

# **Mark Scheme for January 2013**

---

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, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, 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 2013

**Subject-specific Marking Instructions**

Distribution of marks for each level that reflects the Unit's AOs  
**2 answers: Each maximum mark 60**

	<b>AO1a</b>	<b>AO1b</b>
<b>IA</b>	18–20	36–40
<b>IB</b>	16–17	32–35
<b>II</b>	14–15	28–31
<b>III</b>	12–13	24–27
<b>IV</b>	10–11	20–23
<b>V</b>	8–9	16–19
<b>VI</b>	4–7	8–15
<b>VII</b>	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.

<b>AOs</b>	<b>AO1a</b>	<b>AO1b</b>
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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context;</li> <li>- the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied.</li> </ul>
<b>Level IA</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses a wide range of accurate and relevant evidence</li> <li>• Accurate and confident use of appropriate historical terminology</li> <li>• Answer is clearly structured and coherent; communicates accurately and legibly.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>18–20</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent understanding of key concepts (eg continuity and change) relevant to analysis in their historical context</li> <li>• Excellent synthesis and synoptic assessment</li> <li>• Answer is consistently and relevantly analytical with developed explanations and supported judgements</li> <li>• May make unexpected but substantiated connections over the whole period.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>36–40</b></p>
<b>Level IB</b>	<p><b>Level IB</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses accurate and relevant evidence</li> <li>• Accurate use of a range of appropriate historical terminology</li> <li>• Answer is clearly structured and mostly coherent; communicates accurately and legibly.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>16–17</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very good level of understanding of key concepts (eg continuity and change) in their historical context</li> <li>• Answer is consistently focused on the question set</li> <li>• Very good level of explanation/analysis, and provides supported judgements</li> <li>• Very good synthesis and synoptic assessment of the whole period.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>32–35</b></p>

AOs	AO1a	AO1b
<b>Level II</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses mostly accurate and relevant evidence</li> <li>• Generally accurate use of historical terminology</li> <li>• Answer is structured and mostly coherent; writing is legible and communication is generally clear.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>14–15</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good level of understanding of key concepts (eg continuity and change) in their historical context</li> <li>• Good explanation/analysis but overall judgements may be uneven</li> <li>• Answer is focused on the issues in the question set</li> <li>• Good synthesis and assessment of developments over most of the period.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>28–31</b></p>
<b>Level III</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses relevant evidence but there may be some inaccuracy</li> <li>• Answer includes relevant historical terminology but this may not be extensive or always accurately used</li> <li>• Most of the answer is structured and coherent; writing is legible and communication is generally clear.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>12–13</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shows a sound understanding of key concepts, especially continuity and change, in their historical context</li> <li>• Most of the answer is focused on the question set</li> <li>• Answers may be a mixture of analysis and explanation but also description and narrative, but there may also be some uneven overall judgements; <b>OR</b> answers may provide more consistent analysis but the quality will be uneven and its support often general or thin</li> <li>• Answer assesses relevant factors but provides only a limited synthesis of developments over most of the period.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>24–27</b></p>
<b>Level IV</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is deployment of relevant knowledge but level/accuracy will vary</li> <li>• Some unclear and/or underdeveloped and/or disorganised sections</li> <li>• Mostly satisfactory level of communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>10–11</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Satisfactory understanding of key concepts (eg continuity and change) in their historical context</li> <li>• Satisfactory focus on the question set</li> <li>• Answer may be largely descriptive/narratives of events, and links between this and analytical comments will typically be weak or unexplained</li> <li>• Makes limited synoptic judgements about developments over only part of the period.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>20–23</b></p>

AOs	AO1a	AO1b
<b>Level V</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General and basic historical knowledge but also some irrelevant and inaccurate material</li> <li>• Often unclear and disorganised sections</li> <li>• Adequate level of communication but some weak prose passages.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>8–9</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General understanding of key concepts (eg continuity and change) in their historical context</li> <li>• Some understanding of the question but answers may focus on the topic and not address the question set <b>OR</b> provides an answer based on generalisation</li> <li>• Attempts an explanation but often general coupled with assertion, description/narrative</li> <li>• Very little synthesis or analysis and only part(s) of the period will be covered.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>16–19</b></p>
<b>Level VI</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of relevant evidence will be limited; there will be much irrelevance and inaccuracy</li> <li>• Answers may have little organisation or structure</li> <li>• Weak use of English and poor organisation.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>4–7</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very little understanding of key concepts (eg continuity and change) in their historical context</li> <li>• Limited perhaps brief explanation</li> <li>• Mainly assertion, description/narrative</li> <li>• Some understanding of the topic but not the question's requirements.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>8–15</b></p>
<b>Level VII</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little relevant or accurate knowledge</li> <li>• Very fragmentary and disorganised response</li> <li>• Very poor use of English and some incoherence.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0–3</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Weak understanding of key concepts (eg continuity and change) in their historical context</li> <li>• No explanation</li> <li>• Assertion, description/narrative predominate</li> <li>• Weak understanding of the topic or of the question's requirements.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0–7</b></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	<p>Candidates should focus on how effectively Bismarck managed German nationalism. Candidates will undoubtedly be more successful if they define 'effectively' in their answer. Candidates might define the ways in which Bismarck was (or was not) effective: for example in controlling, harnessing or using nationalism. Many candidates may argue in favour of the assertion in the question because of Bismarck's critical role in the 1860s in the creation of the Second Reich; candidates may argue that he managed German nationalism by hijacking the nationalist cause for Prussia's ends. This could certainly be considered effective management of German nationalism. However, any answers that only focus on Bismarck and his management of German nationalism are significantly flawed. To be successful candidates must compare Bismarck's management of German nationalism with others. They may conclude that Bismarck was or was not the only effective manager of German nationalism but they must do so on the basis of having given consideration to the claims of others. Most candidates are likely to draw comparisons between Bismarck, Metternich and William II. Clearly all three had different aims and different circumstances, which could enable candidates to make convincing cases for all of them as effective managers of German nationalism. From 1815 to 1848 the nationalist movement was too weak to effectively challenge the Metternich System: arguably this demonstrates Metternich's effective control over German nationalists. By 1848/49 no leader of the nationalist movement with mass appeal emerged. Although Metternich fled Vienna in 1848, his downfall was hardly dominated by German nationalism. Wilhelm II's search for world power was undoubtedly populist, mirroring the development of radical nationalism; arguably he too managed German nationalism effectively. However, the ultimate outcome of his policies was defeat in the Great War and humiliation at Versailles and his own abdication.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	<p>Candidates should focus on to what extent German nationalism was popular in their answers in an attempt to evaluate the mass appeal of nationalism in this period. Candidates should evaluate the extent to which nationalism was popular and demonstrate awareness that popularity was not uniform throughout the period. Candidates could consider the extent to which nationalism was popular at various points, <u>for example</u> from 1789–1815, 1815–1848, from 1871–1914 and in 1918. Candidates may well argue that nationalism gained appeal during the Napoleonic Wars but that consequently concepts of romantic nationalism had a limited intellectual appeal. Similarly candidates may argue that in the revolutions of 1848 nationalism gained considerable popularity, especially in the early days, but that this was not embedded, partly at least due to the actions/inactions of the revolutionaries. Candidates are likely to argue that Prussia under Bismarck did a great deal to popularise nationalism and that victories in the wars against Austria and France certainly fanned those flames as did the establishment of the Reich. Candidates may well demonstrate that they understand that Wilhelmine Germany increasingly looked to exploit nationalist yearnings and the mass appeal of German nationalism, pursuing a populist foreign policy to distract the masses from social discontent. Candidates <u>might</u> choose to demonstrate that the popularity of nationalism may be compared to the appeal of other philosophies. For example the growing industrialization of Prussia and the German Empire was mirrored by the growing popularity of socialism, an appeal that proved relatively immune to either appeasement, in the form of state socialism, or repression. Distress from the winter of 1916/1917 onwards, and defeat in 1918, led to the socialist uprisings of late 1918 and early 1919 and the establishment of Ebert’s republic. However, even in 1919 the appeal of unrequited nationalism was never far from the surface, as evidenced by the Freikorps and the emerging ‘stab-in-the-back’ theory.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>



Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	<p>Candidates should focus on the relative importance of political factors within the development of German Nationalism in this period. Candidates must show that they understand that the development of German nationalism was not solely dependent on political factors in this period. The importance of political factors should be evaluated against the other dominant factors in the development of German nationalism during this period, for example economic factors, the role played by wars and the role played by significant individuals such as Metternich, Bismarck and Kaiser Wilhelm II. In discussing political factors candidates might consider the management of German nationalism, in particular they might discuss the role of Bismarck and both his internal and external policies, particularly his diplomacy during the 1860s, this might also lead to a consideration of European political factors, such as the role of Napoleon III. However, some candidates might consider earlier political developments and look back to the legacy of the French Revolution and Metternich, or the Revolutions of 1848-9. In order to cover the whole period, candidates might also consider the importance of Kaiser Wilhelm II. It is possible that many candidates will link political factors to military developments. Candidates may explain the impact of industrialisation on the development of German nationalism, for example the impact of the founding and development of the Krupp Gusstahlfabrik (Cast Steel Works) from 1811 and the impact of the Zollverein after 1834. Some candidates may argue that Prussia's economic dominance led to their dominance over Germany and in turn had a limiting effect on the development of German nationalism through the establishment of a Kleindeutschland in 1871. Candidates are likely to understand how developments in the economy in the 1850s paved the way for the military victories of 1864, 1866 and 1870/71. Military strength depended upon economic strength however. 'Coal &amp; Iron' rather than 'Blood &amp; Iron' could be usefully debated. The development of the railways may be seen as significant. The impact of the extraordinary developments in the German economy after 1871 should be discussed. For example, the Great War left Germany broken and half-starved despite the German economic domination of continental Europe in 1914. The development and impact of ideas on the emergence and development of intellectual nationalism may be usefully explored. Candidates may argue that initially this provided the impetus or springboard for later developments and that, in the Napoleonic period, it was the common fight of people from different German states against their French enemy that gave strong impulses to nationalism.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4	<p>Candidates will need to show a clear understanding of the concepts of tactics and strategy, many are likely to treat the two together and show little or no discrimination, but stronger answers should treat them separately. Some may argue that both remained the same, whilst others may argue that one changed or both changed; any approach is acceptable, provided the answer is supported. 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. In discussing strategy some may argue that it changed and point to the development of the organisation of the state and development of the concept of total war, whilst others might point to the use of bombing at the end of the period. However, some may argue that there was little change as total war was a feature, to a greater or lesser degree throughout the period. Some may argue that planning remained the same and that planners continued to look for at sweeping offensive actions against their opponents as was the case under Napoleon through to Blitzkrieg. Some may suggest that in order to breakthrough this did lead to a change in the latter period as, faced with fortifications and modern weapons it required a massive build up of men, armaments and strategic railways.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5	<p>Alliances tended to have more importance when Europe was in a state of general warfare and conflicts took place over a long period of time with grand objectives such as the domination of the entire continent. Conflicts such as the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars, the First and Second World Wars are such examples and allow candidates to chart success/failure in war in the light of strong or weak alliances. In shorter wars alliances were less important and tended to be used to isolate powers rather than create powerful military coalitions. Good examples are all of the Wars of Unification and the Crimean War. The American Civil War might be used, candidates arguing that the Confederacy could only win with an alliance with a third power, an event that did not take place. Thus, the response might focus on the context of war determining the importance – or not – of alliances in determining a successful outcome.</p> <p>Alternatively candidates might argue that other factors were more important in determining the successful outcome of war: manpower, leadership, economic power, etc. Such responses are valid but the core issue posed by the question must be addressed and rejected in a synoptic manner before the candidate embarks on an alternative explanation.</p> <p>Better responses might advance an alternative explanation or explanations for success in war but interweave such explanations into the response in a synoptic fashion. An example might be manpower; a candidate might argue that it is the manpower produced by a large alliance that was the key factor in success rather than the alliance per se. The opportunities for such a response are legion and would meet the synoptic requirements of the mark scheme.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6	<p>Responses will need a sound understanding of what is meant by economic strength and its impact on war. Thus, candidates might examine the impact of industrial power, man power, agricultural wealth etc on the outcome of wars agreeing or disagreeing with the basic precept of the question as the response develops.</p> <p>Examples of economically strong states being successful in war might be Britain in the Napoleonic Wars, the coalition against Russia in the Crimean Wars or the USA in WWII. Examples of economically strong states being unsuccessful might be France in the Napoleonic Wars or Austria in the 1866 war against Prussia. In both of these cases the nature of economic strength might be examined, industrial strength as opposed to stronger manpower and/or agricultural strength. A clearer example of a more economically strong state losing to a weaker one might be the Russo-Japanese War. There are more complex situations where the relative economic strength of the combatant powers change depending on which point of a conflict is being discussed, for example the Axis powers in WWII.</p> <p>The important quality to identify in scripts is the application of the synoptic element of the mark scheme to the question set in a focused manner. Weaker scripts might agree or disagree with the question – or indeed do both – and then list wars to prove the case. Examiners might even encounter scripts that accept and reject the question producing two lists with relevant reasoning, effectively two mini essays.</p> <p>Better responses will engage the question in a synoptic manner and produce a thematic response focused on aspects of economic strength and the impact of such factors on the outcome of wars.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7	<p>Candidates will need to stress that all British political parties agreed that the Union should be maintained and even between 1798 and 1800 it was only the Whigs that argued for maintenance of Grattan's Dublin parliament. Disagreement came over reform within and of the Union. The extent of that disagreement forms the focus of the question. Candidates may stress that up to 1868 disagreement was relatively minor with both Whig/Liberals and Tories/Conservatives preferring to maintain the protestant ascendancy, the Irish Church and the land settlement. Both revolutionary and constitutional nationalism was resisted, often through coercion. This was particularly so from 1800–1829 and again from 1846–1868. After 1868 Gladstone's 'mission to pacify Ireland' polarised policy, the Liberals epitomising reform within the Union to 1885 (Disestablishment, two Land Acts and University reform) and then reform of the Union by proposing Home Rule in 1886, although this prompted a split, Liberal Unionists (who saw Irish reform as tied to both Empire and social reform) moving across to the Conservatives. Post Gladstone (1895) the Liberal party remained wedded to Home Rule as the answer to Ireland's problems through to 1920. The Conservatives initially opposed Liberal reform under Gladstone and were strengthened in this by Whig defections in the 1880s. Their policy remained a defence of the Irish Church and they questioned interference with landlord rights and concessions to Parnell and the Land League. They identified with both the Liberal Unionists and the Ulster Unionists in opposing Liberal Home Rule. Between 1910 and 1914 they took this opposition very far (Bonar Law's Blenheim Palace speech) by backing Ulster's mobilisation to resist the imposition of Home Rule. However in the Salisbury Balfour period, 1886–1905, they too were prepared to continue with liberal type reform within the Union, particularly by facilitating land purchase and moving towards ratepayer democracy at a local level in Ireland. Both Liberal and Conservative administrations conceded much in the post Parnell period. Disagreement was also marked in the 1916–21 period, although coalition government blurred matters. Liberals, both inside and out of the Coalition disliked the post Easter Rising coercion of the Conservative dominated administrations of Lloyd George, but supported Home Rule for North and South. All parties reluctantly agreed to the end of the Union in the Anglo-Irish treaty. However there is a case that the pre 1868 period is less consensual than it seems.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>The Whigs instinctively disliked coercion, managing to live without it between 1835 and 1841, and individual liberal figures supported considerable reform at key points. The Lichfield House Compact saw a willingness to do deals with O'Connell. Whigs supported Catholic Emancipation; the Tories on the whole did not, despite being confronted with it in 1829. Some useful comparisons can be made between Peel's Tories and the Whigs. In practice both pursued reform – emancipation, patronage, police, tithe and land, and with relations with the Catholic Church (Peel and Maynooth). Disagreement was not always clear cut.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8	<p>The question focuses on the relative importance of factors in determining the fate of constitutional nationalism. Candidates will need to assess not only the role and attitude of the Catholic Church but at other, possibly more important factors, such as the leadership of O'Connell, Butt, Parnell and Redmond; the tactics of the parliamentary party; the state of Westminster politics; agitation in Ireland (the Catholic Association, the Repeal Association; links to the Land League) etc. The argument that success was determined by the Catholic Church could be demonstrated by an examination of the 1820s and the Catholic Association where O'Connell used the Church to organise, mobilise, fund (the catholic rent) and support what was a catholic issue – emancipation. The revival of Catholicism in the mid and later 19<sup>th</sup> century made it a powerful force. It gained from educational developments, from emancipation and, under O'Connell, became identified with the causes of constitutional nationalism, to the extent that Young Ireland left in 1846. Its attitudes helped to determine the fate of Gladstone's reforms and its withdrawal of support for Parnell, after formal backing in 1884 (Parnell agreed to back its educational demands) in the late 1880s sealed his fate. As the franchise widened its hold on the catholic voter increased. Revolutionary nationalism lost from the Church's disapproval. Redmond's loss of Church support during the 1<sup>st</sup> World War was one factor in the failure of 1918. By identification with the Church constitutional nationalism failed to maintain a secular and unitary policy, losing the initial support it had in Ulster. By the 1910s the Church was beginning to support and do deals with Sinn Fein, backing it after 1916. <b>However</b> it is possible to overstate the importance of the Church, especially in the later Parnell and Redmond periods, when the Irish Parliamentary Party focused on Westminster tactics and alliances with the Land League (the Church was socially conservative) and the Liberals to achieve its agenda (Land reform and Home Rule). The fate of Home Rule lay at Westminster and in the politics and events of the 1<sup>st</sup> World War. Failure in the 1910s was determined by British governments and how tactically Redmond responded to the World War, not by the attitudes of the Church. Even before this Parnell was dependent on Gladstone and on the fate of the Liberal party after 1886. Land issues could either help or hinder constitutional leaders, as the Tithe war (hindered) and the Land War (helped) demonstrated.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	The Church was never as explicitly active after the 1820s and 1830s and preferred, under Cardinal Cullen, to cultivate British governments at a higher level. More effective answers here might make distinctions between the ordinary clergy, whose activism notably helped constitutional nationalism, and the hierarchy, more aware of government.		



Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9	<p>Candidates will need to compare the reasons for the relative success or lack of it of the various nationalist revolutionary groups. Until 1916–17 it could well be argued that Sinn Fein too lacked mass support in its early years, sharing the fate of earlier groups. Its initial stress was on cultural nationalism, as Young Ireland's had been in the early 1840s. This had limited mass appeal. The focus for earlier groups, 1798–1848, was martyrdom and rising. This proved a failed tactic for early revolutionary nationalists, productive of a blood sacrifice only tradition (Emmet in 1803 and '1848'). Risings lacked wider planning to mobilise the masses and foreign support (from France) proved ineffective. Emmet's rising in 1803 had as its basis a Dublin coup that, if it failed, could not trigger a wider response. They failed to mobilise and use the Catholic Church or to use Land issues (the Tithe war of the 1830s) to garner support. However it could be argued that revolutionary nationalists of the mid century (Fenians) were more effective in finding support – funding, money and political direction from the expat community in the US, literary and press contributions and in forging alliances with more mainstream groups (Butt and especially Parnell). However it too indulged in rather unproductive and unfocussed terrorism (the 1867 rising and the mainland bombing campaign in 1867–8) until Davitt's Land League was able to tap into mass agrarian grievance and anti-landlordism, from 1873 to the 1880s, and link to Parnell in 1879 (New Departure). The Fenians were in some respects much more successful in the 1870s and 1880s than Sinn Fein in the early 1900s. However the links with constitutional nationalism would breakdown after the mid 1880s. The key to Sinn Fein's later success was to exploit key issues – the Boer War (out of which SF emerged in 1905) and especially the 1<sup>st</sup> World War. Earlier groups, despite trying in 1798 and 1848 had not been able to effectively exploit contemporary issues. Crucial was to create a political party to rival Redmond, a tactic not used before and to explicitly reject association with constitutional nationalism and its links to the Liberal party. Griffiths tried to broaden SF's appeal but it was not until 1913 that a party political approach linked to a military one in response to the UVF – the creation of the Irish Volunteers and then the IRA with whom SF associated post 1916. In contrast to the French wars the German War created opportunities and led to government mistakes (martial law, the extension of conscription to Ireland and the overreaction to the Easter Rising, from martial law to martyrdom).</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>The Rising was, in practice, another failed Irish rising but SF moved to link constitutional methods with organised military ones (Collins). It challenged Redmond, choosing De Valera as President who courted international sympathy and contested the first universal suffrage election in 1918, a tactic less open to its predecessors who had to accept a limited electorate that supported constitutional nationalism. It could then effectively declare an independent and democratic Dail Eireann in the South and master mind a very effective local challenge to the traditional state (police, justice, administration) using guerrilla warfare. It was then able to negotiate, not without division, the Anglo-Irish Treaty in 1921. Candidates should focus on the key differences between 1916–21 and 1798–1915, in the light of the above.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
10	<p>Candidates should compare the impact of war and revolutions on the development of Russian government. Their impact on economic reforms such as emancipation of the peasantry, collectivisation and five-year plans only become relevant when they are linked to political, administrative and ideological methods and changes in government. Candidates who discuss aspects of Russian government such as reform and repression, the fate of opposition, changes in ideology, the absence of democracy, the one party state and compare the relative influence of war and revolutions on these developments are most likely to be successful. Examiners must not expect to find reference to all these aspects in candidate answers. Candidates may argue that the development of Russian government was influenced more by war than any other factor using a variety of evidence. The horrific impact of the First World War, both at the front and at home, sealed the fate of the Romanovs and, in turn, the Provisional Government in 1917. Arguably the appeal of the Bolsheviks in 1917 and the triumph of Lenin were directly related to the impact of the First World War. War can therefore be viewed as the prime cause of the end of autocratic government and the failure of the temporary move towards constitutional government. Defeat in the Crimean War can be seen as the trigger for Alexander II's programme of reform and the introduction of Zemstva as a new system of post-Emancipation local government. Similarly the Russo-Japanese War led to Nicholas II's announcement of the October Manifesto and the formation of the Duma. In a pure sense, this was the abandonment of absolutism. Arguably, victory in the Second World War entrenched Stalin's dictatorial power and had a brutal impact on the government of many of the outlying 'republics' of the USSR. However, candidates may argue that revolution had a greater impact on the development of Russian government than war. The impact of the First World War was not the only cause of either the October or the February revolutions of 1917. Candidates may choose to argue that the revolutions themselves were multi-causal and that they rather than war had the most important impact on the development of Russian government in this period. October 1917 and the triumph of Bolshevism crushed all possibility that a liberal democracy might emerge in Russia and transformed Russia into the Soviet Union – the world's first communist state.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>The February Revolution ended over 300 years of Romanov rule and the establishment of the Provisional Government intent on bringing constitutional government to Russia. The 1905 revolution may have been triggered by the Russo-Japanese War but had many other causes and arguably it was fear of being overthrown that led to Nicholas II accepting the suggestion of the October Manifesto and the introduction of the Duma. However, candidates may argue that this made little significant change to how Nicholas II wielded power. Some candidates may argue that whilst the revolutions of 1917 swept aside the Romanovs and introduced Bolshevism, they had a limited impact on the development of Russian government as one form of autocracy was replaced by another.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
11	<p>Candidates should focus on the similarities and differences between the condition of the peasantry and the treatment that the peasants received, both before and after 1917. Candidates may well argue that neither the Tsars nor the communist leaders consistently improved the lives of the peasants. The peasantry made little sustained progress in many ways during this period and that predominantly their living and working conditions remained bleak. However to answer this question effectively it is essential that a synoptic comparison is made. To support the assertion in the question candidates are likely to focus on the Emancipation of the serfs in 1861. Candidates may well choose to identify different aspects of peasant life and compare the Tsars and the communists on each one. These aspects might include land ownership, food supply and famine, financial burdens, requisition and taxation, social reform, regulation and control or the pressure to leave the countryside for the towns. However candidates are also likely to argue that emancipation had only a limited impact on improving the lives of the peasants because of the terms. Candidates may further support the assertion by reference to the establishment of a Peasants Land Bank in the 1880s and improvements in their lives made possible by Stolypin's Kulak policy after 1905. However, many candidates may argue in favour of the Romanovs largely because they feel that even less was done to improve their lives by the communist leaders. Those candidates are likely to support their arguments with the consequences of War Communism under Lenin and collectivisation and dekulakisation under Stalin. Candidates may argue that collectivisation was a 'second serfdom'. Before and after 1917 there were famines, eg 1891, 1921 &amp; 1932, regardless of regime, but candidates may argue that Stalin's denial of the famine of the 1930s made its impact worse than. To argue against the assertion in the question candidates are likely to suggest that emancipation was so flawed that the lives of the peasants did not improve and, as a consequence of the rapidly rising population arguably deteriorated through time. They are likely to view the appointment of Land Captains under Alexander III as marking a significant deterioration in the lives of peasants who at the same time were being squeezed dry by taxation to finance Witte's 'Great Spurt'. Candidates are likely to argue that Lenin's Decree on Land in 1917 marked a definite improvement and may suggest that War Communism was simply a temporary deterioration made essential by the Civil War. These candidates are likely to assert that the</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>NEP from 1921 marked a return to their lives improving as they were encouraged to become Kulaks and enrich themselves. Certainly the communists did much more to introduce social reform, for example in the sphere of education, than the Tsars. Candidates may argue that whilst some peasants suffered dreadfully under Stalin because of collectivisation and de-kulakisation the survivors had significantly better health care and education than their predecessors. Candidates are likely to argue that Khrushchev's development of more consumer goods also did improve the lives of the peasants, though his Virgin Lands policy is likely to be judged an ill-considered mistake.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
12	<p>Candidates should focus on whether all the Russian rulers had the same aims in their answers. To be successful candidates should focus on aims, what each ruler was trying to achieve. Their policies and outcomes are only relevant if candidates refer to them in the context of what the ruler was aiming to achieve. Reference to policies and outcomes should only be rewarded where they are used to illustrate and confirm the aims of rulers. Candidates are likely to want to argue both for and against the view in this question. Candidates may well argue that retention of power, whether autocratic or dictatorial, and the crushing of opposition were priorities for all the rulers even if some were singularly unsuccessful in achieving those goals. Candidates may well argue that the modernisation of Russia was an aim for all the rulers, though candidates are likely to differentiate between rulers such as Alexander III and Stalin in terms of motives and extent. Candidates are also likely to argue that commonly the aim of modernisation was to improve Russia's military strength in order to either win or not be defeated in future wars. Candidates may however wish to argue that the communist rulers had very different core priorities to the Tsars in terms of political ideology and social priorities; others may contend that this should have been the case but that rulers, especially Stalin (though some will also indict Lenin) used Marxism as little more than a fig-leaf to cover their rampant desire for personal power. Candidates may argue that the Tsars were not uniform in their core aims; they are likely to see Alexander II as having different priorities to his successors, citing emancipation and the other reforms of the 1860s in support. Candidates may also argue that the communist rulers were not uniform in their core aims either; they are likely to argue that Khrushchev had very different priorities to Stalin, citing de-stalinisation as support. Candidates may well understand that whether Lenin and Stalin had similar aims is subject to significant historical debate. However while knowledge of this debate should be rewarded, it is not required for candidates to achieve the highest level or mark. Candidates are likely to argue that the leaders of the Provisional Government had some significantly different aims to all the other rulers, citing their plans for a constituent assembly for example as evidence of them aiming to establish a more democratic Russia, but they may see some continuity in aims with Tsar Nicholas II because of their continued involvement in the First World War.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
13	<p>Key developments of the Eisenhower administration include: 1954 <i>Brown v Board of Education</i> Supreme Court decision ordering desegregation of schools; Murder of Emmett Till, 1955; emergence of King as leader of the non-violent mass protest in the Montgomery Bus boycott of 1954–56; formation of the SCLC in 1957 and SNCC in 1960; Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960; Eisenhower’s role in the Little Rock crisis of 1957; Sit-ins of 1960.</p> <p>Alternative turning points include: Reconstruction period (1865–77): important constitutional amendments: 1865, 13th abolishing slavery; 1868, 14th guaranteeing civil rights; 1870, 15th guaranteeing the right to vote; significant African American participation in politics, supported by the Radical Republicans in Congress; Freedman’s Bureau (until 1872) in providing legal assistance for former slaves and helping to establish schools.</p> <p>1890s: establishment of Jim Crow 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.</p> <p>Second World War: expansion of the economy providing job opportunities for AA workers and migration northwards; number of AAs serving in the armed forces; expansion of grass-roots activism – founding of CORE in 1942, the creation of the FEPC in response to Randolph’s threatened march on Washington, the ‘double V’ campaign; discrediting of racism – Hitler’s camps and Japanese victories over Europeans; Nuremberg trials, the UNO, and the development of culture of human rights.</p> <p>1960s Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1968 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 – legislative milestones ending Jim Crow; Great Society help for poor inner-city African Americans; the Black Power movement, the activities of 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.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>



Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Issues which might be covered from the 1970–92 period include:            Civil Rights campaigners forced onto the defensive to maintain legislative achievements and welfare programmes; bussing, affirmative action programmes controversial; emergence of successful black middle class and increased political participation contrasted with the continued deprivation, discrimination and low aspirations of many poor AAs; Reagan cuts funding for enforcement agencies and welfare programmes; Supreme Court less supportive (1974: Milliken v Bradley, 1978: Bakke v University of California, 1984: Grove City v Bell, 1992: Freeman v Pitts); Conservative appointments to SC – 1986: Rehnquist Chief Justice, 1991: Clarence Thomas (black conservative) appointed; but Democrat dominated Congress largely supportive – 1983: MLK birthday as public holiday; 1986: Economic sanctions imposed on South Africa over Reagan’s veto; 1987: Rejection of Bork’s nomination to SC; 1988 Civil Rights Restoration Act, reversing SC judgement in Grove City v Bell, passed over Reagan’s veto; Reagan fails to overturn LBJ’s Executive Order 11246 requiring federal employers to implement affirmative action; Jesse Jackson’s bids for Democratic presidential nominations in 1984 and 1988.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
14	<p>Candidates will probably argue that this was not 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.</p> <p>Examples of Federal hostility before the New Deal include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> <li>• President Cleveland's use of federal troops to suppress the 1894 Pullman Strike</li> <li>• 1895 Supreme Court decision upholding the use of injunctions against trade unions under the Sherman Anti-Trust Act</li> <li>• 1905 Lochner Case (striking down a New York law setting a maximum number of working hours for bakery workers)</li> <li>• 1908 Adair Case (upholding 'yellow dog' contracts by which workers were prevented from joining a union)</li> <li>• Use of the 1917 Espionage Act to suppress 'The Wobblies' (Industrial Workers of the World)</li> <li>• 1921 ruling declaring unconstitutional the 1914 Clayton Act (which aimed to guarantee workers' rights to organize, bargain collectively, strike, boycott and picket)</li> <li>• The best candidates might also show that the three branches of the federal government were not always in harmony: in 1921 the Supreme Court struck down 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.</li> </ul> <p>Examples of the post-war climate unsympathetic to organised labour include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1943 Smith-Connally Act preventing strike action in industrial plant producing war materials</li> <li>• 1947 Taft-Hartley Act allowing states to pass 'right to work' laws banning the 'closed shop'</li> </ul>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1959 Landrum-Griffin Act banning secondary picketing</li> <li>• The impact on trade union power, membership and strike activity of Reagan's 1981 defeat of the PATCO strike</li> <li>• Reagan's policies of lower taxes and business deregulation were part of a deliberate rejection of the New Deal philosophy in the 1980s.</li> </ul> <p>In dealing with Federal support, candidates might refer to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attempts during the presidencies of Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson to legislate on such matters as working conditions, consumer protection, housing and education</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• The creation during WW2 of the FEPC and the National War Labour Board</li> <li>• The support given, especially by post-war Democratic presidents, to workers: Truman's 'Fair Deal', JFK's 'New Frontier' and LBJ's 'Great Society' programmes aimed to build on FDR's New Deal and brought benefits to working people – support for a minimum wage, economic regeneration measures, improved housing and medical care and better work opportunities</li> <li>• Nixon's support for affirmative action and Carter's extension of the minimum wage are examples of presidential support for labour rights.</li> </ul>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
15	<p>Evidence of Native American activism includes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indian Wars of the late 19<sup>th</sup> century – unsuccessful defence of their rights</li> <li>• NA contribution to the US war effort in the two world wars influencing subsequent federal policy – the granting of US citizenship in 1924 and the formation of the Indian Claims Commission in 1946</li> <li>• Society of American Indians (SAI, established in 1911), the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI, established in 1944), American Indian Movement (AIM, established in 1968) to preserve Indian customs and culture and exert pressure on federal and state authorities</li> <li>• Opposition to termination policy of 1950s helped to end it</li> <li>• ‘Red Power’ in the late 1960s and early 1970s (the occupation of Alcatraz in 1969, the occupation of the BIA in 1972, and the protest at Wounded Knee in 1973)</li> <li>• Actions by individual Indian nations to gain greater economic wealth through court action against the US Federal government (eg Passamaquaddy Indians of Maine in the 1970s) or in developing their reservations (Mohawks of New York or Jicarilla Apaches of New Mexico).</li> </ul> <p>Most candidates are likely to argue that the federal government did much more than NAs themselves to advance their civil rights. They might mention the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1934 Indian Reorganisation Act inaugurating the Indian New Deal – recognition of Indian separate identity and right to self-government under the BIA; allotment ended, some land restored</li> <li>• 1946 Indian Claims Commission – some recognition of illegal land loss in 19<sup>th</sup> century</li> <li>• 1968 Indian Civil Rights Act – guaranteed individual rights under US Constitution to Indians (some able candidates might interpret this as limiting tribal collective rights)</li> <li>• 1975 Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act – Indians given increased responsibility for educational and other programmes previously administered for them.</li> </ul>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>The best answers might point out the lack of clarity about what Native American civil rights actually are and discuss the impact of economic and social changes of the mid to late 20<sup>th</sup> century on Native Americans. Some want recognition of their separate culture and traditions while others, particularly those who have moved to the cities and/or intermarried, wish to assimilate into mainstream US culture and overcome de facto racial prejudice over such issues as employment and housing. Candidates might also analyse the lack of consistency in federal Indian policy and will be able to discuss the current legal and economic status of the reservations.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
16	<p>Candidates should examine the reasons for democratic change, particularly whether it occurred because of reforming governments and party fighting in parliament and outside or whether outside pressure groups and popular movements were the key to moving governments and MPs in a democratic direction. Pressure groups could range from Trade Unions, to single cause groups like the Ballot Society and the Suffragettes. Candidates should examine key moments of change (the franchise in the 1880s, 1910s, 1928; local government in the 1880s; Lords reform in 1910/11; Welfare Reforms in the 1940s; equal rights legislation in the 1960s and 1970s). Did these occur because of pressure groups and their ability to mobilise opinion or because of parliamentary and political pressures or general shifts in public opinion? The Suffragettes could be a good example to take – did they help or hinder the cause of votes for women? Other test cases selected might be the relative importance of the Dagenham women strikers in the 1970s in persuading the Labour government to move on equal pay issues. Was it already on Labour’s agenda? The 1918 Reform Act could be seen as the product of Liberal and Labour pressure, the propaganda of wartime cohesion or simply the political calculations of Lloyd George’s Coalition government? Was outside pressure an issue at this point? Earlier examples could be Joe Chamberlain’s Education League or Nonconformist pressure on a variety of civil equality issues. The Trade Unions would be a useful example to take across the period – from their role in pushing for Union rights in the 1870s, their 1<sup>st</sup> World War deals with government over labour practices, their pressure for mining reform in the 1920s, the Jarrow Marchers attempt to persuade the National Government to change economic and social policy and Trades Union pressure in general on economic and social policy from 1926 to the 1980s. It might be noted that they were able to apply pressure both within and through parliament given their sponsorship of Labour MPs from 1900.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
17	<p>The argument that regional politics were less important after 1918 could be made with reference to the importance of Wales, Scotland and Ireland to the Liberal party and its dominance in the pre 1918 period (1868–1886 and 1905–1916) and to the Labour party after 1918. Ulster was important to the Conservatives from 1886–1905 and again in the 1910 period and beyond. Candidates could examine why those areas became identified with the two parties – in Wales, from 1868, a rebellion against Conservative squire and parson which Gladstone’s plural vision embraced; in Scotland a continuing Whig tradition which rejected Conservatism as an English party; in Ireland a Liberal association with the Irish Nationalists under Parnell and Redmond which saw them as the handmaidens of Liberalism throughout the 1868–1918 period, despite occasional dalliances with the Conservatives in 1885–6. In English terms the nonconformist hold on many northern towns helped the Liberals (local press; temperance etc) and local government via the caucus was useful for whosoever could exploit it (Chamberlain’s Birmingham). However it could be argued that regional politics remained important after 1918. Scotland became important for the Conservatives until Thatcher as it did for Labour until Blair. Wales became a Labour stronghold from 1908. Ulster could usually be relied upon for the Conservatives. In much diminished form Scotland retained some important seats for the Liberals, as did the West Country. Again candidates could identify the reasons for this. The argument that regional politics was less important (both before and after 1918) is that national parties had emerged by 1868 and that English dominance in the Commons would always determine electoral outcome. The rise of class allegiance over regional identity was gradual but very obvious post 1900. It explained why Labour came to have such a hold in the Scottish industrial lowlands (Red Clydeside), the South Welsh coalmines and the industrial cities of Lancashire and Yorkshire (minus Liverpool before 1945) and why Conservatism dominated the suburbs, rural areas and southern England. The loss of Ireland outside Ulster from 1918 helps to explain Liberal collapse, as does the decline of Northern nonconformity. The rise of a national press as opposed to a regional one, a national radio and TV service after 1922 and 1945 respectively also eroded regional political loyalties.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
18	<p>A variety of arguments are possible here. It is likely that many candidates will argue that Unions helped democracy up to the early 20<sup>th</sup> century (to 1926? to 1945?) but then were perceived by more and more as an unelected power challenging elected democratic government, particularly from 1950 to the early 1980s. Up to 1926 they pushed for legal equality, were seen as forces for stability and the socialisation of the working man (but not the working woman), campaigned for better conditions, shorter hours and better pay in a widening set of industries (from skilled engineers to the New Unions of the 1880s) and became involved in politics via Liberalism and then independent labour in the 1890s. They had become a major force by the Triple Alliance of 1913 and negotiated with government in the 1<sup>st</sup> World War. After the war they continued to champion fairness of sacrifice in the 1920s and 1930s (mines and then railways) and played a huge role in the 2<sup>nd</sup> World War. At that point the TUC negotiated directly with Conservative and Labour governments on national pay (beer and sandwiches in Number 10). Their control of key industries (mining, transport, iron and steel and cars) via shop stewards and the use of strikes, primary and secondary, gave them great power in an era of mid century economic growth and labour shortage that was only half heartedly challenged by Barbara Castle in the 1970s and by Heath in the early 1970s. Thatcher saw them as obstacles to economic democracy in the 1980s and acted accordingly. <b>However</b> candidates can challenge this view using examples from across the period. Pre 1914 the Unions remained reluctant to get involved in democratic issues and Labour politics. They were led by men who were reluctant to do anything about the unskilled residuum (as Tillet pointed out) and women (as Besant pointed out). Unions remained undemocratic in their structures. Post 1918 the Unions conspired to remove women from work and there is an alternative view of the General Strike – that of the government and much middle class opinion – that the Miners sought political and syndicalist conflict. Post 1945 and especially in the 1980s there were conflicting views on how far the Unions attempted to dragoon their members and how far some deliberately sought conflict with the Conservative governments of Heath and Thatcher. Certainly the Union reforms of the 1980s removed many of the privileges/rights gained in the 1870s on the grounds that they were undemocratic.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</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](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)**

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations  
is a Company Limited by Guarantee  
Registered in England  
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU  
Registered Company Number: 3484466  
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)  
Head office  
Telephone: 01223 552552  
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2013

