

**History A**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **F961/02**: British History Period Studies. Option B: Modern 1783-1994

**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 and corresponds to the UMS  
2 answers: each maximum mark 50.

	<b>AO1a</b>	<b>AO1b</b>
<b>IA</b>	21–24	24–26
<b>IB</b>	18–20	22–23
<b>II</b>	16–17	19–21
<b>III</b>	14–15	16–18
<b>IV</b>	12–13	13–15
<b>V</b>	9–11	11–12
<b>VI</b>	4–8	6–10
<b>VII</b>	0–3	0–5

Notes:

- (i) Allocate marks to the most appropriate level for each AO.
- (ii) If several marks are available in a box, work from the top mark down until the best fit has been found.
- (iii) Many answers will not fall at the same level for each AO.
- (iv) Analysis refers to developed explanations; evaluation refers to the argued weighing up/assessment of factors in relation to their significance in explaining an issue or in explaining linkages between different factors.

AOs	AO1a	AO1b
<b>Total mark for each question = 50</b>	Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.	Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context;</li> <li>- the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied.</li> </ul>
<b>Level IA</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses a wide range of accurate, detailed and relevant evidence</li> <li>• Accurate and confident use of appropriate historical terminology</li> <li>• Answer is clearly structured and coherent; communicates accurately and legibly.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>21–24</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear and accurate understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic</li> <li>• Clear and accurate understanding of the significance of issues in their historical context</li> <li>• Answer is consistently and relevantly analytical with developed and substantiated explanations, some of which may be unexpected</li> <li>• The argument evaluates a range of relevant factors and reaches clearly substantiated judgements about relative importance and/or links.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>24–26</b></p>
<b>Level IB</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses accurate, detailed and relevant evidence</li> <li>• Accurate use of a range of appropriate historical terminology</li> <li>• Answer is clearly structured and mostly coherent; writes accurately and legibly.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>18–20</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear and accurate understanding of most key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic</li> <li>• Answer is mostly consistently and relevantly analytical with mostly developed and substantiated explanations</li> <li>• Clear understanding of the significance of issues in their historical context.</li> <li>• Substantiated judgements about relative importance of and/or links between factors will be made but quality of explanation in support may not be consistently high.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>22–23</b></p>

AOs	AO1a	AO1b
<b>Level II</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses mostly accurate, detailed and relevant evidence which demonstrates a competent command of the topic</li> <li>• Generally accurate use of historical terminology</li> <li>• Answer is structured and mostly coherent; writing is legible and communication is generally clear.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>16–17</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mostly clear and accurate understanding of many key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic</li> <li>• Clear understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context</li> <li>• Much of the answer is relevantly analytical and substantiated with detailed evidence but there may be some description</li> <li>• The analysis of factors and/or issues provides some judgements about relative importance and/or linkages.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>19–21</b></p>
<b>Level III</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses accurate and relevant evidence which demonstrates some command of the topic but there may be some inaccuracy</li> <li>• Answer includes relevant historical terminology but this may not be extensive or always accurately used</li> <li>• Most of the answer is organised and structured; the answer is mostly legible and clearly communicated.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>14–15</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some/uneven understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and of concepts relevant to their historical context</li> <li>• Answers may be a mixture of analysis and explanation but also simple description of relevant material and narrative of relevant events <b>OR</b> answers may provide more consistent analysis but the quality will be uneven and its support often general or thin</li> <li>• Answer considers a number of factors but with very little evaluation of importance or linkages between factors/issues</li> <li>• Points made about importance or about developments in the context of the period will often be little more than assertions and descriptions.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>16–18</b></p>
<b>Level IV</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is deployment of relevant knowledge but level/accuracy of detail will vary; there may be some evidence that is tangential or irrelevant.</li> <li>• Some unclear and/or under-developed and/or disorganised sections; mostly satisfactory level of communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>12–13</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and the topic is variable but in general is satisfactory</li> <li>• Limited and patchy understanding of a few relevant issues in their historical context</li> <li>• Answer may be largely descriptive/narratives of events and links between this and analytical comments will typically be weak or unexplained <b>OR</b> answers will mix passages of descriptive material with occasional explained analysis</li> <li>• Limited points made about importance/links or about developments in the context of the period will be little more than assertions and descriptions.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>13–15</b></p>

AOs	AO1a	AO1b
<b>Level V</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some relevant accurate historical knowledge deployed: this may be generalised and patchy. There may be inaccuracies and irrelevant material also</li> <li>• Some accurate use of relevant historical terminology but often inaccurate/inappropriate use</li> <li>• Often unclear and disorganised sections; writing will often be clear if basic but there may be some illegibility and weak prose where the sense is not clear or obvious.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>9–11</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General and sometimes inaccurate understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and of concepts relevant to the topic</li> <li>• General or weak understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context</li> <li>• Attempts at analysis will be weak or generalised, based on plausible but unsubstantiated points or points with very general or inappropriate substantiation <b>OR</b> there may be a relevant but patchy description of events/developments coupled with judgements that are no more than assertions</li> <li>• There will be some understanding of the question but answers may focus on the topic not address the focus of the question.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>11–12</b></p>
<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>• Answer may have little organisation or structure; weak use of English and poor organisation.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>4–8</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very little understanding of key concepts</li> <li>• Very limited understanding of the topic or of the question's requirements</li> <li>• Limited explanation will be very brief/fragmentary</li> <li>• The answer will be characterised by generalised assertion and/or description/narratives, often brief.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>6–10</b></p>
<b>Level VII</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No understanding of the topic or of the question's requirements; little relevant and accurate knowledge</li> <li>• Very fragmentary and disorganised response; very poor use of English and some incoherence.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0–3</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No understanding of key concepts or historical developments.</li> <li>• No valid explanations</li> <li>• Typically very brief and very descriptive answer.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0–5</b></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	<p>At the higher levels candidates should address the issue of ‘never’ and some may argue that this assessment is correct, whilst others may suggest there were certain periods when it was a serious threat. Some may argue that the political threat was never great as the challenge was because of the economic conditions, reflected in that unrest declined when prosperity returned. Although they failed in hindsight, the 1810s were disturbed years. 1812 saw bread prices reach their highest in the nineteenth century and the 1815 Corn Law was seen as a hated Bread Tax to keep peacetime prices artificially high. The Continental System was followed by depression in 1815 with poor relief reaching its peak in 1818. Luddism in 1812–13 and rick burning in 1816 threatened town and country. Such economic distress stimulated the revival of radical politics and the spread of revolutionary ideas continued via frequent protest meetings spreading democratic and republican ideas under the banner of Parliamentary reform and ‘Old Corruption’ – March of the Blanketeers and Peterloo. Radicals were experienced in extra-parliamentary methods; meetings, petitions, clubs, press and coup d’état (Cato Street). Yet the challenge was undermined by an experienced government, a lack of cohesive leadership which was often impractical, divisions over aims and tactics, the fragmentation of a much regionalised response and moments of economic recovery, 1818 and 1821 onwards. A useful route through this question might be to examine government response, which suggested that they did consider it a threat with the ‘Gagging Acts,’ or the activities of a national leader like John Cartwright and his Hampden Clubs and Political Union societies, Orator Hunt (Spa Fields and Peterloo) or revolutionaries like Thistlewood.</p>	50	No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question.
2	<p>Candidates are likely to focus on the philosophy and policies pursued by the government and consider whether they deserve to be called liberal. The question of how liberal the Tories were in the period after 1822 remains an open one, but most are likely to argue that they were more liberal after 1822, but may question whether this was in all aspects. There might be mention of the appointment of younger politicians such as Canning, Peel and Huskinsson after 1822–3, but candidates should focus on the legislation passed and whether it was liberal. The economic legislation passed by both Robinson and Huskinsson and the reforms of Peel at the Home Office are likely to be the main areas of consideration. Candidates should display a good knowledge of the areas of legislation and assess whether they were liberal. There might be discussion of issues such as budgets, taxation, reciprocal trade treaties, the revision of the Navigation Acts, Peel’s penal reforms and the Combination Acts. However candidates might argue that there were also some illiberal measures such as the refusal at first to accept Roman Catholic Emancipation, the fact that the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts were forced upon them, and the refusal to entertain the issue of parliamentary reform. These issues might also be contrasted with the measures of the earlier period in order to reach a conclusion.</p>	50	No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	Candidates should assess both sides of the question and a balanced answer is essential for the higher levels. Candidates should also note that the question focus is on his leadership and not on his measures and therefore detailed discussion of his financial and economic policies should only gain credit if they are closely linked back to the question. Candidates might consider issues such as the reorganisation of the party after 1832; the widening of the base of support, the creation of the Carlton Club, defeating the repeal movement in Ireland and winning the 1841 election and pursuing popular policies in his 1841–6 ministry. However, against this candidates might consider his relationship with the backbenchers, ignoring the majority of his party over major issues, such as the Corn Laws, how far he did transform the party.	50	No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question.
4	The transformation of the Whigs and the reasons behind the creation of the Liberal party in this period must form the focus of responses. In their answers, candidates might consider some of the following reasons such as the support given by radicals such as Cobden and Bright, unity over Italian unification in 1859, common support for free trade, the success of Gladstone's budgets, the fact that the public trusted the party over finance; popular foreign policy under Palmerston and the abandonment of the aristocratic Whiggish image associated with politicians such as Grey and Melbourne in the 1830s. There might also be some mention of the disarray within conservative ranks and the resultant incentive to create a united party. At the highest level candidates should evaluate and provide supported judgements on the relative importance of the factors, but at lower levels they will simply list the reasons or describe the events.	50	No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5	<p>Candidates will need to consider the role of the Second Reform Act in his emergence if they want to achieve the higher levels. They may argue that its passing consolidated his position as it brought the Conservatives to power, although it was short-lived. Candidates might look to weigh up the strengths of Disraeli as a leader against his weaknesses and other possible contenders before reaching a balanced conclusion. They might argue that Derby had not been interested in leading the party and was more at home horse-racing, whilst other possible contenders, such as Gladstone had left the party. It might be noted that Derby had led the government in 1852 and 1858–9 and it was only ill-health that led him to resign. This argument may be further developed by looking at the weaknesses of Disraeli; he was after all an outsider for the Conservative party. However, some might argue that he was their best speaker, had managed to pilot the Second Reform Act through parliament after Gladstone’s failure and shown himself to have appeal. It might be argued that his successful guidance of the Reform Act through parliament was what guaranteed him the succession. Disraeli was responsible for many of the changes that helped bring the Conservatives back to power; he taught them that it would be pointless to try to win support for the reversal of the Free Trade policy, promoted reform when in office in the minority government, developed ideas on the need for social reform, appointed Gorst to reorganise the party machinery and appealed to the electorate as the spokesman for a party that would offer a strong foreign and imperial policy. These positive qualities should be balanced against the claim that there were no alternatives once Derby resigned in February 1868.</p>	50	No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question.
6	<p>The quality of the answer is likely to be determined by the criteria candidates establish against which to discuss success. Issues such as securing power, advancing Tory democracy, dishing the Whigs or improving the condition of the people may all feature in such discussions. There are a large number of measures that candidates might discuss and this includes Public Health Act, the Artisans Dwelling Act, Employer’s and Workmen’s Act, the Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act, the Education Act, Merchant Shipping Act, Enclosure of the Commons and Public Worship Act. Candidates may examine whether these measures were compulsory or permissive and how far they did transform conditions. There might also be consideration as to whether they were unsuccessful as the Conservatives lost the 1880 election and it might be argued that many did not like state intervention as it endangered individual liberty. However, it might be argued that the legislation did benefit the new urban workers and made Disraeli popular with them, hence the comment that ‘The Conservative party has done more for the working class in five years than the Liberals have done in fifty.’</p>	50	No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7	<p>Candidates will need to show a clear understanding of what British interests were in the Balkans. These included the maintenance of the integrity of the Ottoman Empire, to encourage its reform, to prevent Russian penetration of the Balkans and to contain its navy within the Black Sea or to Odessa, to prevent Russian influence in the Dardanelles and at Constantinople and French influence in Egypt and the Near East. All were aimed at securing trade routes, a balance of power, naval control of the Mediterranean and safeguarding India and Northern Africa. Candidates may be aware of difference over principles – was Turkey to be supported – and means – war or diplomacy? Many candidates are likely to conclude that Britain was largely successful in securing these interests – following the Crimean war a balance was achieved, although Austria was now exposed and clearly suffered at the hands of France and Prussia, neither Russia nor Turkey were allowed a Black Sea fleet and promises were made about Balkan Christians. Yet many gains were short-lived; demilitarisation of the Black Sea ended in 1870 where Gladstone was more concerned with ‘form’ than ‘substance’, a new Romania emerged, little was done to improve treatment of Christians, which led directly to the next crisis in 1875 and Russia conquered Central Asia. Disraeli moved to contain France over the Suez canal, but there might also be discussion of the longer term significance of this and Gladstone’s policy in Egypt. The near-eastern crisis of 1875–8 saw much disagreement over policy, the opposition of many to intervention on Turkey’s side and the initiative soon slipped to the Dreikaiserbund. The outcome at Berlin saw Britain having to accept the Straits as an open waterway, although a potentially pro-Russian Bulgaria was reduced in size and Turkey remained a power. Nonetheless many problems were created for the future via commitments and Austrian Balkan expansion. Candidates might also discuss the importance of the Mediterranean Agreements. Concern over Russia, even if not with regard to the Eastern Question remained and may help explain the Anglo-Japanese alliance.</p>	50	No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8	<p>Candidates should assess the positive and negative impact of the Boer war in changing attitudes to Empire in this period if they are to reach the higher levels. Positive images of the Boer War might include the ultimate victory in 1902, the sense that the invincibility of British forces was still apparent and the importance of the defeat of the Boers and their German backers. This was reinforced by popular music hall jingoism and added to the idea that ‘the sun never set on the Empire.’ It was a fitting tribute to Victoria as Queen. However, many candidates are likely to see it as a negative watershed in attitudes both at home and abroad. The fact that a small force had caused such difficulty for the might of the British army for the duration of the war, the brutal use of concentration camps damaged the British reputation abroad, the wisdom of Chamberlain’s imperial vision was questioned and the social and medical problems of recruitment all brought demands for a concentration on domestic reform.</p>	50	No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question set.
9	<p>Many candidates are likely to focus on the long-term problems in Anglo-German relations. There might be some consideration of the importance of the invasion of Belgium in the decision to go to war. It was the invasion that triggered the declaration, although some may argue it was the occasion not the cause and that there were other reasons that caused it. Some may argue that the invasion provided a divided Liberal government with the excuse and justification it needed to uphold the Treaty of 1830. There had already been resignations from the government and without the invasion it is unlikely that the government would have held together. War was seen by many as an illiberal act and therefore they needed the justification of the defence of a small nation to uphold the decision. However, answers may focus on the longer term problems of naval rivalry, the economic growth of Germany and imperial rivalry. Candidates might also consider the wish or need to support France following the Entente; if Britain did not support her following the military discussions of the previous years then her moral worth would be questioned. There may also have been concern that Britain would be isolated if Germany should win and it was therefore in her interests to ensure that this did not happen. Some answers might suggest that domestic problems also encouraged Britain to declare war as a short and glorious war would detract from the problems of Ireland, industrial unrest and the suffragettes. It might also be mentioned that declaring war was popular and most expected that it would be over by Christmas at the latest.</p>	50	No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
10	<p>There are a large number of reasons that candidates might consider, but in order to access the higher level they must consider the named factor, even if they conclude that it was not the most important. In support of the question some might point to the welfare legislation of Chamberlain and other social legislation, but others might argue that it was their policies that caused difficulties and consider Tariff Reform, the legislation following the General Strike or policies pursued during the coalition of 1918-22. However, some might balance this against the importance of Lloyd George in their victory of 1918. There might be consideration of the importance of Baldwin and whether he was successful in creating a new Conservatism, which resulted in electoral dominance throughout this period and up to 1945. It might be argued that Baldwin was able to heal the divisions in society that had been created by the General Strike, some might suggest that he was a contrast to Lloyd George and reflected the mood of the country. Candidates might also consider Liberal weakness and whether that made it easier for the Conservatives, particularly as Labour was a relatively new party and also point to the associations, even if unfairly, with communism or the fears of many of socialism.</p>	50	<p>No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question.</p>
11	<p>Candidates may consider the role of the government. The government were intransigent, combined with an economic policy that was in part mistaken by returning to an overvalued currency backed by gold in 1925 as the main cause. The government was certainly determined to stand by private ownership and lower labour costs. Candidates might also point out that it was the government that precipitated a strike on 3 May by calling off negotiations, not the Unions. Candidates are also likely to consider the role of the Trade Unions, especially the NUM and this might be set alongside the role of the mine owners with their response to adverse terms in world trade which saw British coal as increasingly uncompetitive. The role of the Daily Mail could also be considered as the trigger for the strike. The case for Union unrest as the main cause is the growing power and influence of the Unions up to the First World War and their reaction to changed economic conditions after it. Some candidates might make a distinction between the Miners, led by Smith and Cook, and the leadership of the Union movement in general who were reluctant to act and certainly unprepared to stage a General Strike. The latter were prepared to accept Samuel's recommendation as a basis of settlement. The Miners were less prepared to compromise. Previously they had been the aristocrats of the labour market and long unionised they were especially hard hit by economic contractions, new fuels, poor geological conditions and under-investment in mining technology. Employers might also be blamed as they argued that a competitive price could be achieved only at the expense of the miners. It might also be argued that having scored victories with the Sankey Commission and on Red Friday they were keen to make a stand on behalf of other well organised, but struggling industries. It might also be noted that the Unions failed to see Red Friday as simply a government tactic to buy time and stockpile and prepare for a strike.</p>		<p>No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
12	<p>At the higher levels answers will need to evaluate the reasons and not simply provide a list of reasons. Candidates might consider the role of Churchill. Some might argue that it was not due to Churchill as he was popular as a war time leader, but others might suggest that this was the problem. Churchill had refused to adopt the Beveridge Report, suggested that Atlee would bring in some form of secret police or Gestapo if Labour won, he also insisted in wearing a military uniform which also signalled his link with the past when many wanted a new start. There were other reasons for Conservative unpopularity which need consideration; these could include their association with the failed foreign policy of the 1930s that had led to war, their poor industrial relations record over issues such as the General strike and blame for the Depression and subsequent problems of the Depression, particularly unemployment. The war had also created a desire for change and Labour was seen as the best hope for this. They were associated with social reform and appeared to promise a new start and an improvement in the lives and welfare of the people. They appeared more willing to address the problems the war had revealed. Many were anxious for social reform and Labour had embraced the Beveridge report. There were also many 'first time' voters who turned to labour and they had a large influence as there had not been an election since 1935, added to this many returning servicemen supported Labour.</p>	50	No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question.
13	<p>Many may argue that Britain did not take European integration seriously until 1960, pointing to Britain's traditional world status, the extent of imperial involvement throughout the earlier period, and her concern to shape Europe, rather than be shaped by it. The Atlantic alliance was preferred by both Labour and Conservative governments, enabling them to compete at superpower level. National sovereignty was also given as a reason for keeping out of Europe. Britain did not want the Plevin Plan for a European Defence Union, preferring the NATO alliance and the US on military matters, and her own trading organisations, such as EFTA, for trading. Initially the Schumann Plan and the EEC were distrusted. Closer European integration, after joining the EEC might also be discussed. There might also be a discussion of economic issues and how far they influenced Britain's approach. Those who argue that Britain did take it seriously may stress its economic recovery and British initiatives such as the Council of Europe in 1949, or the Eden Plan of 1952, with leadership coming through the OEEC and NATO. However, devaluation in 1949 encouraged Britain to find her own economic salvation, whilst the Board of Trade and the Treasury both opposed entry because of economic weakness, the disruption of free trade, concerns over the Commonwealth and the need to protect Sterling. There might be consideration of the views and attitudes of individual party leaders. For much of the early period France made it easy for Britain not to involve herself and thus accused Britain of not taking it seriously.</p>	50	No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
14	<p>Candidates at the higher levels will probably identify the aims of her foreign policy, she had strong ideological convictions and a forceful style and use these as criteria against which to judge success or failure, rather than simply look at each event and assess it, however either approach is acceptable. It might be argued that her anti-communist views were very successful as she was in office as communism collapsed in Europe, but this was largely due to factors outside her influence. The consequence was the reunification of Germany, which she did not want. However, she was able to build up a working relationship with Gorbachev and initially use it to mediate between USSR and USA, but this was later undermined as the two powers reached an agreement at Reykjavik which would mean Europe would be exposed to the larger conventional forces of the USSR. Thatcher was able to limit the impact of this. This might be used as an example of occasions when Britain struggled to control US independence despite the special relationship between Thatcher and Reagan; other examples might include SDI and the invasion of Grenada. Thatcher did try to uphold British power and independence and this could be illustrated through reference to the Falklands War and negotiations with the EU. Thatcher was able to get back some of Britain's contribution to the EU budget and it might be argued that this helped Britain's standing in Europe, but this was at the expense of a good relationship with France and Germany and would cause problems in the future. Britain contributed to the SEA as it was consistent with her belief in free market economics. However, this might be balanced by considering the nuclear dependence Britain had on the US and mention might be made of the presence of US weapons in Britain. British willingness to work with the US in support for Kuwait and the Gulf War might also be used to show that Britain was a major power.</p>	50	No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
15	<p>Candidates may approach this by considering how influential Britain was in Europe and the world in the period after 1945. Some might argue that Britain retained its influence on the world stage through its presence on the UN Security council and through having an independent nuclear deterrent, but others may suggest that Britain became increasingly reliant on the USA and was only a minor player, achieving success over small incidents such as the Falklands. In supporting the latter argument candidates might consider the economic consequences of the Second World War as Britain became heavily dependent upon US aid, it forced Britain to hand over the initiative to the US in Greece, Turkey, Persia and the Mediterranean. There is also evidence for candidates to use to show that Britain was unable to stand up to the USSR. The loss of Empire might be used to show that British influence had declined, although some might suggest that the Commonwealth has kept some role for Britain. Most significantly many may consider the Suez crisis to show that Britain was no longer a great power and this led ultimately to a withdrawal from east of Suez and the Gulf, Singapore and Malaysia by 1971. In some instances this was due to cost, again suggesting that Britain was unable to sustain its commitments. There may be consideration of an increased dependence upon the US and what that reveals about British power, this may be over nuclear weapons or détente. The development of NATO might be used to show that Britain was unable to defend herself, however this might be countered by reference to Britain's role in countering the USSR as unlike France she did not commit to a purely European role, Britain was involved in Korea. There may also be a consideration of Britain's involvement in resolving other conflicts in Asia. She was not involved in Vietnam as there were many other concerns and forces were overstretched. Involvement in Europe might be used to show that Britain needed closer European involvement and that her success, as in the Falklands, was limited to minor issues.</p>	50	<p>No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
16	<p>Candidates must consider how far Conservative policies or mistakes were the main reason for their defeat in 1964 if they want to achieve the higher levels, even if they conclude that it was not the most important reason. There are many factors for candidates to consider and these need to be weighed up and a balanced judgement reached. Labour won in 1964 by a large swing in the popular vote, but only by a narrow margin of seats. Candidates might consider the leadership of Wilson, who was young and dynamic, and his association with the 'white heat of technology', whereas the Conservatives appeared out of touch with the young electorate. The Conservative campaign under Home was ineffective and he appeared to represent the old aristocratic Conservative party. Many may argue that it was the Conservatives, especially after 1959, which lost the election. The party appeared too 'establishment', the promotion of a peer to the leadership was a mistake, its organisation had lost its way. The affluence with which they had been associated now appeared rather sluggish compared with elsewhere and the unpopular deflationary policies of Selwyn Lloyd did little to win support. Decolonisation, the Profumo affair, the Night of the Long Knives, immigration might also be seen as evidence of misrule, as might the economic policies. However, if candidates want to argue that it was not a period of misrule they might point to 'you have never had it so good' and the economic prosperity under Butler and the ending of wartime rationing and controls.</p>	50	<p>No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
17	<p>This is a key issue and there is a great deal that candidates can write about and examiners should not expect all issues to be covered. At higher levels candidates will need to consider 'how far' and this will provide scope for a wide discussion. There might be consideration of the change from Home to Heath and how far Heath took the Conservative party away from its old image and association with privilege and the aristocratic order, but some might go on and balance this against Thatcher to argue that it was under her that greater changes took place, however there is no need for this in order for candidates to achieve any level. There might be discussion about his election as leader and this might be contrasted with Home, although again Thatcher's election might also be considered. There might also be discussion as to whether his policies changed the party. In considering these areas it is likely that the issue of Europe and industrial relations, particularly the miner' strike, will figure prominently. Once again candidates might contrast his policies and the transformation with that under Thatcher. He failed to carry through the promised tough programme of economic and industrial reform on which the party had won the election of 1970 and carried on the policies of consensus. He started out determined to carry through a 'quiet revolution' by reducing the scale of the public sector and government intervention in the economy. The government was beset by a series of problems, but also made tactical errors of judgement. The Trade Union legislation was brought in very quickly and without sufficient consultation. The Industrial Relations Act was so broad in scope that it became a target for labour hostility; the good aspects were lost in the general bitterness about the method of its passage. The general refusal to comply with the terms meant it never became credible. There were some achievements in transforming policy: taxes were cut, radical reform of tax and benefits system was well advanced when the government fell. However, it was the reversals of 1972 that the government is best remembered for. There was rising unemployment; the determination to speed the rate of growth before entry to the EEC led to deliberate economic expansion, which flew in the face of the previous commitment to solve the problem of inflation. Voluntary wage control was impossible and Heath had to do this by law, the ultimate U turn.</p>	50	No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
18	<p>Candidates must discuss government policies if they want to achieve the higher levels, even if they conclude that there were other factors that were more important. Answers may start by identifying the problems faced by the governments and this might include issues such as the divisions, the growth of terrorism, economic discrimination, the use of violence, the development of paramilitary groups and perceptions of the police and army. Although the topic starts in 1951 some answers might place the problems in context of earlier developments and this can be credited provided the main focus is on the period from 1951. Candidates might consider the problem of the division between Nationalists and Loyalists and the emergence of more extreme forms within the period which resorted to more violent approaches. The sizeable proportion of the population, about 1/3, who felt resentment against the government made the problems more difficult to resolve. Candidates might examine the importance of the events of 1968–9 in exacerbating the problems and they might also argue that the issues had largely been ignored until then and that this had matters worse. There might be an examination of the issues of discrimination in policing, social and economic areas and the anti-Catholic nature of the Unionist majority that added to the difficulties and this might be linked to the problem of a Unionist dominated government. Answers might consider the role of the IRA and the emergence of the Provisional IRA following the split in 1969. Attitudes towards the British army among many Catholics did not make the situation any easier. In considering government policies candidates might discuss some of the following: internment may also have exacerbated the problem and this was added to by events such as Bloody Sunday. There might be an exploration as to why the Sunningdale Agreement and power sharing failed and this might include the change in government and a lack of decisive leadership. There might also be some consideration of international support for terrorism and reference made to the hunger strikes of the 1980s. Some candidates might also examine the problem of relationship between Britain and the Irish government, particularly when Fianna Fail was in power, particularly during the Falklands crisis. Candidates might also make reference to the political success of Sinn Fein, the divisions within the Unionist movement and the limited support among both communities for a lasting peace.</p>	50	No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question.

**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

