

History A

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **F963/02**: Option B Modern 1815–1945

Mark Scheme for January 2012

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, 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 2012

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

Question (a) Maximum mark 30

	A01a and b	AO2a
1	13–14	15–16
2	11–12	13–14
3	9–10	10–12
4	7–8	8–9
5	5–6	6–7
6	3–4	3–5
7	0–2	0–2

Notes related to Part A:

- (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 be at the same level for each AO

Marking Grid for Question (a)

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
Total for each question = 30	<p>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. 	As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.
Level 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent and developed comparison of the key issue with a balanced and well-supported judgement. There will be little or no unevenness. • Focused use of a range of relevant historical concepts and context to address the key issue. • The answer is clearly structured and organised. Communicates coherently, accurately and effectively. <p style="text-align: center;">13–14</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focused comparative analysis. Controlled and discriminating evaluation of content and provenance, whether integrated or treated separately. • Evaluates using a range of relevant provenance points in relation to the sources and question. There is a thorough but not necessarily exhaustive exploration of these. <p style="text-align: center;">15–16</p>
Level 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Largely comparative evaluation of the key issue with a balanced and supported judgement. There may be a little unevenness in parts. • Focused use of some relevant historical context with a good conceptual understanding to address the key issue. • The answer is well structured and organised. Communicates clearly. <p style="text-align: center;">11–12</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant comparative analysis of content and evaluation of provenance but there may be some unevenness in coverage or control. • Source evaluation is reasonably full and appropriate but lacks completeness on the issues raised by the sources in the light of the question. <p style="text-align: center;">13–14</p>

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
Level 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some comparison linked to the key issue. Is aware of some similarity and/or difference. Judgements may be limited and/or inconsistent with the analysis made. • Some use of relevant historical concepts and contexts but uneven understanding. Inconsistent focus on the key issue. • The answer has some structure and organisation but there is also some description. Communication may be clear but may not be consistent. <p style="text-align: center;">9–10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a comparison but there is unevenness, confining the comparison to the second half of the answer or simply to a concluding paragraph. Either the focus is on content or provenance, rarely both. • Source evaluation is partial and it is likely that the provenance itself is not compared, may be undeveloped or merely commented on discretely. <p style="text-align: center;">10–12</p>
Level 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some general comparison but undeveloped with some assertion, description and / or narrative. Judgement is unlikely, unconvincing or asserted. • A general sense of historical concepts and context but understanding is partial or limited, with some tangential and/or irrelevant evidence. • Structure may be rather disorganised with some unclear sections. Communication is satisfactory but with some inaccuracy of expression. <p style="text-align: center;">7–8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempts a comparison but most of the comment is sequential. Imparts content or provenance rather than using it. • Comparative comments are few or only partially developed, often asserted and/or 'stock' in approach. <p style="text-align: center;">8–9</p>
Level 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited comparison with few links to the key issue. Imparts generalised comment and / or a weak understanding of the key points. The answer lacks judgement or makes a basic assertion. • Basic, often inaccurate or irrelevant historical context and conceptual understanding. • Structure lacks organisation with weak or basic communication. <p style="text-align: center;">5–6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies some comparative points but is very sequential and perhaps implicit • Comment on the sources is basic, general, undeveloped or juxtaposed, often through poorly understood quotation. <p style="text-align: center;">6–7</p>

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
Level 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparison is minimal and basic with very limited links to the key issue. Mainly paraphrase and description with very limited understanding. There is no judgement. • Irrelevant and inaccurate concepts and context. • Has little organisation or structure with very weak communication. <p style="text-align: center;">3–4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little attempt to compare. Weak commentary on one or two undeveloped points, with basic paraphrase. Sequencing is characteristic. • Comments on individual sources are generalised and confused. <p style="text-align: center;">3–5</p>
Level 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fragmentary, descriptive, incomplete and with few or no links to the key issue. There is little or no understanding. Much irrelevance. • Weak or non-existent context with no conceptual understanding. • No structure with extremely weak communication. <p style="text-align: center;">0–2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No attempt to compare either content or provenance with fragmentary, brief or inaccurate comment. • Makes no attempt to use any aspects of the sources. <p style="text-align: center;">0–2</p>

Question (b) Maximum mark 70

	A01a and b	A02a and b
1	20–22	42–48
2	17–19	35–41
3	13–16	28–34
4	9–12	21–27
5	6–8	14–20
6	3–5	7–13
7	0–2	0–6

Notes related to Part B:

- (iv) Allocate marks to the most appropriate level for each AO
- (v) If several marks are available in a box, work from the top mark down until the best fit has been found
- (vi) Many answers will not be at the same level for each AO

AOs	A01a and b	Ao2a and b
Total mark for the question = 70	<p>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. 	<p>As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.</p> <p>Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways.</p>
Level 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convincing analysis and argument with developed explanation leading to careful, supported and persuasive judgement arising from a consideration of both content and provenance. There may be a little unevenness at the bottom of the level. • Sharply focused use and control of a range of reliable evidence to confirm, qualify, extend or question the sources. • Coherent organised structure. Accurate and effective communication. <p style="text-align: center;">20–22</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A carefully grouped and comparative evaluation of all the sources with effective levels of discrimination sharply focused on the interpretation. • Analyses and evaluates the strengths, limitations and utility of the sources in relation to the interpretation. Uses and cross references points in individual or grouped sources to support or refute an interpretation. • Integrates sources with contextual knowledge in analysis and evaluation and is convincing in most respects. Has synthesis within the argument through most of the answer. <p style="text-align: center;">42–48</p>
Level 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good attempt at focused analysis, argument and explanation leading to a supported judgement that is based on the use of most of the content and provenance. • A focused use of relevant evidence to put the sources into context. • Mostly coherent structure and organisation if uneven in parts. Good communication. <p style="text-align: center;">17–19</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grouped analysis and use of most of the sources with good levels of discrimination and a reasonable focus on the interpretation. • Analyses and evaluates some of the strengths and limitations of the sources in relation to the interpretation. May focus more on individual sources within a grouping, so cross referencing may be less frequent. • Some, perhaps less balanced, integration of sources and contextual knowledge to analyse and evaluate the interpretation. Synthesis of the skills may be less developed. The analysis and evaluation is reasonably convincing. <p style="text-align: center;">35–41</p>

AOs	A01a and b	Ao2a and b
Level 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mainly sound analysis, argument and explanation, but there may be some description and unevenness. Judgement may be incomplete or inconsistent with the analysis of content and provenance. • Some relevant evidence but less effectively used and may not be extensive. • Reasonably coherent structure and organisation but uneven. Reasonable communication. <p style="text-align: center;">13–16</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some grouping although not sustained or developed. Sources are mainly approached discretely with limited cross reference. Their use is less developed and may, in parts, lose focus on the interpretation. There may be some description of content and provenance. • Is aware of some of the limitations of the sources, individually or as a group, but mostly uses them for reference and to illustrate an argument rather than analysing and evaluating them as evidence. There is little cross referencing. • There may be unevenness in using knowledge in relation to the sources. Synthesis may be patchy or bolted on. Analysis and evaluation are only partially convincing. <p style="text-align: center;">28–34</p>
Level 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempts some analysis, argument and explanation but underdeveloped and not always linked to the question. There will be more assertion, description and narrative. Judgements are less substantiated and much less convincing. • Some relevant evidence is deployed, but evidence will vary in accuracy, relevance and extent. It may be generalised or tangential. • Structure is less organised, communication less clear and some inaccuracies of expression. <p style="text-align: center;">9–12</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sources are discussed discretely and largely sequentially, perhaps within very basic groups. Loses focus on the interpretation. The sources are frequently described. • May mention some limitations of individual sources but largely uses them for reference and illustration. Cross referencing is unlikely. • An imbalance and lack of integration between sources and knowledge often with discrete sections. There is little synthesis. Analysis and explanation may be muddled and unconvincing in part. <p style="text-align: center;">21–27</p>
Level 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little argument or explanation, inaccurate understanding of the issues and concepts. The answer lacks judgement. • Limited use of relevant evidence or context which is largely inaccurate or irrelevant. • Structure is disorganised, communication basic and the sense not always clear. <p style="text-align: center;">5–8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A limited attempt to use the sources or discriminate between them. The approach is very sequential and referential, with much description. Points are undeveloped. • There is little attempt to analyse, explain or use the sources in relation to the question. Comment may be general. • There is a marked imbalance with no synthesis. Analysis and explanation are rare and comments are unconvincing. <p style="text-align: center;">14–20</p>

AOs	A01a and b	Ao2a and b
Level 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is very little explanation or understanding. Largely assertion, description and narrative with no judgement. Extremely limited relevance to the question. • Evidence is basic, generalised, patchy, inaccurate or irrelevant. • Little organisation or structure with poor communication. <p style="text-align: center;">3-4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very weak and partial use of the sources for the question. No focus on interpretation. • A very weak, general and paraphrased use of source content. • No synthesis or balance. Comments are entirely unconvincing. <p style="text-align: center;">7-13</p>
Level 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No argument or explanation. Fragmentary and descriptive with no relevance to the question. • No understanding underpins what little use is made of evidence or context. • Disorganised and partial with weak communication and expression. <p style="text-align: center;">0-2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little application of the sources to the question with inaccuracies and irrelevant comment. Fragmentary and heavily descriptive. • No attempt to use any aspect of the sources appropriately. • No contextual knowledge, synthesis or balance. There is no attempt to convince. <p style="text-align: center;">0-6</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1 (a)	<p>The context is the crisis faced by the Whig reform bill when, after it was passed by the Commons, it faced amendments and opposition in the House of Lords. Both sources agree on the desirability of radical parliamentary reform, especially the desirability of universal suffrage. Both agree that what is proposed is a measure based on property, designed to facilitate middle-class participation in the system and to strengthen the existing constitution (stated explicitly in Source A in these very terms and implicitly in Source C with reference to the ‘just claims of the labourers’ being ignored). Source C largely accepts the thrust of A’s argument on the duplicity of the middle classes.</p> <p>However the differences outweigh the similarities. They disagree on what the radical strategy to the Whig Reform Bill should be and on how to react to a perceived middle class measure. To the article in Source A it is an aristocratic government trick to strengthen the existing constitution by a measure that admits the middle classes and their property into the political system. It is devised to detach the middle class radicals and draw off their wealth and organisational expertise from the wider struggle for universal suffrage and argues that working class radicals are being used. It cites as evidence middle class radicals dragooning workers and labourers as fodder to attend meetings simply to advance middle class causes. By implication it pleads with them not to do this. Whilst Carpenter in C accepts this line of argument, it disagrees on implications. Whilst A argues that working class radicals should not assist the middle classes and should push for a more radical bill, Carpenter argues that nothing should be done to rock the boat. In the wake of the Bristol riots the message in C is that such action will definitely produce what Source A fears – the hardening of middle class hearts and minds to radical causes. Whilst Carpenter’s argument is that it may be a tactical trick, strategically the radicals will in practice gain a crucial foot in the door. Source A’s focus is on pointing out the pretence of the middle class, appearing to listen whilst openly and flagrantly opposing universal suffrage. Carpenter disagrees and takes the long term view. He stresses the concession to general principles – to numbers and population as opposed to property; to admitting the role of popular ‘out-of-doors’ opinion; to Benthamite utility and the public will. He sees in the prospect of the bill’s success an admission that matters can more easily change; there will be long term benefit given that the precedent has been set (once made it must be ‘carried to its full extent’).</p> <p>The provenance of the sources is similar. Both are articles from a working class radical perspective. Both appear in the same journal, ‘The Poor Man’s Guardian’, part of a proliferating underground and illegal press. The purpose of both is similar – to argue the radical cause in public and win the debate on what to do about a limited measure of reform. Source A may have an interest in talking up the danger and arousing passions over trickery</p>	30	<p><u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources</u></p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source ‘as evidence for.....’ The Headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>but his points are fair. Similarly Carpenter may stress the opposite, although his analysis of the case for gradualism is convincing given the strengths of the British state. Together they provide a fair summary of the arguments on both sides. Source A is produced when the struggle for the Whig reform bill was underway and worries that Radical energy is being used and tricked; Source C is written after the Lords had rejected it and serious rioting had occurred in London, Derby, Nottingham and especially Bristol. Its concern is that violence has been and will be counterproductive. It has been chastened by the violence. Thus the key change is one of date and circumstance. Source A occurs before the outbreak of popular violence across English cities in October 1831 and may well have contributed to a hardening of radical attitudes on reform. The more moderate stance of Carpenter in C may be a reaction to the failure of this violence and the potential damage done to the radical cause from the perspective of their erstwhile allies in the middle class. However, it could simply be a legitimate difference. Carpenter takes the more intellectual and principled view, spotting the political implications contained in the bill whereas Source A is more attuned to the realities of the perceived 'con'.</p> <p>In judgement candidates may well see Source A's evidence as more practical, based on an observation of what was happening at political meetings (especially given the evidence of who convened them and how petitions were used). Carpenter's arguments are more abstract and philosophical, based on assessing the possibilities for the future which are mere suppositions. Nonetheless, candidates could argue they are the more perceptive. Both are valid attitudes on the strategies to be adopted and both provide good evidence on the radical perspective.</p>		
(b)	<p>The issue of how effective the radical campaigns for parliamentary and press reform were between 1830 and 1834 is central. The sources provide mixed views on the issue and one man's assertion of effectiveness is considered ephemeral by another. The context is the struggle for parliamentary and press reform between 1830 and 1834. The sources all come from a radical and working class perspective, mostly concerned to play up the achievements and keep a momentum going, although Carpenter in C is concerned that such a strategy will be counterproductive. They do represent divisions over campaign tactics – Source A argues that the workers and labourers are being used and they should remain aloof whereas Wade in Source D suggests unity between property and people, middle class and working class, to create a common strategy to force the issue.</p> <p>The view that the campaigns were effective can be found in various forms in C, D and E (from different angles). Sources C, D and E are from three different perspectives – a</p>	70	<p><u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on a set of Sources and own knowledge.</u></p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual evidence and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>philosophical moderate in C who sees long term effectiveness in the Whig reform bill, a once radical editor and author in D who writes from recent hindsight and celebrates the unity and effectiveness of the radical campaign in its varied tactics and a great and active campaigner for press reform in E proudly asserting press victory. The thrust of Carpenter in C is to emphasise how effective the reform bills' principles were and the precedents set by recognising change. It is a victory over antiquity and enslavement to precedent. It can usefully be compared with Wade in D, whose very recent History is from a different perspective. It stresses strategic and tactical effectiveness in 1832 rather than the principled one in C. Its context is the May Days in 1832 when the Whigs resigned and the final crisis occurred. The Radicals stepped up the prospect of popular violence to defeat the prospect of an anti reform Tory government. This, according to Wade, ensured a Whig return and a swift and effective passing of the Bill into law in June 1832. This is a radical history which celebrates the effectiveness of tactics suspected and disapproved of by Carpenter in C. Candidates are told in the provenance that Wade believed in middle and working class effectiveness through unity and in D he celebrates this – newspaper unanimity, petitions, middle class tax strikes – to secure MPs' support against the Lords, traditional political societies meeting and 'communicating' and the threat of an armed populace marching on London. Parts of this are clearly an exaggeration (marching and arming) but others were very real – the weapon of a tax strike and the threat to government solvency. His conclusion is that the radicals have created an 'alarming state' of affairs, the prelude to the achievement of reform. Hetherington in E is similar to Wade in D. His purpose is to celebrate the effectiveness of his crusade via the Poor Man's Guardian in achieving an unstamped press in the face of bribery, fines and imprisonment. This is a celebration of persistent confrontation, in contrast to the more measured celebration of the 'principle' in C. Candidates may conclude that the mixed provenance here – the radical and confrontational Hetherington, the celebratory 'History' of Wade written to fix the idea of radical progress in the immediate aftermath of 1832 and the more cautious and principled long term approach of Carpenter - validates a view of radical effectiveness in the early 1830s. The evidence of these three sources could be used to stress the ingenuity of the radical response – attempts to overcome division, to strike financially at the government, to maintain the traditions of marching and petitioning and carry on the press campaigns of Cobbett. However, candidates could equally stress the propagandistic nature of the three sources, especially Wade in D and Hetherington in E. Their purpose is to maintain radical morale at a time when there had been setbacks – the stamp duty remained and the case of the Tolpuddle Martyrs demonstrated that governments continued to use the full force of the law. Effectiveness is</p>		<p>range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.</p> <p>The sources can be read/ analysed in different ways and as part of their judgement candidates will need to appreciate this.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>exaggerated, not least because impressive demonstrations of support would appear to be more intimidatory than they actually were and would help strengthen the Whigs in overawing a potentially recalcitrant House of Lords.</p> <p>The view that they had not been especially effective is mainly to be found in sources A, B and, to some extent, E. The hard line radical in A was right to point out that the main radical agenda had been ignored in the proposed Reform Bill – universal manhood suffrage, annual parliaments and the secret ballot etc. This is the basis for seeing workers and labourers as being meekly co-opted to serve middle class interests. Knowledge would suggest that such a view was especially typical of northern factory cities like Manchester and Leeds, or artisan centres like Nottingham (source of much earlier radicalism) which disagreed with the more cooperative attitudes of Attwood's Birmingham (potentially untypical). From a different and potentially more moderate angle, Wade in B provides telling evidence of class divisions in the radical campaign that were to surface again with Chartism. They led to a multiplicity of organisations, often reflecting the particular emphases of cities and regions.</p> <p>Hetherington in E, whilst celebrating the effectiveness of his own paper in legally being seen as not a newspaper (in reality a technicality), admits that the key element of his campaign – abolition of the stamp duty - has yet to be achieved (and was not to be until the 1860s) – not a case, as alleged, of being 'shortly' achieved). Victory is only partial and candidates need to see through the propagandistic tone of E with its endorsement of continued confrontation. The sources, all radical, are divided, suggesting that it is the Whigs who are effective, not the radicals. They clutch at straws – the promise of long term success, the technical triumph of the Poor Man's Guardian, the use of phrases like 'unstamped politics', rather meaningless when reading remained so expensive. Wade in B and C, by 1839 more moderate and conservative, is clearly concerned to clutch at straws and is trying to provide a rather unconvincing gloss on success in 1832. The evidence of A is more realistic in its reading of events. The reality was very varied with lots of different political unions.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (a)	<p>Both sources are formal occasions in parliament, part of the process of legislation on the Irish Church bill in 1869. Together they summarise the main points raised as to the impact of the bill. Both agree that the issue is momentous and both make broad charges as to its serious implications. They agree that the protestant ascendancy in Ireland, religious and secular, will see the measure as potentially dangerous, a blow to their traditional dominance. Even Gladstone admits this – he understands all too well that it will ‘appear nothing less than ruin and destruction’.</p> <p>However, the differences outweigh the similarities in terms of the perceived impact.</p> <p>Gladstone in A is optimistic in tone and outlook; Derby and the Lords in B are pessimistic. Gladstone is convinced that it will cement the Union with Britain. Derby is convinced that it will do the opposite and undermine it, encouraging the Irish to demand ever more. Its end result will be independence (‘freedom from the control of British law’). For Gladstone it will end the grievances felt towards an alien established church, whose wealth was a standing affront. In contrast Derby argues that it will merely substitute a despotic Catholic Church for a privileged Anglican one. Far from creating equality between the two it will provide an unfair advantage to Catholicism. Gladstone is convinced that the Irish Church will only prosper if it stands on its own two feet, unhindered by unattractive privilege, but Derby is convinced that this will not work in practice. To him the Catholic Church is too well organised, its priesthood too practiced in keeping its followers in a servile condition. As such he reflects a common English 19th century prejudice that Catholicism was despotic, part of an international conspiracy to oppose progress. Gladstone takes a much longer perspective and argues it will remove an historic injustice, not a point that Derby picks up on, preferring instead to argue for the future damage the measure represents to the Union. They also disagree over its impact on the protestant ascendancy in Ireland. Gladstone hopes they will generously respond to his call to abandon privilege and rise to the occasion. Derby in contrast thinks the measure will instead alienate the ruling class who will see it as abandonment by their mainland colleagues. To him it represents an injury to the Union, something Gladstone refutes. The original injury for Gladstone was the establishment of an alien church in the first place which put it in the invidious position of always being a target of hostile majority opinion.</p> <p>As regards provenance the key lies in the respective political positions of the two sources.</p> <p>Gladstone in A is the new Liberal leader and has just won an election victory on the issue of Irish Disestablishment. As PM he confidently and optimistically introduces a very well thought through measure that his opponents found difficult to criticise other than by a negative assessment of its long term impact on the Union. He promises much and couches his argument in terms of a generous gesture, a faith and hope that the Church would survive on</p>	30	<p><u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources.</u></p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources ‘as evidence for ...’. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>its own strengths. He was largely right – not that it could survive other than as a minority church but that it did remove a long standing injustice and grievance. Derby in B, using the Anglican majority in the Lords, is forced onto the back foot and can only register a protest. As a former Conservative PM and leader he carries some weight and represents traditional conservative interests – pro Anglican and establishment, a fear that such measures may be extended to England, Wales and Scotland. His appeal is one to prejudice and to fear that any concession will undermine a delicate and controversial (in Ireland) Union. Candidates are likely to judge that both sources are of equal use in assessing the impact of the measure. Both hazard guesses as to likely impact. Both make valid points in the context of the day and represent and summarise their respective positions well.</p>		
(b)	<p>The sources support two possible interpretations – that Gladstone had a large measure of success in meeting the needs of Ireland, his stated intent on learning of his 1868 election victory, in that he proceeded to tackle religious grievances (Irish Disestablishment and Dis-endowment in the 1869 Irish Church Act), land grievances (the Irish Land Act of 1870) and educational ones in the Irish Universities bill of 1873; but also that these measures failed both in the short and long term. They represent a variety of views – Gladstone himself commenting in public and private, a Whig Liberal Cabinet colleague, a former Conservative leader and the catholic establishment that Gladstone sought to woo.</p> <p>The argument for meeting Ireland’s needs is to be found in Sources A, C and E (with a hint from the catholic hierarchy in D that Gladstone had sought to create confidence in Catholic Ireland about the Union and in the rule of Westminster). However, these three sources are from a liberal perspective, with two from Gladstone himself, whose measures these were. One is from his famous speech to parliament endorsing the Church bill (A). The tone and rhetoric reek of optimism and the grand liberal gesture – the removal of ecclesiastical privilege, the ending of historic wrong, the taking of the moral high ground and the appeal to the better instincts of the protestant ascendancy, both lay and clerical. The bill became an act and candidates may well accept that it did remove a long standing Irish religious grievance. The dis-endowment clauses especially could be considered successful. On land reform candidates may well be more inclined to accept the evidence of Gladstone in E, in part corroborated by Kimberley’s more critical comments in C, given their private nature. They are an honest appraisal of the short term land situation; albeit from a Gladstonian perspective (the Lords and harvests are blamed). They both refer to the attempt to tackle Irish land. Both the Gladstone memorandum in E and Kimberley in C consider, at least initially, the 1870</p>	70	<p><u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</u></p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Land Act to be well received. Prosperity is promised and a crucial grievance 'laid to rest'. Gladstone had conceded a measure of tenant security and attempted to encourage land improvement and tenant betterment through the agency of compensation. Only later, in the 1870s, and largely through accident (poor harvests), was pacification undone. Through the Bright clauses there was even the prospect of future tenant land purchase, considered by many to be the key to successful pacification.</p> <p>The alternative interpretation, that Gladstone failed to meet Ireland's needs in the First ministry, can be found in Sources B, C, D and, in part, E. On the Irish Church, Derby in source B considers Gladstone to be singularly unwise in conceding such a measure, weakening the ascendancy's ability to control Ireland and handing over future control of the catholic peasant to a Roman dominated priesthood, something which the catholic hierarchy in D appears to corroborate. Far from pacifying Ireland Derby argues that this will only encourage nationalists to demand more. However, such evidence could be considered sour grapes from an opposition roundly defeated by Gladstone and that the measure did not have the predicted effect on the ascendancy. The evidence on the failure of land reform is perhaps more convincing given the variety of opinion that gives voice to it. Gladstone himself, in the 1880 memorandum (E), admits a measure of failure. In part he blames this on others and on events that could not have been predicted - amendments from the Lords, poor harvests and the agricultural depression that removed any prospect of profitability from Irish land. However, he also admits that a crucial mistake had been made. No restriction was put on eviction for non payment of rent by the tenant, something which candidates may know that he had been warned about in 1870. In the near famine circumstances of agricultural depression this led to a 'large increase in the number of evictions'. The context of the 1880 memo (E) is Gladstone's return to power and what was to be a Second Irish Land Act in 1881, evidence that the first act had been superseded by events and was flawed. The activities of Davitt's Land League bore witness to that. The key to Irish pacification would prove to be the need to effect a land transfer. Candidates could point out that, despite the Bright clauses suggesting a measure of this in 1870, little effort was made by Gladstone in this direction. The emphasis was on tenant improvement and compensation for eviction. It was an attempt to get the landlords to behave sensibly and to encourage spontaneous and natural agricultural improvement from the tenants, not to begin a wholesale buy-out of landlords. Landlords could still put the rent up and Gladstone's magnanimous appeal for reason to prevail over tenure issues was lost in ensuing events. Kimberley in C, albeit from a Whig and aristocratic propertied perspective, but also as a previous Lord Lieutenant, points to Gladstone's misplaced idealism ('a happy delusion'). Clearly there were reservations on the right wing of</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>the Liberal party. From a private diary this is effective evidence of the divisiveness of Gladstone's pacification policy. One of his own colleagues considers Irish demands to amount to 'robbery of landlords' and it corroborates Derby's view in B as to the questionable wisdom of conceding to any Irish demand. In both Derby and Kimberley's opinion the Irish do not share Gladstone's reasonableness. Thus, on the varying criteria of Derby and Kimberley, Gladstone had failed. Source D, the Catholic petition over 'education questions' and the failure of Gladstone's Irish University bill in 1873, is telling evidence from a source that Gladstone hoped would broker a deal over Ireland's needs. Instead it precipitated the implosion of the Liberal government itself. It demonstrates the failure of Gladstone over that type of religious question (denominational education) and the limits of his success on the religious question. However its purpose is to undermine (a petition to parliament) although it acknowledges the efforts Gladstone's government has made.</p> <p>In terms of judgement candidates may well consider the evidence for a failure of pacification to be more convincing, at least in terms of the immediate 1868-74 period (Sources A to D). Some could, alternatively, argue that Gladstone met some of the religious needs of the Irish only to fail in the long term over land and in reconciling the Catholic hierarchy to his university plans.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (a)	<p>In terms of organisation and control the sources confirm consistency with the LEAs answerable to the Board of Education, established in 1902, still the basis of management in 1918. However, as Source E suggests, the Act of 1918 allowed the public more scope to scrutinise the plans of the LEA. Both indicate government commitment to provide elementary and secondary education though the 1902 Act was less precise in this respect. In Source A secondary schooling could be provided 'if needed' and LEAs had 'autonomy to do what is best' whereas in Source E it is clear the Act of 1918 intended secondary education to be compulsory to the age of 14. Candidates may know that the Act of 1902 set a leaving age of only 12. The 1918 Act went further yet in respect of years at school by encouraging the placement of children in nursery schools, an option not included in the 1902 Act. Both sources stress the importance of training teachers to the success of education; in Source A 'nothing was of greater importance' and Source E emphasises the need to 'attract the very best'. Government policy on the curriculum is shown to be consistent, with Source A boasting that the emphasis will be on 'things that will be of use' to children and Source E promising the curriculum will be 'practical'. A commitment to provide equal opportunity to all is made in both Acts: in Source A this is stated as an aspiration to allow 'children of promise' to fulfil their potential which is endorsed in Source E with 'there will be equality for all' but arguably the 1918 Act went further by providing 'special care' for the disabled.</p> <p>Concern about America and Germany, as a threat to British economic power helps account for the motives for reform proposed in Source A which stresses economic reasons for improving the education system as 'the country's industrial competitiveness ... disadvantaged by inadequate education'. This was at a time when the Boer War exposed certain military weaknesses which might be linked to the concept that Britain was challenged abroad. Extending the suffrage to women in 1918 and the desire to provide Homes for Heroes underscores the concerns stressed in Source E. This regards political and social factors as key triggers for the Act of 1918 highlighting the need for education to safeguard 'democracy' and make good 'the losses caused by war'. Further, candidates might explain the consistency of policy as a function of the success of the 1902 Act upon which the 1918 Act was able to build and in doing so explain the different emphases or extension of principle in the latter compared to the former. The obvious sympathy of both authors for the Bills they were prepared to sponsor might be explained by their political allegiances: as a Conservative it is not surprising that Jebb backed Balfour's Bill or that Rowntree, a Liberal, supported the Bill of Fisher, a fellow Liberal MP. Their support might be judged the result of their personal inclinations: it is unsurprising that Jebb, an academic, Rowntree, a philanthropist, favoured</p>	30	<p><u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources.</u></p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	improvement in standards of education. Even if both sources are judged to be partial they are likely to be regarded as reliable as each other. .		
(b)	<p>At face value Sources A, D and E appear to support the interpretation. By the Acts of 1902 and 1918 children were promised 'equality of educational opportunity' (Source E), in access to secondary education previously denied to most, especially 'a child of promise' (Source A) but also nursery provision for some envisaged in the Act of 1918 (Source E). Children would surely benefit from teachers of quality who will 'teach things that will be of use' (Source A) and a 'curriculum that will be more practical' (Source E). The health of children appears to have been given greater consideration. Source D stresses this aspect of child welfare linking the learning of the 3 R's to 'good health' and the efforts made in Birmingham to improve 'personal cleanliness' and 'sound feeding'. Cross reference to Source E would be useful highlighting the 'physical training' that would be a feature of schools. Poor standards of hygiene and health in England at this time and earlier efforts to deal with this in the School Meals Act of 1906 and medical inspections introduced (1908) sets the establishment of clinics in Birmingham as part of a process started in Edwardian Britain. Sources D and E confirm that the welfare of disabled children was improved with 'special schools'.</p> <p>However, it could be argued that the evidence provided by all three sources is not entirely convincing. Sources A and E merely state the objectives of the politicians rather than comment on the practical application of the legislation. For example, the fact that the requirement for teachers was regarded as a priority still in 1918 might suggest that the emphasis placed on providing them in 1902, as stated in Source A, had fallen short of expectation. Candidates may know that Fisher's Bill was never fully implemented, a victim of the austerity of post-war Britain. Although Sir George Newman, in Source D, praises the efforts of Birmingham to improve the health of its children as 'more extensive than in any other town' such a comment implies the situation was not as good elsewhere and he concedes that even in Birmingham the scheme for the maintenance of personal cleanliness was 'not complete'. As the Chief Medical Officer he was well placed to make such comparative judgements. It might be argued that the unevenness of improvement might be explained by the demands of other priorities at a time of war although some might feel the latter would have stimulated concerns to improve the health of the country's youth.</p> <p>Sources B and C seem to provide scope for arguing that the welfare of all children was not improved. In Source B concerns about the religious teaching in schools on Nonconformist children is made clear which, if true, could be argued to be negative in its effect. The author</p>	70	<p><u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</u></p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>declares his refusal to teach in such schools and, if typical of others, could be detrimental to children by depriving them of good teachers. The potency of this concern is acknowledged in Source A which suggests how LEAs could meet 'the grievances of Nonconformists' on the training of teachers. Further, the ability of LEAs to deliver the Act of 1902 could be questioned given the refusal of so many people to pay their rates. Candidates might dismiss the numbers of those imprisoned or punished as small but this could be countered by the fact that 'passive resistance' was still practised 6 years after the Act. Nonetheless, by 1918 such opposition was marginal. Source C articulates the folly of the banning of children from public houses, listing several dangers of the Act. Given these views are from officers who operated in London and a major centre of population they might be considered a significant indication of the national picture. However, the assessment of the house fire was based on the report of just one officer and could not be linked specifically with a woman abandoning her children because of the Act and, also, that most women stayed at home. Further, candidates will know of other aspects of the Children's Charter allowing them to comment on the value of the Act as a whole.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4 (a)	<p>Similarities: Both A (Guedalla) and E (Churchill) show Churchill's hostility to Russian Communism. A refers to wild-eyed exclamations about Moscow, and E confirms this, as it is 'wild' in its use of vocabulary – 'armed hoards' and 'typhus-bearing vermin'. Both show Churchill seeing Russia as threat – in A to internal stability and E to the West. A talks of 'dangerous pamphlets' and E goes further with 'political doctrines which destroyed the health and... soul of nations'</p> <p>Differences: A refers to Churchill's fears of Communist influence in Britain, but E is wider and refers to the independent nations of Eastern Europe. In A the threat is seen to be false – part of a 'wild vision' and is contrasted with real problems facing Britain. There is no hint in E that there could be any over-exaggeration and the rhetoric seems to be genuine. The fantasies referred to by a sceptical Guedalla of lurking Communists seem realities in Churchill's 1929 book which seems to believe in the 'poisoned' and 'infected' Russia. There is no reference to 'black shirts' in E – but the belief in independent eastern Europe by 1929 shows that Churchill was less worried by some of the undemocratic regimes there because they were a protection against Communism.</p> <p>Provenance: A is a book obviously intended to present a critical portrait of a politician with a somewhat dubious background and reputation for instability. The writer as a liberal ridicules some of the fears of Churchill. It has a mocking tone but is not really a serious warning against Churchill. The intention of E is to maintain British hostility against Communism and to maintain the 'cordon sanitaire' which cut Russia off from the West. Candidates could note the dates -by 1929 the Soviet regime had become established and under Stalin was embarking on major social change. The Conservative government was hostile to Russia after the General Strike. It was clear that the Soviet regime was there to stay and it continued to be disliked and feared by conservatives. A strikes a sceptical liberal pose; E adopts a heated and impassioned tone. Both come after the Russian Revolution, but by 1924 Britain was moving to a more conciliatory attitude to Russia under Labour and the source is before the General Strike of 1926. E is written after the Strike which Churchill did see as a result of Moscow influence – a view quite widely held as the acceptance of the so called Zinoviev letter of 1924 showed. Note that E is not an impromptu speech but comes from the more considered position which a book – the sequel to the World Crisis 1911 -1 918 – demands. A is also a book, but of a different and lighter nature.</p>	30	No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source 'as evidence for.....' The Headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Judgement: Both show a typical attitude of Churchill – he had advocated intervention in the Russian Civil War and saw socialism as a threat to the British Empire. A theme of his career was that Russia was a threat so both could be seen as reliable evidence for his views in the 1920s. However, A introduces an element of speculation and mockery, while E for all its rhetoric is probably most reliably indicative of Churchill’s attitudes. Some may point to Churchill’s praise for Mussolini and argue that for all its irony, A is equally reliable. There is no set answer expected.</p>		
(b)	<p>The issue here is whether Churchill was, as A suggests a potential Mussolini-like figure opposed to change, determined to keep the pre-war world and its Empire and class structure intact, or was a more generous figure, concerned for social justice and the interests of the workers as D and C suggest. B might be seen to be taking a midway point, with the view that his opposition to the General Strike came only from its supposed political origins rather than its concern for the wages and conditions of ordinary workers.</p> <p>A (Guedalla) paints a picture of Churchill as in the grip of somewhat extreme fantasies about foreign threats and likely to institute a right-wing dictatorship backed by reactionary elements. He seems remote from the everyday economic concerns of ordinary people. This is confirmed by E (Churchill in 1929) which sees an ideological hatred of Russia which might by its language and its tone seem to be extremist and more akin to the anticommunist rhetoric of the wider European Right. However a much more moderate figure emerges from C (the cartoon) and D (the letter from the Bristol MP). Having thundered against the Strike in articles such as the one in B (Churchill’s article). Churchill as Chancellor of the Exchequer attempted a settlement to the miners’ strike which went on long after the end of the General Strike. The cartoon shows him aware of the economic importance of both industrial production and the social importance of peace in the coal industry. He is shown as a policeman trying to move on obstinate coal owners – someone concerned with the peace of the community and not allying with the reactionary elements or being extreme. This is confirmed by the letter (D) praising his moderation and feeling for fairness for the workers. Even the article in B says that strikes in pursuit of non-political objectives are acceptable and is not particularly extreme in objecting to political strikes, though the references to Moscow may be seen as more provocative and unrealistic.</p> <p>In terms of provenance, A is not so much a serious and studied analysis but rather a satirical, journalistic piece – perhaps an indication that Churchill’s more extreme utterances are not to be taken seriously. However E is a considered study, an updating of a serious history in which the sort of over-statement about Russia had little real place and a sign of a</p>	70	<p>Focus: Judgement in context, based on a set of Sources and own knowledge.</p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual evidence and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>lack of perspective and mature judgement. B was written in the aftermath of the General Strike and for a Conservative newspaper. It might have been expected to be polemical but does not develop the conspiracy theory. C is evidence for a public awareness of Churchill's more moderate position after the General Strike and is confirmed by B. There is no particular purpose in the MP(D) letting Churchill know that he is seen as a conciliator or any doubts about its sincerity – but of course Bristol was not any industrial community and not typical of many working class areas, but it accords with Churchill's speeches about reconciliation in parliament even it is clashes with some of the rhetoric of the British Gazette.</p> <p>In terms of contextual knowledge, candidates may use knowledge of Churchill's hostility to Russia after the First World War and his desire to maintain forces there longer than his cabinet colleagues. Churchill supported anti-Russian measures by the Baldwin government. This could be used to assess A and E. There may be knowledge of his activities and utterances during the General Strike, the provocative use of troops and the support for the Trade Disputes Act of 1927 as well as the use of the British Gazette which are used to assess sources and in argument. There may also be knowledge of the frustrations he felt with the mine owners and particularly Evan Williams, who appears in C the cartoon, his encouragement of talks between unions and employers and his overt sympathies for the sufferings of the miners who held out until autumn 1926 to assess the counter arguments which appear in the sources.</p> <p>No set answer is expected and candidates may argue, using E, that Churchill was still over concerned with class war by 1929.</p>		

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

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 2012

