

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

Maximum mark 120 for this unit.

2 answers: Each maximum mark 60

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

Notes:

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

AOs	AO1a	AO1b
Total mark for each question = 60	Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.	Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of: - key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; - the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied
Level IA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a wide range of accurate and relevant evidence • Accurate and confident use of appropriate historical terminology • Answer is clearly structured and coherent; communicates accurately and legibly. <p style="text-align: center;">18-20</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent understanding of key concepts (eg continuity and change) relevant to analysis in their historical context • Excellent synthesis and synoptic assessment • Answer is consistently and relevantly analytical with developed explanations and supported judgements • May make unexpected but substantiated connections over the whole period <p style="text-align: center;">36-40</p>
Level IB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses accurate and relevant evidence • Accurate use of a range of appropriate historical terminology • Answer is clearly structured and mostly coherent; communicates accurately and legibly <p style="text-align: center;">16-17</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very good level of understanding of key concepts (eg continuity and change) in their historical context. • Answer is consistently focused on the question set • Very good level of explanation/ analysis, and provides supported judgements. • Very good synthesis and synoptic assessment of the whole period <p style="text-align: center;">32-35</p>
Level II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses mostly accurate and relevant evidence • Generally accurate use of historical terminology • Answer is structured and mostly coherent; writing is legible and communication is generally clear <p style="text-align: center;">14-15</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good level of understanding of key concepts (eg continuity and change) in their historical context • Good explanation/ analysis but overall judgements may be uneven • Answer is focused on the issues in the question set • Good synthesis and assessment of developments over most of the period <p style="text-align: center;">28-31</p>

AOs	AO1a	AO1b
Level III	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses relevant evidence but there may be some inaccuracy • Answer includes relevant historical terminology but this may not be extensive or always accurately used • Most of the answer is structured and coherent; writing is legible and communication is generally clear <p style="text-align: center;">12-13</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows a sound understanding of key concepts, especially continuity and change, in their historical context • Most of the answer is focused on the question set • Answers may be a mixture of analysis and explanation but also description and narrative, but there may also be some uneven overall judgements; OR answers may provide more consistent analysis but the quality will be uneven and its support often general or thin • Answer assesses relevant factors but provides only a limited synthesis of developments over most of the period <p style="text-align: center;">24-27</p>
Level IV	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is deployment of relevant knowledge but level/ accuracy will vary. • Some unclear and/or underdeveloped and/or disorganised sections • Mostly satisfactory level of communication <p style="text-align: center;">10-11</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfactory understanding of key concepts (eg continuity and change) in their historical context • Satisfactory focus on the question set • Answer may be largely descriptive/narratives of events, and links between this and analytical comments will typically be weak or unexplained • Makes limited synoptic judgements about developments over only part of the period <p style="text-align: center;">20-23</p>
Level V	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General and basic historical knowledge but also some irrelevant and inaccurate material • Often unclear and disorganised sections • Adequate level of communication but some weak prose passages <p style="text-align: center;">8-9</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General understanding of key concepts (eg continuity and change) in their historical context • Some understanding of the question but answers may focus on the topic and not address the question set OR provides an answer based on generalisation • Attempts an explanation but often general coupled with assertion, description/narrative • Very little synthesis or analysis and only part(s) of the period will be covered <p style="text-align: center;">16-19</p>

AOs	AO1a	AO1b
Level VI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of relevant evidence will be limited; there will be much irrelevance and inaccuracy • Answers may have little organisation or structure • Weak use of English and poor organisation <p style="text-align: center;">4-7</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very little understanding of key concepts (eg continuity and change) in their historical context • Limited perhaps brief explanation • Mainly assertion, description/narrative • Some understanding of the topic but not the question's requirements <p style="text-align: center;">8-15</p>
Level VII	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little relevant or accurate Knowledge • Very fragmentary and disorganised response • Very poor use of English and some incoherence <p style="text-align: center;">0-3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weak understanding of key concepts (eg continuity and change) in their historical context • No explanation • Assertion, description/narrative predominate • Weak understanding of the topic or of the question's requirements <p style="text-align: center;">0-7</p>

1 How far would you agree that Prussian ambitions undermined the aims of German nationalists in the period from 1789 to 1919? [60]

Candidates should focus on 'the aims of German nationalists' and evaluate whether these were either undermined or furthered by 'Prussian ambitions' in their answers. Candidates should compare the various aims and ideas of German nationalism with the developing impact that Prussia had on Germany, for example Prussia's role in the defeat of Napoleon. Candidates may consider the impact that the Prussian Zollverein had on the development of nationalism. Candidates may discuss the role played by Prussia in the 1860s in forging the new Germany. Candidates may discuss Bismarck's views about German liberalism and the impact of the 1871 Constitution. Candidates may demonstrate that they understand that the German Empire in 1871 represented Kleindeutschland and an enlarged Prussia rather than a united Germany. They may argue that it was a Prussian Empire rather than a German Empire. However not all German nationalists aspired to Grossdeutschland and it can be argued that the creation of the Second Reich was a crucial step forward for the aims of many German nationalists. Candidates could point to the mythical status of Bismarck in German history and/or to the popularity and mass appeal of increasingly radical nationalism in the reign of William II to argue that Prussia's creation of the Second Reich was consistent with the aims of many German nationalists. Candidates might argue that the aims and ambitions of Prussian militarism were to ultimately set the German nation on course for disaster and humiliation by reference to Germany's defeat in the First World War and her humiliation at Versailles. Candidates may well discuss other factors that undermined the aims of German nationalists, for example their own divisions. The 1848 Revolution may be seen as a pivotal moment by such candidates.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

2 Assess the view that the effects of industrialisation hindered the development of German nationalism in the period from 1789 to 1919. [60]

Candidates should focus on 'the development of German nationalism' and whether 'the effects of industrialisation' 'hindered' or encouraged it in their answers. Candidates should explain the impact of industrialisation on the development of German nationalism, for example the impact of the Zollverein after 1834 in developing Prussia's economic strength and, consequently, Prussian leadership of Germany. This also had a limiting effect on the development of German nationalism as Prussia was able to exclude Austria, first from the Zollverein and then from Germany. This led to the creation of Kleindeutschland, thus thwarting the ambitions of those nationalists who aspired to Grossdeutschland. Candidates should understand how developments in the economy in the 1850s paved the way for the Prussian military victories of 1864, 1866 and 1870/71 and the creation of the Second Reich. Military strength depended upon industrialisation; 'Coal & Iron' rather than 'Blood & Iron' could be usefully debated. The impact of the extraordinary developments in the German economy after 1871 should be discussed. Candidates may well argue that the quickening pace of industrialisation led to urbanisation and the development of increasingly radical socialism. Socialism gave the working class an alternative loyalty to patriotism and nationalism. This in turn led Kaiser Wilhelm II to embark on a foreign policy aimed at distracting the workers from their grievances. It could be argued that this populist foreign policy fanned the flames of German nationalism.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

3 Assess the importance of German nationalism in the creation and development of a united Germany in the period from 1789 to 1919. [60]

Candidates should focus on the 'importance of German nationalism' in the 'creation and development' of a 'united Germany'. Candidates should show that they understand that German nationalism was not the sole factor determining the creation and development of the German Empire in this period. The 'importance of German nationalism' should be evaluated against the other dominant factors in the creation and development of the German Empire during this period. Candidates may argue that the emergence of romantic nationalism, during and after the Napoleonic period, had an impact on the creation and development of Germany. The development and impact of ideas on the emergence of nationalism may usefully be explored as may the impact of these ideas on the creation and development of the German Empire. Candidates may argue that the divisions within the nationalist movement weakened the impact of nationalism in the creation of a united Germany. Candidates should be able to explain the importance of economic factors on the creation of a united Germany, for example the impact of the Zollverein after 1834 in developing Prussia's economic strength and on Prussian leadership of Germany. The leadership role played by Bismarck in determining the shape, extent and development of the German Empire may usefully be discussed. Candidates could argue that Bismarck's achievements owed little or nothing to nationalism and that therefore the contribution of nationalism to the creation of the Empire was minimal. The impact of Kaiser Wilhelm II from 1888 was arguably as significant on the further development and fortunes of the Empire.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

**4 'A strong alliance was the most important reason for a country to succeed in war.'
To what extent do you agree with this view of the period from 1792 to 1945? [60]**

There are two key concepts to be evaluated here, firstly the importance of alliances in warfare; secondly, if the significance of the role of alliances changed across the period.

Strong alliances tended to have more importance at a time when Europe was in a state of general warfare and conflicts took place over a longer period of time. These examples will allow candidates to chart success/failure in war and link that to the state of given alliances. In the Revolutionary and Napoleonic periods coalitions of European powers were vital to containing and eventually defeating France. A key point would have been the need to form strong alliances when faced with the demographic and economic power of France. Candidates may also argue that France forged alliances of sorts with states in the wake of military victories. Examples would be Bavaria and other German minor states, the alliances with Austria and Prussia between the middle part of the Napoleonic Wars and the Russian campaign of 1812. The First World War is tailor-made for the question as it entailed two strong alliances fighting with each other. In the case of the Central Powers the relationship of a dominant partner – Germany – with its allies might be a worthwhile area for discussion. The Second World War saw a large powerful alliance of Britain, the USA and the USSR successfully defeating a far weaker alliance, Germany – again very much the dominant partner – Italy, Romania and other Axis minor allies. Candidates could discuss the formation of the Western/Soviet alliance over time and relate this to varying success on the battlefield.

In other periods strong alliances were less important and alliances tended to be used to diplomatically isolate powers rather than create powerful military and economic blocs. Good examples are the Wars of Unification and the Crimean War. The American Civil War might also be used in this context, candidates arguing that the Confederacy could only win with a strong alliance with a third power, an event that did not take place and/or that the Union was capable of winning the war without an ally. Other examples of countries winning without the aid of a strong alliance might be Austria against Piedmont in 1848 & 1849, Japan defeating Russia in 1904-5 and the many examples that come from the colonial conflicts of the period, especially where the colonial power was defeated by indigenous forces. Some candidates may place a greater emphasis on factors other than alliances eg the quality of leadership, strategy and tactics, economic resources and technological developments. Better responses should therefore set the impact of 'strong alliances' against a range of factors.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

5 'Battlefield tactics remained unchanged.' How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1792 to 1945?

The question invites candidates to discuss change and continuity in battle tactics. Candidates must be aware that the question is specifically about tactics. Some leeway, however, must be allowed as the period goes on and the division between strategy and tactics starts to blur, a good example would be a large WWI battle like the Somme.

There are two clear lines of debate that might be established. The first would be to challenge the question. Given the developments in military organisation, command, control and technology across the period battlefield tactics obviously changed. A simple example would be to compare a WWII to a Napoleonic battlefield. Such an essay might then link synoptically the factors that caused such changes to take place to the line of debate.

Alternatively, the response might support the proposition in the question pointing to consistency in certain principles of warfare. Examples might be drawn from the military theorists in the specification, economy of force, maintenance of aim, concentration of force, etc. These concepts could then be linked to specific examples such as the Crimean War, the Wars of Unification or WWI where it is possible to argue that linear tactics were used throughout this period, any differences in the nature of battle being superficial.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

6 To what extent did public opinion influence the conduct of war in the period from 1792 to 1945?

It is expected that candidates will discuss the conduct of war in the light of the pressures of domestic public opinion. Definitions of public opinion can be expected and examiners need to be aware that political pressure on elites can come in many forms. Candidates might link developments in state structures – for example, the development of more democratic forms of government – and/or more effective forms of media that informed public opinion as the period developed. Arguments that public opinion did influence military decisions might include the early part of the Revolutionary Wars where the French Republic was fighting perhaps an ideological war for its existence. Candidates might point to the concept of the 'nation in arms' or the execution of generals for political reasons. It might be argued that the *Ancien Regime* powers fought for the same reasons, ie to protect their own political establishment from potential opposition from below. Napoleon might be used both ways, for example the need for military victory and its links to political stability. The Crimean War is a good example where military decisions were influenced by public opinion placing pressure on military decisions via the political demands on the French and British governments. Popular reaction within Russia to this conflict might also be discussed. With regard to the Wars of Unification, an example of the impact of public opinion might be the entry of France into the Italian War of 1859. The impact of rising nationalism on all of the wars of this period provides many obvious examples for candidates to use in support of analysis. Candidates might link the outcome of the Russo-Japanese war to the 1905 Revolution. Colonial conflicts in the latter part of the period, for example the Boer war, are candidates for discussion. Both WWI and II have a lot of potential with regard to the question with discussions of propaganda, different forms of media and censorship. Conversely, candidates might argue that military decisions were made with no regard to public opinion in autocratic states or that factors other than public opinion were of greater importance eg the quality of leadership, strategy and tactics, economic resources and technological developments. Better responses should therefore argue for and against the influence of public opinion upon the conduct of war.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 7 'Irish cultural nationalism was the most important factor in undermining the links with Britain.' How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1798 to 1921?

[60]

Candidates will need to be able to define cultural nationalism as a changing phenomenon and, whilst comparing with other factors that undermined links and the Union, will need to keep a reasonable focus on the issue of cultural nationalism. It is possible to argue that it was vital in undermining the links with Britain. In the late 18th century it was arguably important in providing the impetus both for the Parliamentaryism and Home Rule of Grattan's Patriot followers amongst the literate and educated Protestant ascendancy and the revolutionary nationalists like Wolfe Tone whose culture was that of the rights of man and the liberty and equality of the French Revolution. Candidates could usefully examine the rising of 1798 in this context. Such enlightened ideas also informed the campaigns of O'Connell for both Emancipation and Home Rule. The Romantic view of the 'nation' became an important force in the 1840s for Young Ireland but it was the failure of Parnell and Home Rule in the 1880s that led to the emergence of a more distinct sense of an Irish cultural identity. This owed less to Protestantism, Catholicism or the rights of man than to other aspects of Irishness, albeit a romanticised one of ancient identity distinct from Englishness, increasingly seen as alien in every respect (Church, property laws, culture etc) and above all to language (the Irish language was fast dying). The Gaelic League (1893) waged war on 'complete Anglicization' from games to literary traditions for the rest of the period and was to find expression in the declaration of the republic in 1916 which, it has been argued, had its origins in the Gaelic revival, and Pearse's School to raise the young in an Irish spirit. It was a bridge into the IRB, revived in the early 1900s and, via Griffith, into Sinn Fein. By the 1910s therefore it could be argued that Ireland had created its own history, language and culture in opposition to the mainland and that political events from 1916 played into this 'myth' and broke the bonds with a state that used illegitimate repression. **However** candidates could question its importance by stressing its minority appeal, particularly obvious in the earlier periods when any mass support was economically, religiously and socially rather than culturally driven and the emphasis was firmly political and religious. Even from the 1880s, after half a century of basic education in English, it remained largely middle and lower middle class in appeal, and would only gradually have a wider impact (imposed by the later Republic) and never in Ulster. It specifically renounced politics as a mere response to the English 'game'. The Irish literary movement of Yeats used English. Amongst revolutionary nationalists there was only a very small minority who were active. The IRB was to be as much inspired by the Fenianism of Tom Clark as by any new cultural Irishness. Nationalists were politically inspired and 1916 had little to do with it. Events like the diaspora following the Famine probably had more impact on undermining links than home grown cultural nationalism. Catholicism, Disestablishment, the faltering of the Protestant ascendancy, local government reform in 1898, the First World War (1916 and conscription), the Land revolution, government mistakes and the failure of repression after 1916 were probably of much greater importance than cultural nationalism in undermining the Union.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their team Leader.

- 8 'Tory and Conservative governments were the most successful in maintaining a stable Union with Ireland.' How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1800-1921? [60]

Candidates could usefully point to the fact that all governments desired a stable Union and tended to implement changes in reaction to opposition and to recreate equilibrium. The case for Tory and later Conservative success lies with first Pitt's creation of the Union itself (which survived until 1921), born out of the reaction to rebellion, followed by relative stability in the Lord Liverpool period and then the handling by Peel of Catholic Emancipation (its concession with safeguards), the Famine and his proposed reforms to defuse O'Connell's Repeal Association's campaign in the 1840s. This was combined with frequent recourse to coercion and attempts to restrict the activities of O'Connell, unsuccessfully in the 1820s, successfully in the early 1840s (arrest and trial). Tories also had frequent recourse to military repression (in 1798 and afterwards, notably 'Bloody Balfour' in the later 1880s). Later in the century the Conservatives made considerable economic concessions, building on Peel's land proposals, via the Balfour and Wyndham Land Purchase Acts after 1886 and the Congested Boards Act which stabilised Ireland and oversaw huge changes in land ownership in the face of O'Brien's United Irish League western campaign. It could be argued that this went much further than just an attempt to kill Home Rule through kindness. There were also political attempts at stabilisation, from the viceroyalty of Marlborough under Disraeli (genuinely popular in contrast to his predecessors?) to extensive local government reform in the 1890s, although the latter was to see the nationalists entrench themselves in the new county councils. These have generally been regarded as successful in that Ireland appeared stable in the post 1886 period, despite O'Brien and nationalist developments, the latter imbued with perhaps greater significance than was due given later developments. Candidates may be more equivocal on the 1916-21 period (Conservative dominated Coalition governments). They could be blamed for an over-reaction post 1916, for disastrous decisions on conscription and the use of the Black and Tans but equally measures to attempt stabilisation such as the Home Rule for both North and South in the Government of Ireland Act in 1920 and the Anglo Irish Treaty of 1921 which stabilised the North if not the South (Civil War).

Alternatively candidates could argue that the Whig/Liberals were more successful, having advocated Catholic emancipation, preferring concession to coercion (the 1830s governments moving towards more patronage sharing and municipal government reform), and to the years of relative stability under Palmerston in the mid century. The Gladstone period could be seen in both lights – a successful stabilisation via Land Reform, Disestablishment and the attempt at Home Rule or a mishandling of Parnell and his party, a resort to coercion in 1881-3, inappropriate Land reforms and repeated failure over Home Rule. However constitutional nationalists found it easier to deal and cooperate with the Whig Liberals than the Conservatives and it could be argued that this aided stability and integration within the Union. The 3rd Home Rule crisis is a good example of a Liberal lack of success in achieving stability. Some candidates could conclude that 'success' was occasioned less by the political complexion of governments than by developments in Ireland. Both reacted firmly to risings and terrorism, both made considerable political, economic and religious concessions. Both contained individuals who took different views on how best to stabilise Ireland, eg Chamberlain (Liberal and then Unionist).

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

9 **How far was the issue of Home Rule in 1886 the main turning point in British attitudes to the Union with Ireland in the period from 1800 to 1921?** [60]

Candidates will need to compare Home Rule with other approaches towards the Union – religious reforms (Catholic Emancipation, Maynooth and Disestablishment), local government reform, economic issues and land and other political approaches such as Partition. The question is concerned with the British point of view – did ‘1886’ change government thinking more radically than other events? The argument that it was a turning point might refer to its impact on the Liberals who split on the issue but remained formally committed to a form of autonomy for Ireland up to the Government of Ireland Act in 1920, which created separate Home Rule for both North and South. All Liberal governments attempted versions of it (1886, 1893, and 1912) except for Campbell Bannerman’s. Gladstone argued that the Union had no moral force without autonomy. Before 1886 all governments either coerced to maintain the Union as it stood or adopted the approach of reform within the Union. After Peel’s Catholic Emancipation in 1829 Britain seemed prepared to make religious and land concessions to Ireland but took a firm stance against any suggestion of a return to a Grattan style Dublin parliament, however constituted. That changed in 1886, its significance underlined by Chamberlain’s opposition and the creation of the Liberal Unionists and by continued Conservative commitment to the Union (and opposition to Home Rule) and to Ulster under Balfour and Bonar Law, at least until 1919-20. ‘1886’ thus opened up a key split in British **attitudes**. Against this view candidates might look more closely at the Home Rule Bills and stress that they were simply another way of reserving power at Westminster whilst granting control over minor matters to a Dublin Parliament. The 1886 Bill removed the now ‘awkward’ and obstructionist Irish Nationalist MPs from Westminster, kept even economic issues under central control and would have handed over only very marginal powers to the ‘conservative’ political machine of Parnell and later Redmond. The Second Bill in 1893 was also, arguably, another fudge by Gladstone in that it was largely about extending local self government, something the Conservatives and Chamberlain had argued for and were to deliver in 1898. It could be argued that Home Rule had more to do with maintaining power at Westminster than any change in attitude to the Union. 1886 (the ‘Union of Hearts’) and 1912 could be seen as tactics designed to secure the Irish Nationalist vote. Some candidates may see Catholic Emancipation as the more important turning point in that it heralded the beginning of a reluctant acceptance of a Catholic nation’s right to political office holding and represented a key change in approach to the role of the Protestant Ascendancy as Ireland’s local ruling class and the attitude of the Catholic Church to Irish nationalism. Similar importance could also be accorded to Land reform from the 1830s onwards. Together these changes in approach, largely consensual in the second half of the century, provided a successor group, the Catholic tenant farmer, to the Protestant Ascendancy. Alternatively candidates could point to the radical changes in attitude which occurred in 1919-21 as the more important turning point in that it accepted Partition, either in the Home Rule sense (1920) or as an absolute divide (1921) as the answer to relations with Ireland.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

Key Theme: Russia and its Rulers 1855 – 1964

- 10 Assess the view that the 1905 Revolution changed Russian government more than other events in the period from 1855 to 1964. [60]**

Candidates should focus on ‘the 1905 Revolution’ and the extent to which it led to changes in Russian government in their answers. Candidates may argue either for or against the importance of the 1905 Revolution but must do so comparatively in the context of other events. What follows is not an exclusive list, but consideration could be given to the effects of the Crimean War, the reforms of Alexander II, in particular the establishment of Zemstva, the assassination of Alexander II in 1881, the Statute of State Security and Land Captains introduced by Alexander III, the First World War, the February Revolution of 1917, the October Revolution of 1917, Stalin’s victory in the 1920s power struggle and his death in 1953. Examiners must not expect to find reference to all these examples in candidate answers and candidates may select other events in their answers. Candidates may argue that the 1905 Revolution changed Russian government because Bloody Sunday was a pivotal moment when Russians lost faith in their Tsar. They may argue that the main impact of the Revolution was the issue of the October Manifesto and the consequent abandonment of autocracy through elections to the Duma. Candidates may however argue that the Fundamental Laws and the rigging of the elections to the 3rd and 4th Dumas suggest that little of substance really changed. Candidates may argue that the First World War was the event with the most important impact on the development of Russian government because it was the horrific impact of the war both at the front and at home that sealed the fate of the Romanovs and, in turn, the Provisional Government. Arguably the appeal of the Bolsheviks in 1917 and the triumph of Lenin were directly related to the impact of the First World War. Candidates may argue that the end of over 300 years of Romanov rule in February 1917 was the event with the most important impact as it ended the 304 year old Romanov dynasty. It could also be argued that ultimately this led to the replacement of ‘Romanov Tsars’ by ‘Red Tsars’. Many candidates will undoubtedly argue that October 1917 and the triumph of Bolshevism was the event with the most important impact as it crushed all possibility that a liberal democracy might emerge in Russia and transformed Russia into the Soviet Union – the world’s first communist state. Some candidates may well consider that Lenin’s death in 1924 was the event with the most important impact, perverting the true course of the Russian Revolution because Stalin succeeded Lenin. Candidates who argue this are likely to suggest that Stalin’s victory in the ensuing power struggle led Russia down a very different road than that being paved by Lenin. Other candidates may use a counter-argument based on more recent archival evidence to suggest that there was significant continuity between Lenin and Stalin and argue accordingly. Candidates may argue that Khrushchev’s secret speech of 1956 and subsequent de-stalinisation was the event with the most important impact on the development of Russian government though others may argue that the continuation of communism way beyond 1964 somewhat negates that view.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

- 11 ‘Communists and Tsars ruled Russia in the same way.’ How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1855 to 1964? [60]**

Candidates should focus on the similarities and differences between the ways in which the Communists and the Tsars ruled Russia in this period. Candidates may well choose to concentrate predominantly on a comparison between the Tsars and the communists as rulers, but the most successful answers may involve comparisons between the individual rulers within each period. Arguments in favour of overall similarity might include autocratic/dictatorial government, the use of terror, centralized control of the economy and brief periods of reform. Comparisons could also be made at a personal level, for example

between Alexander III and Stalin. Both regimes tended only to reform under pressure. The regimes ruled in similar ways, but there were considerable differences of scale (eg in terms of economic progress, urbanisation & the use of terror). A case could be made for arguing that the communists were a more ruthless and efficient twentieth century variant of Russian authoritarianism. In terms of arguing that there was more difference than similarity in the ways in which Russia was governed by the Tsars and the communists, arguments might include the very different ideologies, the fate of the old elite & the attitudes towards religion and the Orthodox Church. In terms of comparisons between the individual rulers within each period there was little in terms of continuity in terms of how Alexander II governed Russia from 1855 (beyond his desire to uphold the principle of autocracy) and Alexander III's approach to government which was in significant contrast to his father's. On the other hand there was a great deal of continuity between the reigns of Alexander III and Nicholas II in intent (though rather less in terms of outcome!). In terms of the communist period, the most interesting debate for candidates is the extent to which Stalinism was Leninism's baby; did Stalin take the government of Russia down different paths to those being paved by Lenin? Candidates may consider the period of Lenin's rule and to what extent he aimed to set up a harsh dictatorial regime. And of course, particular reforms implemented by Khrushchev after 1956 may be usefully contrasted with the ethos of centralisation which had coloured Stalin's later years in power.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

12 Assess the view that economic change in Russia was more successful under Stalin than any other ruler in the period from 1855 to 1964. [60]

Candidates should focus on 'economic change' and whether it was more successful under Stalin in their answers. Candidates may focus on the reasons for the economic development of Russia from 1855 to 1964. A relative comparison of Russia's economic development under the Tsars from 1855 – 1917 and under communism may be undertaken. In support of the view in the question candidates are likely to focus on the achievements of the Five Year Plans both before and after the Second World War. Candidates may argue that Russia's victory in the Second World War (as opposed to their defeats in most other wars during this period) and Russia's emergence as a global super-power in the Cold War are adequate testament to the significance of Stalin's role in Russian industrialisation. Any answers that are limited to the importance of Stalin's role in terms of economic change within Russia are likely to be imbalanced. Candidates should compare and contrast the roles of others, for example Alexander II, Lenin and Witte (in the reigns of Alexander III and Nicholas II) in order to fully answer the question. For example, candidates may well argue that Alexander II's Emancipation Edict of 1861 enabled much of the economic change that followed to happen, though others may argue that its economic impact on the lives of most peasants was insignificant. Witte's 'Great Spurt' accomplished a great deal in terms of modernizing the economy in the 1890s. The NEP made important progress in terms of development after the economic low point of 1921. Candidates may also choose to argue that economic change under Stalin was only successful in terms of industrial might and that the consequences of collectivisation and the Five Year Plans were dreadful for many Russians. Some candidates may make a case for the economic reforms and achievements of Khrushchev and refer to his Five Year Plan, Seven Year Plan and Virgin Lands Scheme.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

- 13 To what extent was the presidency of Lyndon Johnson (1963-69) the most important turning-point in the development of African American civil rights in the period from 1865 to 1992? [60]**

Candidates who support this view might refer to the Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1968 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 as the most significant legislative milestones because they ended the Jim Crow era in the South, and to the Great Society programmes which helped poor inner-city African Americans. Some candidates might see the LBJ presidency as a negative turning-point and refer to the Black Power movement, the Black Panthers, the urban rioting, the assassinations of Malcolm X and Martin Luther King and the damage done to LBJ's Great Society programme by the Vietnam War. Better candidates might also be aware that, after 1965, the Civil Rights campaign achieved only mixed success – the emergence of a successful black middle class and increased political participation contrasted with the continued deprivation, discrimination and low aspirations of many poor, especially inner-city, African Americans. They may also refer to the increasingly acrimonious debates in the 1970s and 1980s over key aspects of civil rights: school bussing, affirmative action, judicial appointments and welfare provision.

Alternative turning-points candidates might consider include,

- 1 The Reconstruction period (1865-77) when important constitutional amendments were passed (1865: 13th abolishing slavery; 1868: 14th guaranteeing civil rights; 1870: 15th guaranteeing the right to vote) and there was significant African American participation in politics, supported by the Radical Republicans in Congress. The Freedman's Bureau (until 1872) provided some legal assistance for former slaves and helped to establish schools.
- 2 The 1890s when the Jim Crow system was established in the South, taking advantage of the end of Reconstruction and a series of Supreme Court judgments (1873 Slaughterhouse Case; 1883 Civil Rights Cases; 1896 Plessy v Ferguson) which undermined the 14th and 15th amendments.
- 3 The two world wars when the expansion of the economy provided job opportunities for African American workers and led to migration northwards.
- 4 The Second World War, in particular, because the impact on society and the economy, and the number of African Americans serving in the armed forces were so great. The war also stimulated the expansion of grass-roots activism (the founding of CORE in 1942, the creation of the FEPC in response to Randolph's threatened march on Washington, the 'double V' campaign) and discredited racism (Hitler's camps and Japanese victories over Europeans).
- 5 The events of the 1950s when the Brown decision of 1954 overturned Plessy v Ferguson and the non-violent campaigns of Martin Luther King gave the civil rights movement publicity, significant white support and – arguably – irresistible momentum.

The best candidates will be able to make a judgment about the relative importance of the various turning-points. If arguing for the LBJ presidency they might observe that both the legislative changes and the bifurcation of the 1960s have proved permanent. Those selecting the Second World War might show how (building on the New Deal) the relationship between federal and state governments changed permanently, making it increasingly difficult for state governments to ignore federal legislation and Supreme Court rulings. They might also emphasise the importance of the transformation wrought by the war. If selecting the 1950s, they might point out that the Cold War competition between the West and the USSR for influence in the Third World made the retention of institutionalised racism in the USA impossible, especially as the war had destroyed any notion of the implicit superiority of white European culture. They might observe that, without these changes, the achievements of the LBJ era could not have occurred.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

- 14 **'The Federal government hindered rather than helped the development of trade union and labour rights.'** How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1865 to 1992? [60]

Candidates will probably argue that this was true of the period up to the Great Depression but that the Federal government was supportive during the New Deal. They will probably be aware that, after World War Two, the Federal government became less supportive of trade union rights but (under Democratic administrations at least) supportive of workers' rights.

Examples of Federal hostility before the New Deal include

- 1 Laissez-faire assumptions about the role of government which helped to create a climate of hostility to organised labour, especially during the 'red scare' that followed each world war.
- 2 President Cleveland's use of federal troops to suppress the 1894 Pullman Strike.
- 3 1895 Supreme Court decision upholding the use of injunctions against trade unions under the Sherman Anti-Trust Act.
- 4 1905 Lochner Case (striking down a New York law setting a maximum number of working hours for bakery workers).
- 5 1908 Adair Case (upholding 'yellow dog' contracts by which workers were prevented from joining a union).
- 6 Use of the 1917 Espionage Act to suppress 'The Wobblies' (Industrial Workers of the World).
- 7 1921 ruling declaring unconstitutional the 1914 Clayton Act (which aimed to guarantee workers' rights to organize, bargain collectively, strike, boycott and picket).

Examples of the post-war climate unsympathetic to organised labour include

- 1 1943 Smith-Connally Act preventing strike action in industrial plant producing war materials.
- 2 1947 Taft-Hartley Act allowing states to pass 'right to work' laws banning the 'closed shop'.
- 3 1959 Landrum-Griffin Act banning secondary picketing.
- 4 The impact on trade union power, membership and strike activity of Reagan's 1981 defeat of the Air Traffic Controllers' strike.

In dealing with Federal support, candidates might refer to

- 1 Attempts during the presidencies of Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson to legislate on such matters as working conditions, consumer protection, housing and education.
- 2 The key New Deal measures: the National Labour Relations Act of 1935 (Wagner Act), the NIRA (1933), the Social Security Act (1935) and the Fair Labour Standards Act (1938). Better candidates might also point out that FDR's response to the labour militancy of 1936-7 contrasts sharply with that of earlier administrations.
- 3 The creation during WW2 of the FEPC and the National War Labour Board.

Good candidates may also be aware of the support given, especially by Democratic presidents, to workers. Truman's 'Fair Deal', JFK's 'New Frontier' and, in particular, LBJ's 'Great Society' programmes aimed to build on FDR's New Deal and brought definite benefits to working people: support for a minimum wage, economic regeneration measures, improved housing and medical care and better work opportunities. Candidates can also refer to Nixon's support for affirmative action and Carter's extension of the minimum wage as examples of presidential support for labour rights. In contrast, they may also be aware that Reagan's policies of lower taxes and business deregulation were part of a deliberate rejection of the New Deal philosophy in the 1980s. They might also show that the three branches of the federal government were not always in harmony: the Supreme Court struck down Congressional legislation in 1921 (the Clayton Act) and in 1935 the Schechter Case

ended FDR's NIRA. Both the Smith-Connally Act and the Taft-Hartley Act were passed over presidential vetoes.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

- 15 'It was the activism of women themselves that was the most important factor in advancing their civil rights.' How far do you agree with this judgement on the period from 1865 to 1992? [60]**

From the Progressive era candidates can discuss campaigners for improved regulation of working conditions and for health and housing reform such as Jane Addams, Florence Kelley and the National Consumers' League. They might also discuss Ida Wells's anti-lynching crusade and the role of the National Association of Colored Women (1896). On the suffrage issue, some might refer back to the Seneca Falls Convention of 1848 as the start of organised women's campaigning and go on to refer to the work of Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B Anthony and of the more genteel Lucy Stone. They will probably be aware of their respective pressure groups, the NWSA and the AWSA (both 1869, but merged as the NAWSA, 1890) as well as Alice Paul's more radical campaign and the role of the National Women's Party (1917). Candidates may mention women's role in the temperance movement and refer to the work of Frances Willard and the WCTU (1874) as well as the Anti-Saloon League (1893). Better candidates may also be aware of women's role in the repeal of prohibition and of Pauline Sabin and WONPR (1929). Some might refer to Margaret Sanger's lengthy campaign for family planning and birth control. In the post-war period, candidates will probably discuss the impact of Betty Friedan's campaign to liberate women from domesticity and the role of NOW (1966) in pressing for women's equality and its impact on the *Roe versus Wade* judgement and the ERA. Some may wish to discuss Phyllis Schlafly and the importance of her campaign against the ERA.

The weaker candidates will probably do little more than outline the activities of some or all of these campaigns. Better candidates will attempt some judgement about their importance. They may be aware that women were not the only campaigners during the Progressive era which was a reaction to changing economic and social conditions brought about by the rapid industrialisation of the USA in the late 19th century and that legislative and judicial progress depended on male politicians in the White House and Congress and male justices in the Supreme Court. They may also be aware that the 19th amendment (1920) came after many states had already given women the vote and that western territories (eg Wyoming 1869, Utah 1870) did so to encourage emigration westwards and hasten statehood. They may point out that prohibition was part of the wider Progressive agenda and as much a product of protestant religious zeal as female activism. Repeal owed as much to the perceived failure of prohibition and the need to revive (and tax) the drinks industry during the Depression as to women's campaigning. Better candidates will probably also be aware of the controversial nature of modern feminism and that issues such as pornography, abortion, the ERA and women's role in the economy have divided both the women's movement and male opinion.

The best candidates might also assess how far divisions in the women's movement lessened the effectiveness of their campaigns (eg the differing aims of black and white, middle class and poor). They may also be able to evaluate the importance of women's activism in relation to other factors and balance the importance of women's pressure on politicians with the impact of social, cultural and economic change bringing women more opportunities in education and employment. They may wish to analyse how far social and legislative change was caused by, or followed, women's activism. Finally, they might assess how far there is a consensus on what women's civil rights are.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

- 16 'Changes made by the Liberals between 1868 and 1893 were the most important factors in the development of democracy.' How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1868 to 1997? [60]

Candidates will need to compare the importance of the party and constitutional changes of the Liberal Gladstone period against other factors such as the achievement of universal male suffrage in 1918, the enfranchisement of women 1918-28, the curbing of the Lords' veto in 1911, the creation of a literate nation by 1914, the inclusion of Youth in the later 20th century, the mobilisation and involvement of key groups throughout the period (Nonconformists, Catholics, Trade Unions, regional groups in Wales, Scotland and Ireland), and the provision of political information by popular newspapers, radio and television. It could be argued that the **1868-93 changes** - Irish Disestablishment (1869) the Secret Ballot Act (1872), Forster's Education Act (1870), the Birmingham Caucus and the National Liberal Federation, the Corrupt Practices Act (1883) the Third Reform Act and Redistribution (1884 and 1885) and Irish Home Rule (1886 and 1893) – created the possibility of democracy by the end of the 19th century. It furthered religious equality, extended to Wales and Scotland in the early 20th century, and at least seriously proposed a federal and devolved constitutional structure for the UK that was achieved for part of Ireland by 1921. The ending of patronage and corruption via expense limits and secret voting in 1883 and 1872 ended nomination and private corruption, something that required a more democratic type of voter mobilisation pioneered by Chamberlain in the Birmingham Caucus and the ensuing National Liberal Federation (more accountability, political involvement and canvassing etc.). With the extension of universal household suffrage to the Counties and the end of the county/borough distinction a majority of men (60%) now had the vote and 'population' could have due effect via equal constituencies. The skilled Trade Unions were recognised and integrated into society. Artisan democracy had been achieved. **However** it could be argued that the Church in England was never disestablished and even Liberal politicians saw no reason to enfranchise the residuum of the working class until the 1910s. Property remained the determinant of voting rights. Female suffrage was not on the agenda until the early 20th century and even then wider female issues were ignored until the 1970s by middle class male and arguably unrepresentative MPs. Devolution proved a cul de sac up to 1997 (except for Northern Ireland, with considerable consequences for the rights of Catholics there until the 1970s and beyond). Education remained limited to the basics and was essentially primary until the developments of 1918-45. The Trade Unions were to feel unrepresented by both Liberals and Conservatives by the turn of the century and moved to cooperate in the founding of their own party post 1900. It could be argued that it was this and the slow acceptance of Labour between 1900 and 1931 that was more important in achieving democracy. Similarly the aristocratic and establishment veto was not removed until 1911 and the Lords remained an undemocratic voice and power up to 1997. The arrival of a populist press by the 1890s, largely Conservative, and the role of the BBC, could also be seen as vital in popularising politics and, in the case of the Reithian BBC, in consciously educating people in respectable democratic modes. The consideration of minorities (not least women) awaited the later 20th century. Thus democracy was a patchy development throughout the period.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

17 Assess the view that a two party political system dominated British politics in the period from 1868 to 1997.

The argument that it did could be **supported** by reference to the dominance of the Liberal and Conservative parties between 1868 and 1918 followed by the dominance of the Conservative and Labour parties from 1918 to 1997. This was aided by a first past the post system that tended to militate against coalitions and supported parties that could draw upon money, voluntary effort and the support of key groups and organisations. It was also reinforced by the development of class based politics as the franchise was increased, something that helped explain the transition from Liberal to Labour as the other main party. The 'swing of the pendulum' provided 'choice' in a democratising society and the ambitious gravitated towards one or the other of the two parties. Their control of politics and parliament made constitutional change to widen choice difficult if not impossible, as the Liberal commitment to PR and the attempted breakthrough of the SDP in the 1980s demonstrated in the second half of the 20th century. This dominance was also reinforced by the media in its focus on the two parties and the less air - time allocated to minority parties. The periods 1868 - 1915 and 1945-1997 seem to support the contention in the question. **However** this would be to ignore periods when it could be argued that two-party dominance was a myth. All parties tended to be coalitions and groups moved to independence and association with others throughout the period. The Whigs moved from Liberal to Conservative in the Salisbury period (from the late 1870s), Lib-Labs moved into association with the Socialist Societies from the 1880s onwards, the Liberal Unionists moved to the Conservatives in the late 1880s and the Irish Nationalists were a crucial third party from the late 1870s until 1918, being replaced by Sinn Fein who refused to work with any mainland party. The Nationalists arguably determined the fate of governments in 1886 and again after 1910. The 1918 – 45 period could be seen as a period when a two party system broke down with the fragmentation of the Liberals (Asquithians v the followers of Lloyd George), Labour during the 1st World War and after the split of 1931 and with divisions in the Conservatives occasioned by Tariff reform 1904-6 and by the Lloyd George Coalition 1918-22. Coalitions dominated the period – 1915-22 (Liberal, Conservative and, until 1917, Labour); 1924 and 1929 -45 (Labour with Liberal support 1929-31, followed by Conservatives with National Liberal and Labour support 1931-1940, then an all party wartime government 1940-45). Social changes, war, economic crisis and political infighting led to a breakdown in a two party system. Since 1945 the Liberals, SDP and the Liberal Democrats have maintained a reasonably high profile (polling large numbers of votes after 1970 – up to 25%) with much talk about breaking the mould in the 1980s when Labour was subject to internecine feuding and restructuring as its traditional electorate fractured and declined. Plaid Cymru and the SNP have also maintained a presence in their respective regions, despite a tendency for Labour to dominate, whilst within the political parties there have always been groupings and 'caves' where those of a particular persuasion have made their presence felt eg the Ulster Unionists within the Tories. It could also be pointed out that the two main parties have been subject to considerable change both in terms of policies, structures and support. It could also be pointed out that, in periods of two-party dominance, (post 1945), there have been times when elections were won by the same party consecutively - between 1951 and 1964 Labour lost three elections in a row. There is a case for Britain having a dominant party system from 1916 - the Conservatives. Labour failed to achieve two full term consecutive periods of office in the 1918 – 1997 period.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

18 How far did economic change influence the development of democracy in the period from 1868 to 1997?

The argument for a **crucial role for economic change** is that parties have responded to it by moving in a democratic manner. Thus the franchise consciously caught up with the rise of the upper working class after 1867 and this reinforced the dominance of Liberalism at the beginning of the period, which was urban based. It also led to the rise of the lower middle class as a tertiary sector grew to service a mature industrial society and this helped to secure the late Victorian dominance of the Conservatives (Mr Pooter) who were keen to cooperate over single member constituencies in order to give due weight to the suburbs. A mature industrial society also accommodated female employment in primary and tertiary industry and their importance in the 1st World War was thus recognised in 1918 and 1928 through suffrage equality with men, although unemployment and slump in the Inter-War years delayed any emancipation and gender and economic equality until much later in the 20th century. Trade Unions as an expression of economic change (Model Unionism in the 1860s and 1870s; New Unionism in the 1880s) also resulted in a Labour party post 1900 that threatened to put a different economic agenda before government and both conservative and Liberal agendas adapted to a more progressive one, the Liberals before 1914 and the Conservatives intermittently in the 1920s and 1930s and after 1945. Wartime economic controls and the move to a command economy in the 1910s and 1940s put democratic issues (homes, health, education, full employment and insurance) firmly to the fore. Since 1945 economic change has had less effect on democracy given that a democratic arena had been achieved earlier, although candidates could point to the increasing role of middle class women in the economy and the Equal Opportunities Acts of the 1970s that resulted and educational developments that sought to respond to economic demand. The main democratic argument has been the position and power of the industrial unions in a de-industrialising society, fought out over Union legislation between 1969 and 1993 (especially in the 1980s – limiting the position achieved in the 1870s via the Employment Act of 1980, the Trade Union Act of 1984 and other employment acts in 1982, 1986, 1988, 1990 and 1993). These Acts reflected the economic decline of manufacturing industry and the rise of service industries characterised by part-time, flexibility and low wages. It could be argued that in terms of democracy fewer chose to vote, becoming marginalised as a unrepresented under-class, socially excluded and dependent on state benefits. As in the 1920s and 1930s unemployment was an issue for governments which also became more interested in middle class and middle aged issues, ie those who voted. It has also had an impact on the regions, the argument being that the North and the Celtic Fringe, recognised in the 2nd half of the 19th century, have lost out economically and politically to the South and East. However candidates **can equally argue that economic change has had little importance** in the development of democracy in comparison to party competition, the impact of pressure groups, war, education or the manoeuvrings of the political elite. It was rare that economic factors were cited as the reason for any specific change. Similarly they could argue that economic change was more important in some periods (1868-1914) than others (1945-1997). Much depends on whether economic change is considered the determinant of all changes (in a Marxist sense), just some change, or simply the general backdrop to democratic development.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

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 2011

