

GCE

History A

Unit **F966/02**: Historical Themes Option B: Modern 1789–1997

Advanced GCE

Mark Scheme for June 2016

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 2016

Annotations and abbreviations

Annotation	Meaning
BP	Blank Page – this annotation must be used on all blank pages within an answer booklet (structured or unstructured) and on each page of an additional object where there is no candidate response.
F	Factor or Theme
DET	Description/Narrative
E	Continuity/Change
X	Error/wrong
S	Synthesis
AN	Analysis
EXP	Explains
SC	Simple comment, basic
A	Assertion
J	Judgement
IRRL	Irrelevant or not answering the Question
EVAL	Evaluation

AOs	AO1a	AO1b
Total mark for each question = 60	Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.	Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of: <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
Level IA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a wide range of accurate and relevant evidence • Accurate and confident use of appropriate historical terminology • Answer is clearly structured and coherent; communicates accurately and legibly. <p style="text-align: center;">18-20</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent understanding of key concepts (eg continuity and change) relevant to analysis in their historical context • Excellent synthesis and synoptic assessment • Answer is consistently and relevantly analytical with developed explanations and supported judgements • May make unexpected but substantiated connections over the whole period <p style="text-align: center;">36-40</p>
Level IB	<p>Level IB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses accurate and relevant evidence • Accurate use of a range of appropriate historical terminology • Answer is clearly structured and mostly coherent; communicates accurately and legibly <p style="text-align: center;">16-17</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very good level of understanding of key concepts (eg continuity and change) in their historical context. • Answer is consistently focused on the question set • Very good level of explanation/analysis, and provides supported judgements. • Very good synthesis and synoptic assessment of the whole period <p style="text-align: center;">32-35</p>

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

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

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
1	<p>‘No one else managed German nationalism as successfully as Metternich.’ How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1789 to 1919?</p> <p>In favour of this view, candidates may argue that from 1815 to 1848 the nationalist movement in Germany was too weak to challenge the Metternich System effectively: this demonstrates Metternich’s effective control over German nationalism. At the Congress of Vienna Metternich’s diplomacy had helped ensure that Austria’s status in the German Confederation had been strengthened. Examples of Metternich then ensuring that he controlled German nationalism could include his use of the Carlsbad Decrees in 1819 to outlaw the Burschenschaften and increase government regulation of the universities and the censorship of German newspapers. Despite occasional incidents such as at Hambach in 1832, the Metternich system kept German nationalism under control until 1848.</p> <p>When arguing against this view candidates are likely to argue that Metternich’s control over German nationalism failed completely in 1848. However it can be argued that his fall and resignation in Austria in March had everything to do with the revolutionary situation in Vienna and nothing to do with German nationalists. Candidates may draw comparisons with Napoleon, Bismarck and William II. All three had different aims and circumstances, enabling candidates to make convincing cases for all of them as successful managers of German nationalism.</p> <p>In supporting the case for Napoleon candidates are likely to argue that by 1806 the defeat of Prussia, the creation of the Confederation of the Rhine and rewarding the southern German states with spoils from the Habsburg Empire was successful management. Napoleon gave Germans a taste of unity. He introduced a common legal system making trade easier between the states. He gave the state control over church and education, reduced landowner power and gave more say to workers and the poor. However candidates are likely to argue that Napoleon was not the most successful manager of German nationalism because the strong nationalism that was stirred up to drive him out helped strengthen the sense of a common German identity and common goals.</p> <p>Candidates may argue for Bismarck because of his critical role in the 1860s in the creation of the Second Reich, arguing he managed German nationalism by hijacking the nationalist cause for Prussia’s ends. His crucial role in unification and development of the Reich may well be considered successful management of German nationalism.</p> <p>In discussing the case for William II candidates may argue that his search for world power was populist, building on the development of radical nationalism. Mass-nationalism distracted sufficient Germans from social, economic and political issues and represented successful management of German nationalism. However the ultimate outcome of William II’s search for world power was defeat in the Great War and humiliation for the German nation at Versailles.</p>	60	<p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>Stronger answers will consider both sides of the proposition and may define 'successfully'. Candidates must compare Metternich's management of German nationalism with that of other rulers and leaders in this period. Such an approach, with regular synoptic comparisons between different ministers and rulers throughout the essay, should be rewarded in the higher levels for AO1b. Candidates are likely to focus comparisons on Napoleon, Bismarck and William II. They may choose to consider others but they must not be expected to do so.</p>		

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
2	<p>'The reasons for the growth of German nationalism changed in the period from 1789 to 1919.' How far do you agree with this view?</p> <p>In favour of this view, candidates may argue that changes in circumstances meant the reasons for the growth of German nationalism evolved considerably from 1789 to 1919. For example they may cite the origins of German nationalism being stimulated in the Napoleonic period and as a consequence of the impact on Germany of the Congress of Vienna. Candidates may explain how a growing sense of unity among Germans developed as a consequence of foreign domination. Some may argue this reason came to the fore again in 1918 and 1919 when defeat in the First World War and humiliation at Versailles led to many Germans uniting as a nation in their hatred of the 'diktat'.</p> <p>Candidates may argue that intellectual nationalism was an important driver of the growth of German nationalism in the first half of the Nineteenth Century. Liberalism offered an intellectual basis for unification by challenging the status quo and absolutism; German liberals emphasised the linguistic and cultural unity of German peoples. Candidates may demonstrate understanding of the impact of the debate about Grossdeutschland or Kleindeutschland on the growth of German nationalism.</p> <p>Candidates may argue that industrialisation had a significant impact on the growth of German nationalism, for example, because of the Zollverein after 1834 or the development of railways. Candidates may argue economic power and consequent military strength led to Prussian dominance over Germany which in turn limited the growth of German nationalism through establishment of a Kleindeutschland in 1871.</p> <p>Candidates may see Bismarck as playing a pivotal role in changing the course of German nationalism after 1860 ensuring that a militaristic and autocratic 'Prussianised' Germany emerged rather than a liberal Germany. Candidates may also explain the impact of William II on the development of mass-nationalism and its appeal in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.</p> <p>When arguing against this view candidates are likely to argue that the core aim of German nationalists, the creation and development of a united German nation, remained the same throughout this period and that this was the most important reason for the growth of German nationalism in this period. Candidates may argue that although events, developments and leaders all had an undeniable impact on the evolution of German nationalism, the desire of the German people to unite and their sense of German nationhood was the main reason for the growth of German nationalism in this period.</p> <p>Stronger answers will consider both sides of the proposition. The strongest responses will adopt a thematic approach, comparing how various reasons contributed to the growth of German nationalism during this period. Such an approach, with regular synoptic comparisons between different reasons throughout the essay, should be rewarded in the higher levels for AO1b. Candidates are likely to focus on the origins of nationalism under Napoleon and other factors such as intellectual forces, economic forces, military force and the contributions of individuals such as Bismarck and William II.</p>	60	<p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
3	<p>Assess the view that the German people were never united during the period 1789 to 1919.</p> <p>Many candidates are likely to consider the extent to which the German people were united territorially. They may well argue that all the German people were never united territorially / geographically. However, they may argue that earlier in the period the German people achieved a form of unity through Napoleon's creation of the Confederation of the Rhine. The German people were certainly divided from 1815 as a consequence of the Congress of Vienna, though candidates may argue that the German Confederation from 1815 loosely bound most Germans into a Confederation with a Diet. Candidates may also argue that the German people became more territorially united from 1866 and then 1870 under the leadership of Prussia. They could certainly argue the German Empire from 1871 physically united the majority of Germans. Candidates may also make the point that from 1866 the vast majority of German people were united behind the leadership of Prussia. Candidates may understand that the Prussian Empire in 1871 represented Kleindeutschland - an enlarged Prussia - rather than a united Germany. They may argue that it was a Prussian Empire rather than a German Empire; it certainly did not unite all the German people even geographically. The exclusion of Austria from the process of German unification may be dealt with, though candidates may refer to Bismarck's creation of the Dual Alliance as significant. Nevertheless the German people in Austria were not united in the German Empire from 1871.</p> <p>If considering political unity, candidates are likely to see the divisions between liberal and conservative nationalists, which were evident throughout the majority of this period, as significant. Examples would include during the revolutions of 1848-49 and in the 1860s. They may well argue that the industrialisation of Germany spawned the rise of socialism which led to further disunity during the reign of Kaiser William II. The rise of socialism may well be considered if candidates choose to focus on either social or economic unity, as evidence that the emergence of an industrial working class was divisive. Some may argue that populist foreign policy and the development of more radical nationalism in the reign of William II suggests that for many working class Germans the attractions of German nationalism weighed more heavily than the appeal of class politics.</p> <p>Candidates may argue that the First World War united the German people at first but divisions were entrenched by 1918. Although Versailles divided Germans geographically it then united them in condemnation of the 'diktat'.</p> <p>Arguments based around religion are likely to concentrate on the differences between Catholic and Protestant Germans – and may therefore also feature on Austria and Prussia too. Many candidates may choose the Kulturkampf as a significant example to suggest that religion divided the German people during this period.</p>	60	<p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>Although candidates may argue that continuing political and religious differences meant Germans were never entirely united they may argue the creation of the Reich was of immense significance for the German people.</p> <p>The strongest responses will adopt a thematic approach, based upon different types of unity, for example political, territorial, religious, social and economic. They will structure their essays around these different types of unity and how each impacted upon the unity of the German people. Such an approach, with regular synoptic comparisons between different factors throughout the essay, should be rewarded in the higher levels for AO1b. Others are likely to structure the essay chronologically considering the extent to which Germans were united at various points. This approach is likely to be more successful if comparisons are made throughout the essay than if they are largely left to the conclusion.</p>		

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
4	<p>‘There was considerable change in military strategy.’ How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1792 to 1945?</p> <p>Indicative content will probably be a mixture of discussion of strategic principles – see over – along with specific examples of strategic activity. With regard to the former they might refer to the work of military theorists, the two obvious examples would be Clausewitz and/or Jomini.</p> <p>Candidates will probably engage indicative content by discussing potential points of change during the period under study. Of course, the reality of these potential points of change is a clear point for debate.</p> <p>For the Revolutionary and Napoleonic period they might point to the use of more flexible strategic options such as rapid envelopment, movement and the use of surprise. Candidates might point to the development of the strategic battle and the resulting blurring of the line between strategy and tactics. Good examples might be the run up to Lodi, Ulm, Jena or any battle where massed reinforcements arrived.</p> <p>In the middle part of the 19th century candidates might use the developments of the Prussian general staff and the use of the Kesselschlacht in the wars of 1866 and 1870-71. The Italian War of 1859 is a good example of the rapid concentration of force by the French coupled with strategies very similar to those used by Napoleon once the French army was in theatre. This period also saw the development and use of developments in transportation to move masses of troops on a continental scale via the use of railways and naval power. For the former any of the Wars of Unification or the American Civil War are valid examples, for the latter a good example is the Crimean War. The Russo-Japanese War is also a good example of developments in transport and its application to strategy.</p> <p>The First World War will probably be divided into the two fronts with novel strategic options being employed in the West and more traditional strategies in the East. The latter has obvious parallels with the wars of the middle 19th century. The former can either be seen as a reaction to a novel strategic situation with a series of gambits failing to achieve objectives or can be fitted into a general argument that all strategy remained the same.</p> <p>The Second World War will probably be used in two ways. Firstly, as an argument for the use of the new strategy of blitzkrieg. Note that this strategic option might arguably only have been used by Germany in France in 1940 and that in the East they followed options that would have been very familiar to Moltke the Elder or even Napoleon.</p> <p>For the wars of the twentieth century examiners should allow arguments based on air strategy, for example the strategic bombing of the Second World War.</p>	60	<p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>Candidates must discuss strategy rather than tactics. It might be valid to include the latter when strategy had an impact on tactics. One approach would be to summarise strategic principles such as concentration of force, maintenance of aim, methods of manoeuvre, etc. The candidate might then use specific examples to argue a case for or against. At the highest level an argument that the principles and form of strategy are constant is a very strong one. Alternatively, candidates might argue that these principles of strategy are not constants and that in reality other factors – such as developments in technology – changed the nature of strategy at different points in the time period. They might then prove their case by giving reasons why. Responses might link other factors to strategy such as the talents of individual generals, the nature of the theatre of given wars or the size of wars in chronological or geographic terms.</p>		

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
5	<p>‘Developments in the organisation of armies significantly changed the nature of battle.’ To what extent do you agree with this view of warfare in the period 1792 to 1945?</p> <p>The indicative content should be deployed into the response to link changes and developments in the organisation of armies with the conduct of battle.</p> <p>At the start of the period armies of the Ancien Regime were organised into regiments which were, in turn, grouped into divisions – often on an ad hoc basis. This created problems both deploying armies rapidly and effectively on to the battlefield and then controlling them. Often army commanders controlled individual regiments. Revolutionary France changed the structure of its armies grouping divisions into corps which became effectively all arms ‘mini-armies’ with infantry, cavalry and artillery components. This trend continued into the Napoleonic period with the addition of a substantial reserve in the form of the Imperial Guard and the concentration of heavy cavalry into a single masse de manoeuvre by 1805. This organisational change arguably changed the nature of battle significantly creating a deeper battlefield, consigning linear warfare to the past and allowing army commanders to delegate control to lower command echelons within this more flexible structure. The allied powers – with the exception of Britain – followed suit. By 1809 Austria was using army corps, Russia by 1812 and Prussia by 1813. Arguably these developments were significant in the development of what has been termed impulse warfare.</p> <p>Napoleon also created the first army staff with the Grand Quartier-General. This allowed greatly increased the effectiveness of his leadership on the battlefield. Arguably this advantage was lost in very large actions such as at Leipzig in 1813.</p> <p>In the middle part of the period from the end of the Napoleonic Wars to the outbreak of the First World War all European armies – with arguably the exception of the allied forces fighting in the Crimea – used the corps system. New developments were the introduction of more sophisticated staff organisations at the army level to control the increasing numbers of soldiers fighting in the battles of the mid-century – examples being Koniggratz and Solferino. The Prussians led this development. Arguably, however, the battles of this period had a far more linear appearance than those of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic period. This trend can also be seen in the battles of the American Civil War and the Russo-Japanese War. In both of these wars cavalry became less important due to the developments in weapons technology.</p> <p>The First World War saw the organisational structures of armies placed under great strain as the novel conditions of the conflict created serious challenges of command and control. Examiners should be flexible about the definition of battle from 1914 onwards, fronts were larger and battles in the 20th century had a very different aspect than those of the 19th. Communications technology and its development now assumes real importance, also staff planning – which often failed in the face of the demands of the new military</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>environment. Higher formations in the form of army groups composed of several corps became commonplace.</p> <p>The developments in military organisation in the Second World War were in reaction to the size of battles – like Kursk or Normandy – and the complexity of military formations created by the introduction of armoured formations. By the end of the war the only truly mechanized armies were those of the Western Allies. Although the USSR and Germany possessed powerful armoured formations they were outnumbered by infantry divisions that were little different from those of the 19th century. In this period the army group became commonplace and communications technology became vital to military planning and the conduct of battle.</p> <p>One line of debate is to argue an emphatic yes, organisational development were bound to change the nature of battle. Candidates could then point to the radically different approaches to battle of Napoleon as opposed to his opponents until the Austrian campaign of 1809. Across the piece candidate could also argue that organisation developments – and the associated developments in communications technology – allowed battles to get bigger. With the exception of the Crimean War there is a very good case that without better systems of control the increasing size of battles would have been impossible, good examples to compare would Leipzig, Solferino and Mukden. Evidence from the 20th century might be used to reinforce this line due to the sheer size - geographic and regarding the numbers involved – of First and Second World War battles. Further, the added complexity of armies with a multiplication of types of weapons systems further placed organisation at the core of the development of the shape of battle.</p> <p>It would be difficult to argue an emphatic no to the question, but a more balanced approach is certainly possible. In this approach the argument would be that organisational development significantly changed the nature of battle at the beginning – up to 1815 – and the end of the period, perhaps from 1914 onwards.</p> <p>This line would argue that the circumstances of war at the start and the end of the period led to rapid changes in organisation which gave one side significant advantage and, hence, changed the nature of battle. This argument could be applied to France's use of impulse warfare to 1809 and to the to and fro development of the First World War as each side modified organisations to deal with the changing nature of the battlefield. The same can be applied to the Second World War as armies modified military organisation to cope with the developments in armoured warfare. In the latter period better responses might be expected to link other developments, especially weapons technology, to these developments.</p> <p>The central part of the period, however, might be argued to resemble the linear warfare of the Ancien Regime – compare shape of the battles of the Alma, Solferino and Liaoyang with that of the layout of any Ancien Regime army up to 1809 and the similarities are obvious. The argument might be that organisational</p>		

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	changes could not compensate for other developments – especially weapons technology – and that battles reverted back to the linear form seen at the start of the period. Indeed, candidates might argue that this occurred earlier, proof being the linear warfare used by the British in the Napoleonic Wars.		

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
6	<p>To what extent did the use of superior weapons bring about success in battle in the period from 1792 to 1945?</p> <p>During the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars the weapons technology deployed onto the battlefield by the different combatant armies was essentially the same. Logically, therefore, any indicative content selected from this part of the course might be expected to be deployed to disprove the question.</p> <p>From the Crimean War onwards the issue of the impact of weapons technology on battles becomes more important. Such developments increased the effectiveness and lethality of both small arms and artillery.</p> <p>By the Crimean War the combination of the use of the percussion cap and Minié technology had produced small arms with a far greater range and reliability than before. In this war the French and the British had the technological edge. The 1859 Italian War saw both sides using this technology, but with a greater preponderance on the French side. The Austro-Prussian and Franco-Prussian War saw rapid developments in both small arms and artillery with the balance rapidly changing in both. In the former the Austrians had better artillery and a longer ranged muzzle loader – the Lorenz – which was balanced by the more rapid firing breech loading Prussian needle gun. In the latter, the Prussians had better artillery with the French using the first modern breech-loader – the Chassepot – together with the first machine guns – the Mitrailleuse.</p> <p>The American Civil War and Russo-Japanese War once again had a balance of technology on both sides, with the Japanese more readily accepting the machine gun in the latter conflict.</p> <p>Indicative content drawn from the 20th century will probably point to a greater range of weapons above and beyond small arms and artillery – although for the latter increasingly sophisticated use of indirect fire might feature in responses. Examples might be developments in armoured vehicles, anti-tank weapons and aircraft.</p> <p>The question specifically points to the impact of weapons technology on battles and their outcome. Weaker responses might engage this by listing battles; such responses will not engage the synoptic aspect of the mark scheme. Better responses will examine the issues in the question pitching weapons technology to other factors and circumstances. Examiners might expect responses to point to specific points of change within the time period under discussion. They may also expect the balance of the impact of weapons technology vis a vis other factors to change at different points in the period.</p>	60	<p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
7	<p>‘The defeat of the Home Rule Bill of 1886 was the main turning point for Constitutional Nationalism in the period from 1798 to 1921.’ How far do you agree with this view?</p> <p>The focus of the question is on the pattern of Constitutional Nationalism’s development, in particular whether the Home Rule Bill of 1886 was the main turning point in this. Candidates might trace this as a chequered progress, from the narrow patriot nationalism of Grattan in the 1790s, the focus on first Catholic Emancipation in the 1820s and then the slow development of repeal (the 1840s) through external pressure and, from 1830, internal parliamentary pressure to the triumph of a Home Rule Bill in 1886. From there candidates might detect signs of decline up to 1918. Was the Home Rule Bill of 1886 the main turning point in engineering the collapse of Constitutional Nationalism? Candidates may consider the impact of the defeat of the Bill, they may consider Ulster and its attitude, Liberal Unionism and Conservatism and how their attitudes impacted on Constitutional Nationalism. Candidates might consider that other turning points were of greater importance, either in terms of success or failure – Parnell’s divorce case and the divisions of the 1890s could be seen to foreshadow decline, whilst the key turning point for its development in the earlier period was the collapse of Grattan’s patriot nationalism in the wake of Wolfe Tone’s rising and the loss of the Ascendency parliament in 1800. The extra parliamentary success of O’Connell’s Catholic Association and the long term significance of emancipation for the party, capturing the Roman Catholic tenant votes as they became enfranchised from 1850 onwards, was important. A major turning point in Constitutional Nationalism’s fortunes came under Parnell who created a formidable political machine in the late 1870s. The Irish Parliamentary Party thus became the supreme focus of Constitutional Nationalism from 1874 to 1918, both in Ireland and at Westminster, pressurising governments over land legislation, obstructing Westminster and ultimately sweeping the board in 1886, enabling Gladstone’s conversion to Home Rule. It even managed an accommodation with revolutionary nationalism in the form of the Land League. Redmond’s flawed strategy post 1914 of support for the war, his commitment of the Irish Volunteers on unequal terms with Ulster Volunteers to the British Army and his failure to gain a commitment to a temporary Ulster exclusion from Home Rule rather than a permanent one, all suggest the war posed insurmountable problems for Constitutional Nationalism. The conscription crisis was especially damaging. It compelled Dillon to withdraw his MPs from Westminster in protest and align with Sinn Fein, appearing to merely follow their rival’s strategy. Losing by-elections and then, catastrophically, the 1918 general election, might also suggest this. However candidates might question whether this collapse was the result of the war. Constitutional Nationalism had been complacent from the 1890s and Sinn Fein had begun to win locally before 1914. DeValera and Collins moved to control the new pre-war paramilitaries. Candidates might also refer to the 1918 election itself. Although disastrous in terms of the loss of Constitutional Nationalism MPs the number voting for Sinn Fein was not as impressive as it seemed (48%). More important might be a failure to appeal to the new electorate created in 1918. Thus other key moments could be stressed in the pattern of Constitutional Nationalism’s development, but no set answer is expected.</p>	60	<p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
8	<p>To what extent was the Home Rule crisis of 1912-1914 the most significant event in the development of Unionism in Ireland in the period from 1798 to 1921?</p> <p>The focus here is on Unionism as a whole – both Southern Unionism (the Protestant Ascendancy-PA) and Ulster Unionism. The case for the significance of the Third Home Rule crisis is that it clearly polarised the two Unionist groups. Although the Ulsterisation of Unionism had begun before 1912 (in reaction to the first two Home Rule Bills of 1886 and 1893 and the devolution crisis of 1904), the 1912-14 crisis saw a change of aim, from preserving an all-Ireland Union to moving towards a de facto partition. This was formally considered by Ulster Unionists in 1916, but was implicit in the demands for permanent exclusion from Home Rule in 1912. It also crystallised a new paramilitary approach – the UVF, the Larne Gun running incident and the mobilisation of Protestant Ulster. However in opposition to this candidates could point to Ulster's organisation from 1886 – the electoral triumph of Parnell's Constitutional nationalists had foreshadowed the focus of Unionist MPs on Ulster, whilst the economic argument for industrial Belfast was being made as early as the 1830s (by Cooke). The Ulster Unionist Council, the organisational basis of Ulster Unionism, was a response to the devolution crisis of 1904. Before 1886 Unionism was becoming more Protestant rather than all-Ireland as Protestants reacted to what they saw as the Roman Catholic successes of Constitutional Nationalism (Emancipation in 1829, Disestablishment in 1869). For Southern Unionism the most significant events were the political erosion of power after 1868 and the changes to their landed power in the face of bitter landlord –tenant relationships (the Land War) and changing government policy on first land tenure and then purchase (1870-1909). For Unionism both North and South it could be argued that the key shock was Gladstone's conversion to Home Rule. Before 1886 Unionism was dominated by an existing landed ruling class, the Protestant Ascendancy. They operated through the mainland parties and were buttressed by a narrow political system with a restricted and controllable electorate. The only shock to this had been the abolition of Grattan's Parliament in 1800 but they soon adjusted to Westminster, operating through Irish Toryism and liberalism. The next significant event here was the widening national (1850, 1867, 1884 Reform Acts) and local electorate from 1898, which they could no longer control. Thus for Southern Unionism events and processes before 1912-14 were more significant, but for Ulster Unionism 1886 and 1912-14 were crucial. More effective answers will see the connection between the two.</p>	60	<p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
9	<p>‘The Irish economy changed little in the period from 1798 to 1921.’ How far do you agree with this view?</p> <p>The focus is the question of a pattern in the Irish economy. Did it remain an essentially agrarian economy throughout the period, characterised by under investment, overcrowded and underdeveloped in the west, largely pre-industrial and artisan in its industry, dependent on the export of its labour to sustain small scale farming, and potato dependent for its sustenance or is this too generalised a description? To support this ‘unchanging’ view, candidates might look at the patterns of agricultural depression which reinforced this, particularly the depression which followed the end of the Napoleonic Wars in 1815 and the great depression of the late 1870s and 1880s. They could also look at emigration patterns which were merely speeded up by the Great Famine of post-1845. Most of Ireland was rural and the social structure remained relatively unchanging throughout, with the exception of the destruction of the cottier class in the 1840s and the consolidation of the middling to small Catholic tenants in the second half of the period. They might assess the extent of the economic and land reforms attempted by the government in the 1870s and 1880s (which attempted to stimulate tenant self-improvement) and in the 1890s pointing to their relative failure to address the economic improvement of land and the under-development of the West of Ireland. However it is possible to argue that in some areas there was considerable change, not least in population and in terms of industrial patterns. The linen industry changed considerably up to the 1840s, then declined in the face of mechanised competition from Yorkshire. An engineering and shipbuilding industry emerged in the middle of the 19th century in Belfast and the city, to all intents, became part of the North West industrial triangle, importing its coal from Scotland and Lancashire. Its economic outlook (free trade) became different to the rest of Ireland. Dublin also developed (brewing and light engineering). Other cities remained dependent on agrarian industries (Cork). In agriculture there was considerable change, especially in the central belts and the east, where larger estates were able, from the 1830s, to move from grains to pastoral farming, responding to demands from the urban populations of the mainland. The middle years of the century (1849-1873) saw relative prosperity return to larger and middling estates whilst the stimulus of war, 1798-1815, and 1914-1918, revived the agrarian economy and employed surplus Irish labour. The period thus saw considerable change across regions and periods and candidates need to be able to discuss these against the assertion in the question. No set conclusion is expected.</p>	60	<p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
10	<p>'Russia's rulers had little effect on solving the problems of Russian society.' How far do you agree with this view of Russia in the period from 1855 to 1964?</p> <p>Candidates who consider Russia's hierarchical class system up to 1917 are very likely to argue that the Tsars had little impact because they did not want to change this. However candidates may argue that Alexander II's abolition of serfdom was a very important step on the road to an eventually much more classless society. Candidates are likely to argue that Lenin had a great deal of impact in this area citing the total erosion of the power of the previous landowning nobility in Lenin's Russia. Some may argue that one class system was replaced by another in which members of the Communist Party became the new aristocracy but undeniably the old social order was gone.</p> <p>In terms of rural poverty, some candidates may argue that little impact was achieved as the peasantry entered this period of history enserfed and ended it as impoverished collective farmers. However others may argue that within the period there were times when individual rulers did impact on the problem of rural poverty, for example after 1905 in the reign of Nicholas II or from 1921 under Lenin.</p> <p>Candidates who consider urban living and working conditions may agree that Russia's rulers had little effect on solving this problem as grim living and working conditions for the urban proletariat were the norm. However some may argue that Lenin did enable some improvements through the NEP, though it is likely they may counter-balance this with depictions of grim realities during War Communism. They are also likely to argue that there was too little time for the NEP to do much more than scratch the surface of this problem before Stalin introduced the Five Year Plans. Candidates may also argue Khrushchev had some impact on this problem through de-Stalinisation and the introduction of more consumer goods into the Russian economy.</p> <p>Stalin may be given credit for doing most in terms of providing the Russian peoples with improved education – though some may temper this argument with the fact that Russians under Stalin were certainly more literate but were largely only able to be taught or read Stalinist propaganda.</p> <p>Candidates may argue that Lenin was the only ruler to have a significant impact on gender equality – but may suggest the impact was limited as reversed under Stalin.</p> <p>Answers should consider both sides of the proposition and are likely to define the problems of Russian society. The strongest responses will adopt a thematic approach, considering problems of Russian society such as the class system, rural poverty, gender inequality, inadequate education, the lack of freedom and urban squalor. Such an approach, with regular synoptic comparisons between different rulers throughout the essay, should be rewarded in the higher levels for AO1b. Others are likely to structure the essay around the various rulers of Russia, perhaps arguing that some rulers' policies had more effect on solving the problems of Russian society than others did. This approach is likely to be more successful if comparisons are made throughout the essay than if they are largely left to the conclusion.</p>	60	<p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
11	<p>‘Lenin changed the nature of Russian government more than any other Russian ruler.’ How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1855 to 1964?</p> <p>Candidates may argue in support of the view in the question because Lenin’s reforms involved in the introduction of Bolshevik dictatorship were responsible for preventing the transition to constitutional democracy that might have developed if the Provisional Government had not been overthrown in 1917. His closure of the Constituent Assembly in January 1918 and establishment of a one party state may be seen as particularly significant, as may his banning of factions within the Communist Party in 1922. Candidates may suggest that Lenin’s reforms enabled the communists to have the power and authority that latter-day Tsars (despite autocracy and divine right), were unable to achieve. Candidates may also focus on his victory in the Civil War and crushing of the Kronstadt Revolt as evidence Lenin’s impact on the nature of government.</p> <p>However, candidates may well see the reforms of other rulers as having made significant impacts on the nature of Russian government. These may include the establishment of Zemstva and its impact on local government under Alexander II, the restoration of central authority / autocracy under Alexander III during the ‘Reaction’, the establishment of the Duma in 1905 under Nicholas II and de-Stalinisation under Khrushchev.</p> <p>Candidates may choose to argue that Stalin’s reforms had a greater impact on Russian government than Lenin’s reforms did. In support of this they may suggest that although Lenin built the foundations of communist authoritarianism it was Stalin who utterly transformed the nature of Russian government through his imposition of ruthless policies and reforms. Such candidates are likely to cite the purges, show trials and terror as evidence and to suggest that in his willingness to persecute and exterminate fellow communists in single-minded pursuit of personal power, the extent and impact of his reforms was greater than Lenin’s.</p> <p>Candidates might argue that the real nature of Russian government remained autocratic / dictatorial throughout most of this period of history except whilst the Provisional Government were ‘in power’ in 1917.</p> <p>If candidates stray from discussing the impact of reform on the nature of government to discuss the impact of reform on other aspects such as the economy or society they should not be credited for this. Candidates may argue either for or against the impact of reform on the nature of Russian government being greater under Lenin than any other ruler, but they must do so comparatively, contrasting the impact of Lenin’s reforms with the impact of reforms of Russia’s other rulers in this period. The strongest responses will adopt a thematic approach, considering the extent and impact of reform on specific aspects of Russian government such as change and continuity in central and local administration, methods of repression and enforcement, the fate of opposition and changes in ideology across the period. Such an approach is likely to enable them to make regular synoptic comparisons between the extent and impact of reforms of different rulers throughout the essay. Other candidates may adopt a chronological or ‘reign by reign’ approach. This approach is likely to be more successful if comparisons are made throughout the essay than if they are largely left to the conclusion.</p>	60	<p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
12	<p>‘The main aim of Russian rulers was to strengthen their power.’ How far do you agree with this view of the domestic policies of Russian rulers in the period from 1855 to 1964?</p> <p>When agreeing with the view candidates may argue that after the October Revolution of 1917, and facing counter-revolution, consolidating his power was certainly Lenin’s main priority in the period up to the defeat of the Kronstadt Rising in 1921. Similarly they may argue that Alexander III’s main aim after the assassination of his father was the restoration of his autocratic power through the ‘Reaction’. Equally candidates may argue that, faced with the 1905 Revolution, Nicholas II’s main aim at that point was to restore his power and authority. Many candidates may see consolidating his personal power as Stalin’s main aim after winning the power struggle after Lenin’s death – indeed many may see the purges, show trials and terror of the 1930s as proof that this aim dominated much of his period in power. Consolidating his power after out-manoeuvring his rivals after Stalin’s death may also be seen as key to Khrushchev up to 1955 or 1956.</p> <p>However candidates may argue that for some rulers, consolidating their personal power was never their main aim. These candidates are likely to cite the Provisional Government – perhaps arguing that introducing constitutional democracy was their main priority. Although there is general agreement that Alexander II was anxious to maintain his personal autocratic, power candidates are likely to argue that becoming Tsar at the end of the Crimean War his main aim was to modernise – probably citing the Emancipation Edict and subsequent reforms as evidence.</p> <p>Candidates may also argue that even during the reigns of those rulers who sometimes prioritised consolidating their power, this was not always their main aim. For example candidates are as likely to see Lenin’s main aim as the establishment of Bolshevism / communism as well as the consolidation of his own power. Even though Alexander III certainly prioritised the re-consolidation of autocratic authority, candidates may see increasing Russia’s military might as the main aim once he felt secure – perhaps citing his support for Witte’s industrial reforms despite his reactionary views and innate preference for the status quo. Equally many candidates will see military might as Stalin’s key aim and cite the Five Year Plans and collectivisation in support of their arguments.</p> <p>Candidates may well see other factors such as the impact of reforms and the personalities of the rulers as playing an influential role on the development of Russian government. Stronger answers will consider both sides of the proposition and are likely to also consider the other common aims of Russia’s rulers in this period. The strongest responses will adopt a thematic approach, considering various aims such as industrialisation and modernisation, improving agriculture, developing military might and their consolidation of personal power. Such an approach, with regular synoptic comparisons between different rulers throughout the essay, should be rewarded in the higher levels for AO1b. Some candidates may argue that</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	consolidating their own power was a key priority for many of Russia's rulers at some point in their reigns but that other aims became the main priority at other times. Other candidates are likely to structure the essay around the various rulers of Russia, perhaps arguing that some rulers' policies showed prioritised consolidating their own power more than others did. This approach is likely to be more successful if comparisons are made throughout the essay than if they are largely left to the conclusion.		

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
13	<p>Assess the view that the activities of the Black Panthers did more than any other factor to hinder the progress of African American civil rights in the period from 1865 to 1992.</p> <p>Candidates should be aware of the ideas of the Black Power movement and how these might have obstructed the progress of African American civil rights. They might consider the impact of the rejection of non-violence, the concept of Black Supremacy and its impact and the demand for radical social change. The Black Panthers, founded in Oakland, California, in 1966 by Huey P. Newton and Bobby Seale, were among the best-known activists of the Black Power movement, which emerged in the wake of the Watts Riots of 1965. Combining black nationalism with Marxism, the Panthers rejected the integrationist goals of King's nonviolence campaign. By the late 1960s, Panther membership reached 5,000 in 45 cities and their newsletter had a circulation of 250,000. But their militancy and criminal activity terrified the Establishment and revived fears of unrestrained black machismo. Together with the inflammatory oratory of Black Power activists such as Stokely Carmichael and the impact of the urban riots of the late 1960s, the Black Panthers contributed powerfully to the 'white backlash' against African American civil rights which, until then, had been on an upward trajectory. Republican domination of the White House (with the brief exception of the Carter presidency) between 1969 and 1993 and the patchy progress of African American civil rights after 1968 can be attributed in some measure to the reaction against Black Panther and Black Power radicalism. This view can be challenged by pointing out that the Black Panthers, by advocating self-help, community control, and armed self-defence against police brutality, also helped develop black self-esteem, pride in their identity, heritage and culture, and capacity for self-help. The Panthers wore distinctive paramilitary uniforms of black berets and leather jackets, organized patrols in black neighbourhoods, and operated health clinics, food pantries, 'liberation schools', and children's breakfast programmes. Although weakened by internal feuds and effectively destroyed by the early 1970s, their appeal to black radicals outlived them and was only increased by the ruthless way they were targeted by the FBI. Black radicalism and the urban rioting can be also said to have accelerated civil rights by forcing the authorities to tackle the worst problems. The 1968 Civil Rights Act prohibiting discrimination in the sale and rental of housing was, in part, a response to the urban riots and the Kerner Commission acknowledged that the riots were a response to deprivation and racism. Candidates will need to assess the impact of the Panthers in relation to other obstacles to progress. These include the activities of the Ku Klux Klan in opposing African American civil rights in the Reconstruction era (1865-1877), the continued use of terror and intimidation against African Americans, especially in the South, and the attempts of the White Citizens Councils to obstruct the civil rights movement in the 1950s. Candidates may also want to evaluate the importance of institutional racism in white American society which persisted at least until World War Two. They may also point to the importance of the Plessy versus Ferguson Supreme Court verdict of 1896 in legalising discrimination, the hostility of many state governments to African American civil rights and the indifference of presidents and Congress to the issue until the mid-20th century. Candidates should weigh up the role of the Black Power movement against other factors, such as the police, Supreme Court, Presidents and white supremacists in obstructing the progress of African American civil rights and reach a balanced conclusion.</p>	60	<p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
14	<p>How far do you agree that the actions of the American Indian Movement of the 1960s and 1970s did more to advance the civil rights of Native Americans than any other factor in the period 1865 to 1992?</p> <p>The American Indian Movement (AIM) was founded, in conscious imitation of the Black Panthers, in 1968 in Minneapolis when, in response to perceived police brutality in Indian neighbourhoods, 'red patrols' were formed to monitor police activity. This resulted in a decline in arrests and the numbers of Native Americans (NAs) in gaol. AIM soon evolved into a national group and became the best-known 'Red Power' organization with branches in several cities. Especially popular among urban NAs, it also became a powerful force in the politics of many reservations. Russell Means, an Oglala Sioux (who had been involved in the 1969 siege of Alcatraz) became AIM's principal spokesperson and staged protests which gained media attention, including the occupation of Mount Rushmore in 1971, the 1972 Trail of Broken Treaties caravan which concluded in a six-day occupation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) offices in Washington, DC. In 1973 Means was involved in AIM's 71-day siege of the village of Wounded Knee Creek, South Dakota, the site of the 1890 massacre. By the late 1970s, AIM's popularity was fading as its militant, sometimes violent tactics, became increasingly controversial. The government cracked down, imprisoning key leaders, and internal dissension split the ranks. However, in the long term AIM helped to create a sense of pan-Indian unity and pride in their identity and heritage and drew national attention to Indian issues. Arguably, the 1975 Indian Self-Determination Act (which gave NAs greater control over their reservations) and the 1978 American Indian Religious Freedom Act (which acknowledged traditional religious customs and beliefs) were, in part, a response to NA activism. Candidates will need to compare and contrast the achievements of AIM with that of other NAs and may wish to argue that AIM merely built on the work of the Society of American Indians (SAI, established in 1911) and the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI, established in 1944) in seeking to preserve Indian customs and culture and exert pressure on federal and state authorities. Also, AIM initially benefited from a climate sympathetic to minority rights created by the better-known black civil rights movement. The significant contribution of NAs to the US war effort in the two world wars influenced federal policy (1924 granting US citizenship; 1946 formation of the Indian Claims Commission) and individual Indian nations used court action against the US Federal government to gain greater economic wealth (e.g. Passamaquaddy Indians of Maine in the 1970s) or to develop their reservations (Mohawks of New York or Jicarilla Apaches of New Mexico). Candidates should weigh up the impact of AIM against other factors. Some candidates are likely to argue that the federal government did much more than AIM to advance NA civil rights. They might mention: 1934 Indian Reorganisation Act which inaugurated the Indian New Deal (recognition of Indian separate identity and right to self-government under the BIA; allotment ended, some land restored); 1946 Indian Claims Commission (some recognition of illegal land loss in 19th century); 1968 Indian Civil Rights Act (guaranteeing individual rights under US Constitution to Indians, though some candidates might interpret this as limiting tribal collective rights); sympathetic attitude of Presidents Johnson and Nixon, both of whom sought to improve conditions and opportunities for NAs. Some</p>	60	<p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	candidates might also point out the lack of clarity about NA civil rights; some NAs wanted recognition of their separate culture and traditions while others, particularly those who have moved to the cities and/or intermarried, wished to assimilate into mainstream US culture and overcome de facto racial prejudice over such issues as employment and housing.		

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
15	<p>Assess the view that developments in the 1960s had more impact on gender equality in the USA than developments that occurred in any other period from 1865 to 1992.</p> <p>The 1960s saw two important legislative milestones, the 1963 Equal Pay Act and the 1964 Civil Rights Act. The effectiveness of women’s campaigning was assisted by greater awareness of minority rights as a result of the black civil rights movement and extensive media coverage of protest. An assertive feminist movement, spearheaded by Betty Friedan, gained widespread support. Changes to family size, the widespread availability and acceptability of birth control techniques (especially the development of ‘the pill’), the increased rate of divorce, the expansion of university education and of welfare provision helped accelerate gender equality. But for many women (especially in racial minorities) there was little change as the majority of working women were in low-paid and low-skilled jobs as secretaries, cleaners, junior school teachers, saleswomen, waitresses and nurses. Many of the changes were controversial and contested. Women played key roles in the black civil rights movements but also faced prejudice from some chauvinistic activists. In 1968 a group called Radical Women attracted national attention and divided opinion by protesting against the Miss America contest, throwing bras, cosmetics and other symbols of womanhood into the rubbish bin (the origin of the legend of feminist bra-burning). Abortion became a major issue, both because of the number of illegal (and often risky) abortions and because radical feminists regarded it as a right. The more controversial demands of feminist campaigners alienated many and contributed to the backlash against the campaign for the ERA, led by Phyllis Schlafly.</p> <p>Candidates should compare the 1960s with other periods of change. These might include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Progressive era achievements of campaigners for improved regulation of working conditions and for health and housing reform such as Jane Addams, Florence Kelley and the National Consumers’ League. • Women’s role in the temperance movement and the work of Frances Willard and the WCTU (1874) as well as the Anti-Saloon League (1893). • The 19th Amendment granting women the vote and the greater sense of liberation among women (from the middle class, at least) manifested by the “flappers” of the 1920s. • The New Deal advanced a number of women’s causes and FDR appointed Frances Perkins the first female member of the Cabinet as Secretary of Labor. • Both World Wars gave women unprecedented employment opportunities and extensive participation in each war effort enhanced women’s public profile though women still had to juggle domestic responsibilities with paid employment; their employment gains were temporary and they and faced discrimination from employers and trade unions. 	60	<p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>Some candidates may argue that, for middle-class women, changes in the economy (rather than any single issue or period) have been fundamental to the breakdown of the 'separate spheres' assumptions which circumscribed their aspirations at the start of the period. The periods in which the USA has experienced its most significant economic developments (late 19th and early 20th centuries, the 1920s, the Second World War and the post-war boom, the 1980s) have coincided with the most fundamental transformations of women's role and attitudes to their status. The periods of economic expansion and development have provided greater access to white collar employment, educational opportunities and consumer goods. They have also transformed attitudes to marriage, divorce, sex, child-rearing and fashion. Candidates may also wish to argue that for poor women, especially those from racial minorities there has been very little, if any, progress towards gender equality in any period of US history.</p>		

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
16	<p>‘Change to the franchise was the main factor in determining the fortunes of the political parties.’ How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1868 to 1997?</p> <p>The question focuses on the relative importance of the franchise extensions in determining the success or otherwise of the three main political parties. Candidates will need to examine and compare this with other factors such as party leadership, the impact of war or depression (and the role of the economy in general), the attractiveness or otherwise of party policies, splits and their ability to respond to social change. For the Labour Party after 1900 franchise change was crucial – before 1918 they found it difficult to attract either the skilled upper working class or the labourer vote which stuck, via the Trade Unions, with Liberalism, although it might be argued that the Edwardian period saw considerable inroads into this (founding of the LRC, responding to anti-Union legislation, affiliation to Labour) that were not connected to franchise factors. The Liberals were the main beneficiaries of the franchise changes of 1867 and 1884, attracting skilled artisans and rural labourers, whilst Conservative consolidation under Salisbury owed less to franchise factors than to the social changes of a maturing industrial society – the rise of the lower middle class. The 1918 Reform Act enfranchised the rest of the working class, although it could be argued that the War and Liberal splits aided the rise of Labour to opposition status in the interwar period. In 1968 the youth vote appeared not to aid either Conservative or Labour. Candidates might thus argue that the fortunes of political parties after 1918 owed more to other factors. Indeed before 1918 the Liberals had split over Home Rule following 1886, allowing Conservative domination to 1905 and split again in the conflict between Asquith and Lloyd George in 1916, never again to hold power alone in the period. Labour split in 1931 over ‘cuts, the gold standard and the Depression whilst in the 1980s the SDP’s break from Labour hindered their grasp on power in the 1980s and Conservative splits over Europe and Thatcher damaged them in the 1990s. The Conservative handling of the economy in the 1920s, the Great Depression and foreign policy damaged their chances post 1945 whilst Labour’s association with austerity and splits over economic and social policy advantaged the Conservatives in the 1950s and early 1960s. Post 1945 the handling of economic policy became arguable more important (as it had in 1905 when the parties split over free trade versus fair trade). The Conservatives capitalised on economic recovery in the 1950s and the late 1980s whilst Labour suffered from economic crises in 1970 and again in the late 1970s. The handling of war could also be important –the Conservatives suffered from this in 1880 but used it to advantage during the Boer War in 1900 and world War One after 1916. Thatcher used the Argentine War to her advantage in the 1983 election. Candidates could also examine the issue of leadership which could advantage a party (Salisbury, Baldwin, Churchill, and Thatcher) or disadvantage (Gladstone after 1886, Balfour after 1902, Chamberlain in 1940, Eden over Suez and Heath over the Miner’s strike). No set conclusion is expected.</p>	60	<p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
17	<p>‘The most significant change to electoral methods occurred in the period 1872-1885’. How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1868 to 1997?</p> <p>The question focuses on changes to electoral methods. The argument that the period 1872 -1885 saw the most significant change could be based on changes made by and to the Liberals in the Gladstone period. This period saw the Secret Ballot Act (1872), Forster’s Education Act (1870) and the beginning of new levels of local democracy (School Boards), the Birmingham Caucus and the National Liberal Federation which began to use the precedents set by Parnell’s IPP for the creation of a disciplined party machine, the Corrupt Practices Act (1883), the Third Reform Act and Redistribution (1884 and 1885). The ending of patronage and corruption via expense limits and secret voting in 1883 and 1872 ended nomination and private corruption, something that required a more democratic type of voter mobilisation pioneered by Chamberlain in the Birmingham Caucus and the ensuing National Liberal Federation (more accountability, political involvement and canvassing etc.). With the extension of universal household suffrage to the counties and the end of the county/borough distinction a majority of men (60%) now had the vote and ‘population’ could now be managed more effectively by the political parties. The key ‘modern’ precedents of a mass press, modern parties with programmes and the persuasion in elections had been set. Against this candidates could point to the limits of what occurred– Gladstone’s dislike of the changes pioneered by Chamberlain, the slow development of Party organisations after Chamberlain, the importance of the Local Government changes made after this period by the Conservatives in 1888. For women local government was a more important area of change than national government. A longer term case could be made for the importance of media changes from the 1890s onwards. Thus the rise of the popular press and popular issues via the Harmsworth and Northcliffe press had a major impact on electoral methods and continued to be influential – during 1924 and the 1926 General Strike and the Maxwell and Murdoch press of the 1970s and 1980s which aided Conservative electoral methods. After 1953, TV, despite its ‘neutrality’, was seen as crucial to elections and from the 1960s all parties were concerned with image (Thatcher’s softening of tone and Mandelson’s New Labour standardisation of party members could be cited). It could also be argued that party conferences and policies took a much longer period to mature into electoral instruments. This local activism and management was especially important from 1918 to the 1980s – canvassing and door knocking for example became very characteristic of the post-1945 period whilst propaganda summed up by a key poster or advertisement could be cited – Big Loaf/Little Loaf in 1906; ‘Labour isn’t Working’ in 1979. No set answer is expected.</p>	60	<p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
18	<p>How important was education in the development of democracy in the period from 1868 to 1997?</p> <p>Candidates could argue this to be the case but would need to set it against other factors in the development of democracy - economic change, the role of the media, party competition, the impact of pressure groups, war, or the manoeuvrings of the political elite. The argument for education could be based on its role in opening up a mass electorate to influence via the media, schooling and a set of moral standards to apply to the actions of politicians and parties. Lowe argued after the Second Reform Act that 'we must educate our masters now' and Forster's Education Act 1870 created a largely universal system of primary education. This was followed by the halting extension of secondary education between Balfour's Education Act of 1902, Fisher's 1918 Act and the final achievement of universal secondary education in Butler's Act of 1944. It could be argued that this provided a meritocratic ladder that was important to democracy providing access to political power for new groups, especially in the 1902- 1976 period. However curriculums followed the private sector model of the mid-nineteenth century and arguably created an elitist political and academic culture. However whilst education increasingly opened up access to the economy the link to democracy may be more tenuous. Voting has declined in the second half of the twentieth century just as mass secondary education and entitlement has been achieved. It is difficult to see any link between education and democratic participation despite late twentieth century attempts to impose citizenship into the curriculum, although the School Boards of 1870-1902 fostered Nonconformist participation and rural areas saw much conflict over the penetration of rate aided Boards into County areas in the late 19th century. There was conflict over Comprehensive reorganisation in the 1970s that asserted the importance of this to democracy but since 1976 the private sector has consolidated a hold amongst the wealthier sections of the population and MPs and Cabinets are still disproportionately representative of what some see as private privilege. The number of working men has fallen in the 2nd half of the 20th century. The professions dominate politics, particularly with the demise of traditional industry and the Trade Unions. Candidates should compare education with other factors relative to democratic development. Although it was rare that economic factors were cited as the reason for any specific change it could be argued that economic change was important in promoting democracy, especially in the 1868-1914 period. Much depends on whether economic change is considered the determinant of all change, just some change, or simply the general backdrop to democratic development. Like education the link is not obvious. The mass media especially could be linked to education and its development preceded many of the key democratic changes such as party organisation and franchise reform. Governments noted its impact and sought to exploit it politically or moved to include groups affected by it. The emergence of a powerful provincial middle class press in the 1860s was evidence of political commitment, especially nonconformist and artisan, and franchise and electoral reform followed. However, the more populist press of the 1890s, with its sensationalism could be seen to have a contrary effect. Governments could easily use the Press to influence and control public opinion, most obviously during the World Wars, the General Strike in 1926, the Falklands War and the Troubles in Northern Ireland. However, it could also hold government to account, (Ponting in the 1980s). However by the twentieth</p>	60	<p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>century it was rare for democratic change to be pushed by the press on anything major, like gender or minority issues, Public Relations and reform of the Lords or Monarchy. It preferred personal issues. Nonetheless, the tabloid press from the 1960s was widely held by governments to be crucial during elections, the 'Sun' in particular. The radio, and later TV, given its BBC origins in the early 1920s, was more consciously moulding of what it conceived to be British democratic values – fair play, educative in a highbrow sense, informative and grave, at least until the 1950s. It was important in creating a sense that Britain upheld democracy in the 1930s and 1940s and in the 1960s and 1970s, the BBC and ITV could campaign for the underprivileged. Other factors playing a role in the development of democracy, which could be developed, include pressure groups (important throughout the period from Nonconformists to Nuclear Disarmament), party competition, and war, especially the two World Wars, the latter seeing a highpoint of participation in the electoral process and policy in the 1945 election. This is a wide question so neither an exhaustive coverage nor a set answer is to be expected.</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 2016

