to shorter term issues related to the weakening of communist control in the 1980s (economic problems, death of Tito, rising ethnic tension) and especially after 1989. Candidates may well refer to the moves to independence of Slovenia, Croatia, Macedonia and Bosnia and the ambitions and aggression of Serbia under Milosevic (for example, in relation to Kosovo and in relation to Slovene, Croat, Macedonian and Bosnian ambitions). Candidates may point to the significance of the failure of the 1990 14<sup>th</sup> Communist Party Conference in 1990 – that led to the walk out of the Slovene and Croat members. There may also be discussion of the role of the Serb dominated Yugoslav army, UN/Western attitudes, and ethnic minorities within new states (eg Serbs in Croatia).

**Crisis in the Middle East 1948-2003**

- 28** 'Nasser's policies were the main reason for the Six Day War in 1967.' How far do you agree?

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates must deal adequately with the given factor even if they wish to argue that other factors were more important. In relation to Nasser's policies, candidates may point to Nasser's defensive alliance with Syria, the significance of Nasser's rhetoric as the crisis between Israel and Syria mounted, the build of troops and the defensive alliance with Jordan, and the closure of the Strait of Tiran. However, others may argue that Nasser tried to avoid and did not want war, but was forced into it. They may point, for example, to his attempt to contain Palestinian actions against Israel by the setting up of the PLO. Candidates should set Nasser's role against a range of other factors, such as Israel's actions and culpability, the re-arming of the Middle East after Suez, the long term tensions that, of course, remained after the first Arab-Israeli War, the actions of Syria, the involvement of the USA and the Soviet Union as the Arab-Israeli conflict became an key 'battleground' of the Cold War.

- 29** **Assess the reasons for the difficulties in solving the Palestinian question since the Yom Kippur War (1973).** [50]

No specific answer is looked for. In coming to a judgement candidates may discuss some of the following: the impact of the 1973 war; the role the PLO and Arafat; the policies of Begin after 1977 and growth of Israeli settlement of West Bank and Gaza; the post-1985 'Iron Fist' policy; the roles of Islamic Jihad, Hamas and other radical Palestinian groups; the Intifada post 1987; PLO acceptance of UN resolution 242 and renunciation of terrorism; US involvement and refusal of Israel to negotiate; post-1991 US-Soviet brokered talks in Madrid/Washington; the Oslo Accords, Oslo 2 and Arafat's return to Gaza; the Wye River talks linking Israeli withdrawal to action against Hamas and Islamic Jihad; Camp David and renewed violence, the second Intifada; Bush and the Road map. Candidates may discuss long term reasons for the hostility between Israel and the Palestinians, the significance of particular issues (settlement, Jerusalem), violence and use of force, roles of the superpowers and Arab states and so on.

- 30** 'Concern over oil supplies was the main reason for Western intervention in Iraq in 1991 and 2003.' How far do you agree? [50]

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates must deal with the given factor adequately even if they wish to argue that other factors were more important. Candidates may treat both actions together or separately (there is no need for strict balance of treatment). In relation to the question of security of oil supplies, candidates may refer to the widespread contemporary view that this was a key motive for action and may support this with discussion of the centrality of western dependence on Middle East oil supplies for the sustenance of their economies. They may point to not only the oil reserves of Kuwait and in Iraq/Iran but also their proximity to the reserves in other Arab states, notably Saudi Arabia. Candidates may balance such discussion by considering some of the following in relation to 1991: US distancing from Iraq after Iraq-Iran war because of use of WMD against Iranians and Kurds and sympathy with Israeli fears over development of missiles (Scuds) capable of using a nuclear warhead (but strong trade links between West and Iraq); Saddam's rhetoric spoke of an anti-imperialist and anti-Zionist campaign; Saddam's attempts to bully Kuwait into giving aid (Iraq had huge debts) unsettled the Arab world; Invasion took West and Arab world by surprise, but was a naked act of aggression; Thatcher was key in persuading Bush Senior to act under auspices of UN with many Arab states in support. In relation to 2003, candidates may discuss: the fact that 1991 cleared Kuwait but did not topple Saddam; US close involvement in Iraq after the failed uprisings by Kurds and Shias – no fly-zones etc – was a constant source of tension; fear of WMDs

and missile technology that could be used against Israel; Iraq's alleged links to militant Islam and Al Qaeda and the mentality of the 'war on terror' after 2001 (invasion of Afghanistan, identification of Iran, Iraq, Syria as sponsors of terror and militant Palestinian organizations); Iraq's 'refusal' to cooperate with UN weapons inspections and US/British bombing raids; aim of regime change as way of achieving ME and world stability.

**Paper Total [100]**

**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