

GCE

History A

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

Advanced GCE

Mark Scheme for June 2015

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 2015

These are the annotations, (including abbreviations), including those used in scoris, which are used when marking

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
C	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

Subject-specific Marking Instructions

Notes:

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

AOs	AO1a	AO1b
Total mark for each question = 60	Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.	Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of: <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>

AOs	AO1a	AO1b
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>

AOs	AO1a	AO1b
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>Assess the view that war divided the German people more than it united them in the period from 1789 to 1919.</p> <p>In opposition to the view in the question, candidates may argue that the common fight of people from different German states against the French, especially in 1813, gave strong impulses to nationalism and united the German people against a common foe. They may argue that the consequences of the Napoleonic Wars, the decisions about Germany taken at the Congress of Vienna, reinforced the desire of some Germans to unite the German nation. Candidates may argue that the wars from 1862-1870 had a massive impact on the unification of the German people as the defeats of Austria in 1866 and France in 1870 enabled the emergence of a united German Empire from 1871. Candidates may also argue that the First World War united the German nation at first.</p> <p>However candidates may argue that the impact of war was often divisive. Candidates are likely to argue that from 1815 Austria had a controlling role over the other German states through the German Confederation and that, especially up to 1848, Austria was successful in ensuring that the German people remained divided. Arguably therefore, the consequence of the Napoleonic Wars had a divisive influence on Germany and the German people at least through to the 1860s.</p> <p>Although candidates are likely to argue that the wars in the 1860s had an extremely important unifying influence on Germany, they may stress that the war with Austria in 1866 was a war between the German peoples and that one consequence was to ensure that only a Kleindeutschland emerged by 1871. Candidates are likely to view the Franco-Prussian War as of pivotal importance in the unification of Germany, though some are likely to argue that this, and the consequences beyond 1871 and the establishment of the German Empire, can be viewed more as a take-over of some German people by Prussia than as a process of unification. Candidates may argue that although wars united the German Empire by 1871 they still left the German people divided geographically. Candidates are likely to argue the German people were never fully united geographically in this period.</p> <p>Candidates are also likely to argue that other continued divisions between the German people, such as religious or social, illustrate the fact that the wars from 1862-1870 may have had a unifying influence on Germany as a country but a divisive impact on the German people. Candidates may also argue that during the First World War political and social divisions amongst the German people soon arose and were entrenched by 1918. The impact of the First World War and Versailles divided the nation geographically (East Prussia) but arguably united the German people in condemnation and bitterness at the 'diktat'.</p>	60	<p>The strongest responses will adopt a Thematic approach, considering themes such as political, religious, social, economic & cultural.</p> <p>Candidates may structure the essay around these different aspects.</p> <p>Such an approach, with regular synoptic comparisons between different periods and themes throughout the essay, should be rewarded in the higher levels for AO1b. Stronger answers will also consider both sides of the proposition.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
2	<p>‘German nationalism was managed more effectively by ministers than by rulers.’ How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1789 to 1919?</p> <p>Candidates arguing in favour of the assertion in the question may well argue that from 1815 to 1848 Metternich was almost single-handedly responsible for blocking and suppressing nationalism in Germany. From 1815 to 1848 the nationalist movement was too weak to effectively challenge the Metternich System: arguably this demonstrates Metternich’s effective control over German nationalists. By 1848/49 no leader of the nationalist movement with mass appeal emerged. This was much more to do with Metternich than either of the Austrian Emperors of this period or any ruler of any German state.</p> <p>Equally Bismarck’s critical role in the 1860s in the creation of the Second Reich may be used by candidates to argue that he managed German nationalism very effectively - hijacking the nationalist cause for Prussia’s ends. This could certainly be considered effective management of German nationalism. In very different ways and with entirely different goals these two ministers managed German nationalism very effectively.</p> <p>Candidates arguing against the assertion in the question may well argue that up until 1814 Napoleon managed German nationalism effectively. From the 1790s to 1814 French troops successively conquered and occupied the area that later constituted the German Empire. In 1806 Napoleon defeated the last independent and defiant German state, Prussia. However, many candidates are likely to argue that the domination of Germany by Napoleon in this period lit the torch of German nationalism. Reformed Prussia became the hope of many Germans who suffered increasingly under French occupation, including the drafting of large numbers of Germans into Napoleon’s armies. Arguably Napoleon, rather than managing German nationalism effectively, sparked its first real upsurge.</p> <p>Candidates are likely to argue that Wilhelm II’s search for world power had populist appeal and captured the imagination of many Germans – arguably he managed German nationalism very effectively by widening its appeal and distracting the working class from the appeal of socialism. However whilst he too managed German nationalism effectively the ultimate outcome of his policies was defeat in the Great War, humiliation at Versailles and his own abdication. Looked at in this light, he was far from an effective manager of German nationalism.</p>	60	<p>The strongest responses will adopt a Thematic approach, comparing how various ministers and rulers managed German nationalism throughout this period.</p> <p>Such an approach, with regular synoptic comparisons between different ministers and rulers throughout the essay, should be rewarded in the higher levels for AO1b. Stronger answers will also consider both sides of the proposition and may define ‘effectively’.</p> <p>Candidates are likely to focus on Napoleon and William II as rulers and Metternich and Bismarck as ministers. They may choose to consider other rulers or other ministers but they must not be expected to do so.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
3	<p>‘Economic change was the most important factor in the development of German nationalism in the period from 1789 to 1919’. How far do you agree with this view?</p> <p>In support of the view in the question, candidates are likely to explain the impact of industrialisation on the development of German nationalism, for example the impact of the founding and development of the Krupp Gusstahlfabrik (Cast Steel Works) from 1811 and the impact of the Zollverein after 1834. Some candidates may argue that Prussia’s growing economic dominance led in turn to its political dominance over Germany and in turn had a limiting effect on the development of German nationalism through the establishment of a Kleindeutschland in 1871.</p> <p>Candidates are likely to understand how economic change in the 1840s and 1850s paved the way for the military victories of 1864, 1866 and 1870 / 71. Prussia’s military strength depended upon economic strength. The development of the railways may be seen as significant, for example in terms of the victory over France in 1870. ‘Coal & Iron’ rather than ‘Blood & Iron’ could be usefully debated. However many candidates may argue that economic change cannot on its own explain the stunning and pivotal victories over Austria and France that were the springboard for the creation of the German Empire.</p> <p>When arguing that economic forces were not the sole factor determining the fortunes of German nationalism in this period, the development and impact of ideas on the emergence and development of intellectual nationalism may be usefully explored. Candidates may argue that initially this provided the impetus or springboard for later developments and that, in the Napoleonic period, it was the common fight of people from different German states against their French enemy that gave strong impulses to nationalism.</p> <p>Economic factors undeniably contributed to Prussia’s domination of Germany from 1866, but opportunistic and skilful leadership, especially by Bismarck, should not be overlooked. Candidates may wish to place considerable importance on the diplomatic abilities of Bismarck both in terms of the unification of Germany and his management of German nationalism.</p> <p>The impact of the extraordinary growth of the German economy after 1871 should be discussed. Candidates may well stress the emergence of Germany as a great naval power, both rival of and threatening to Great Britain, by the turn of the twentieth century. However the Great War left Germany broken and half-starved despite the German economic domination of continental Europe by 1914.</p>	60	<p>The strongest responses will adopt a Thematic approach, comparing the importance of economic change against the other dominant factors in the development of German nationalism during this period. Such factors may include the role played by nationalists, by culture, the role played by military factors and the role played by significant individuals such as Bismarck and Kaiser Wilhelm II.</p> <p>Such an approach, with regular synoptic comparisons between different factors throughout the essay, should be rewarded in the higher levels for AO1b.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
4	<p>‘Alliances had a more significant effect on the outcome of wars in the 20th century than before.’ How far do you agree with this view of warfare from 1792 to 1945?</p> <p>For alliances in the twentieth century candidates might point to the two world wars. In both conflicts large – and shifting – alliances of major and minor powers were lined up against each other. In both world wars the stronger alliance won.</p> <p>The Russo-Japanese War and the American Civil War are the only conflicts on the specification where alliances did not play a part in the final outcome.</p> <p>For alliances prior to the 20th century candidates might point to the series of anti-French coalitions that were formed during the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars. France also formed alliances during this period; candidates might point to the close relationship with German states before or after the formation of the Confederation of the Rhine. Throughout the period Bavaria, for example, continued her eighteenth century policy of supporting France in an effort to offset the power of Austria. The Grand Duchy of Warsaw was also a staunch ally of France after its formation in 1807. Major European powers such as Austria and Russia were at one point allies of France. For example, the former – together with Prussia – supplied troops to Napoleon in 1812. Candidates might also point to support for the Continental System in the context of alliances.</p> <p>Alliances also played a factor in the wars of the middle part of the nineteenth century. Candidates might compare an isolated Russia with the Anglo-French-Turkish-</p>	60	<p>No set response is expected, but there are three obvious routes through the question: to accept or reject the premise or to take a third course which argues that alliances were important throughout the period.</p> <p>The synoptic element of the mark scheme might be addressed by a series of themes which evaluated how alliances had a ‘significant effect on the outcome of wars’. Such themes might be political strength, economic power, the size of the manpower base upon which to draw for soldiers, or the geographic advantages – for example the two front wars of the 20th century – afforded by alliances. Candidates should be aware of the differing impact of alliances on wars of long and short duration. They should also be aware that the structures of alliances could change across the duration of a conflict.</p> <p>Weaker response might be expected to list alliances – possibly chronologically – without themes being addressed as distinct synoptic concepts. The synoptic elements of such a response might be restricted to the conclusion.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	Piedmontese alliance of the Crimean War. Also the Wars of Unification involved alliances. In 1859 France and Piedmont fought Austria. In 1866 the two combatants were alliances of minor German states led by Prussia and Austria. So too the Franco-Prussian War where Prussia led an alliance of German states against an isolated France.		

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
5	<p>To what extent was the First World War the most important turning point in the organisation of the state for war in the period 1792 to 1945?</p> <p>Potential themes that might be addressed as turning points might include the mobilisation of manpower. The Revolutionary Wars would certainly fit into this criterion as the first time mass conscription has been used. The question might be addressed regarding the scale of conscription, in which case one of the two world wars might be advanced as the turning point.</p> <p>Another theme might be the use of the economy to support war. The First World War would be an obvious candidate regarding the use of industry in warfare. On the other hand, the Second World War might fit the criterion for the use of technology as a product of the economy.</p> <p>Other themes might be the organisation of strategic planning, the home front, infrastructure, food production or the use of propaganda. Some other elements of the specification might form appropriate themes - such as communications and transport - if moulded to the question in an appropriate manner.</p> <p>Responses might assess themes based on the demands of war which might become manifested in the time taken to wage a war, its geographical spread, or the human and economic demands of a conflict. If these criteria are applied then the two twentieth century conflicts and the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars are obviously of a magnitude that the other conflicts in the specification would find hard to match.</p>	60	<p>Weaker responses will probably list wars with each sub section arguing a case for or against a turning point. Such a response might be drawn together by a conclusion that displays synthesis of varying quality. Such responses may only engage the synoptic element of the mark scheme in the introduction and/or conclusion.</p> <p>Stronger responses may engage the synoptic element of the question by advancing themes which set criteria for potential turning points.</p> <p>Synopsis and synthesis might be engaged by a comparative analysis of the organisation of a state for war and the challenges that the successful prosecution of a war might pose a combatant.</p> <p>The First World War can be accepted or rejected as the turning point. Alternatively the decision might be made regarding aspects of the organisation of the state, for example the First World War being the main turning point for the mobilization of industry for war, whereas the Revolutionary War was the turning point for the mobilization of manpower.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
6	<p>‘Generals had little impact on the outcome of battles.’ How far do you agree with this view of warfare from 1792-1945?</p> <p>The question is about why battles were won or lost in the period under discussion. Candidates will probably discuss a range of generals with examples being drawn from arguably good generals such as Napoleon or Lee or arguably bad generals such as Benedek. Candidates might use the qualities of a general as themes with the discussion ranging across the period. Such qualities might be leadership, organisation, logistics, tactical and strategic planning.</p> <p>Alternative reasons for the outcome of battles might be luck, the size of armies, weapons technology, the organisation and structure of armies, the quality of troops, the location of battles, weather, etc.</p> <p>There are obviously many battles during the period that might be used as evidence. They should be cited to support thematic arguments. Detailed narratives of battles might be the mark of weaker responses.</p> <p>There may be some issue about what constitutes a battle after 1914. Examiners should have some flexibility when dealing with battles in the First or Second World Wars where formal engagements were larger in terms of time and geography than the set pieces of the later eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Such 20th century examples might have an element of strategic planning as part of the response.</p>	60	<p>Candidates may engage a range of reasons why battles were won or lost but the role of generals must be engaged in a significant manner.</p> <p>The synoptic element of the mark scheme might be engaged by discussing themes such as generalship, logistics and the like. Better responses might argue that no one factor dictated the outcome of battles and follow a middle ground. Further, better response might argue that the role of generals was linked to other factors.</p> <p>Weaker responses might simply list generals and ignore synthesis and synopsis.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
7	<p>‘Revolutionary Nationalism was undermined by weak leadership throughout the period from 1798 to 1921.’ How far do you agree with this view?</p> <p>The focus of the question is on the leadership of Revolutionary Nationalism and how far it was damaged by weak leadership. An assessment of Revolutionary Nationalism’s leadership is central to an effective answer. Candidates need to range across the period, aware that revolutionary nationalism itself changed in approach and outlook. It ranged from the 18th century democratic and enlightened idealism of Wolfe Tone and Emmet, through the romantic and cultural nationalism of Young Ireland and Davis in 1848, the exiled US nationalism of Stephens and the Fenians in the 1850s, the IRB in Ireland of Michael Davitt, the revived IRB of Thomas Clarke and Patrick Pearse post 1898, Arthur Griffith’s Sinn Fein in 1905 and Connelly’s Socialist Citizen Army through to DeValera and Michael Collins in the 1910s. Whether they were weak throughout is arguable. Candidates may consider the leadership of Tone and Emmet flawed, the tactic of general armed uprising in 1798 and a more targeted rising (Dublin Castle) in 1803 being poorly coordinated (Tone wasn’t even there and arrived late only to be arrested). However candidates could point to Tone’s appreciation of the need to gain French support and to the meticulous planning of Emmet which backfired only by accident; neither had the option of gaining electoral support. Both faced a formidable armed state at war and both used potentially dangerous organisations like the United Irishmen. Both inspired Revolutionary Nationalism for the rest of the period. Davis and Young Ireland were able both on the journalistic front and in their association with O’Connell in the 1840s, but their decision to break from O’Connell could be considered a mistake, their 1848 rising ridiculous. Candidates might take a more generous view of leadership in the mid-century. Stephens in the US created the Fenians who consistently raised money and proved a long term source of support for Revolutionary Nationalism safe from British control. The IRB in Ireland and England had less success in their terror strategy in the mid-1860s. Davitt was far from weak and in the Land League and in the New Departure created organisations that brought government in Ireland to a standstill. Clark and Pearse revived the IRB after release from prison in 1898 and awaited the opportunity to rise. Griffiths, MacNeil, DeValera and Collins provided effective leadership with a changed set of tactics – the gun (Irish Volunteers and later the IRA) and the ballot box (Sinn Fein), although candidates may question their strategy in 1916. DeValera ably cultivated the US whilst Collins from 1916 created an effective alternative government. As negotiators in 1921 they proved capable of reaching agreement on most of their objectives. Candidates could thus argue that leadership was far from weak after 1905 and that even before electoral tactics were difficult (an electorate was not there until post 1867), terror and the armed uprising the only options, yet fated to fail.</p>	60	<p>The strongest responses will adopt a thematic approach, considering leadership themes such as strategic issues which include political, religious, social, economic and cultural aspects as necessary. Such an approach, with regular synoptic comparisons between different periods and themes throughout the essay, should be rewarded in the higher levels for AO1b. Stronger answers will also consider both sides of the proposition ‘throughout the period and may discuss the concept of leadership throughout the period.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
8	<p>To what extent was economic conflict the main issue in Irish politics in the period from 1798 to 1921?</p> <p>The question is a wide one, concentrating on the extent economic conflict was at the heart of Irish politics. In support of this view candidates might argue that for most of the Irish it was. These issues – land, the fate of the cottier class, landlord tenant relationships, rent, ownership etc. were central until the early 1900s. In the 1790s Ribbonism and Defenderism had agrarian issues at their heart and much of the 1798 rising was about land issues and economic resentment rather than the politics of the United Irishmen. In the 1830s Irish politics was dominated by the Tithe question, in part economic, whilst land again figured in the 1840s and 1850s on matters of landlord-tenant relations and the fallout over the Famine. In the 1870s the agricultural depression triggered a Land War that became the main focus of Gladstone’s attempts to solve Irish problems from 1870 to 1885 and later Balfour and Wyndham up to 1903. For Connolly economic and class issues were at the heart of his attempts to rouse the Irish working class in the years before the 1st World War. In Ulster the defence of the Union after 1886 was in part economic – to prevent a Home Rule Dublin from imposing protection on free trade economy with world markets (shipbuilding and engineering). For many British governments solving Irish economic problems were central – from Pitt in the 1790s, through Peel in the 1840s to Gladstone in the 1870s and 1880s and Salisbury in the 1880s and 1890s. Achieving this would remove support for more political and constitutional issues. In opposition to the view candidates might argue that economic issues were secondary or subsumed in the larger political and constitutional problems. Irish nationalists rarely made it a priority – their focus was political, either Home Rule or independence. Only Davitt, Lalor and some agrarian nationalists in mid-century thought land to be more important and then possibly only as a means to a wider political end. Tone and Emmet at the beginning of the period thought entirely in political terms, complete independence for an indivisible Ireland through the means of violent insurrection. O’Connell never made much of economic issues preferring to focus on religious and political emancipation (repeal of the Union). The Fenians were entirely political, later 1890s nationalists taking on board cultural notions of a Gaelic state rather than economic self-sufficiency. Griffith’s inspiration for Sinn Fein was a confederative monarchy. By the 1910s economic rural conflict had largely subsided, Connolly’s Dublin strikes had failed and the conflict became entirely political, national and military, remaining so until the Anglo-Irish Treaty of 1921.</p>	60	<p>The strongest responses will adopt a thematic approach, considering the economic theme in comparison to political, religious, social and cultural. Such an approach, with regular synoptic comparisons between different periods and themes throughout the essay, should be rewarded in the higher levels for AO1b. Stronger answers will also consider a variety of other issues.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
9	<p>'Ireland gained far more from Whig and Liberal governments than from Tory, Conservative and Coalition governments in the period from 1798 to 1921.' How far do you agree with this view?</p> <p>The focus of this question is a comparison of the relative importance of gains from Whig-Liberal governments or Tory / Conservative / Coalition ones. There are a variety of approaches that candidates may take. Some may proceed chronologically provided there is comparative judgement within defined periods (say Tory / Whig 1799 – 1852; Liberal / Conservative 1859 – 1893; Liberal / Conservative and Unionists 1894 – 1921). An alternative would be to examine specific types of 'gain' – political and constitutional, religious and economic and social.</p> <p>It could be argued that the Irish gained more political and constitutional concession from the Whig /liberals than the Tories / Conservatives via Municipal and Patronage matters in the 1830s and 1880s, Irish Disestablishment in 1869, proposed University Reform in 1873, 3 Home Rule Bills from 1886 and Parliamentary Reform from 1850.</p> <p>In contrast the question's assertion could be disagreed with by citing Tory/Conservative and Unionist economic concessions (Peel's land proposals, the Land Purchase Acts of the Balfour – Wyndham period after 1886), the major concession of Roman Catholic Emancipation by Peel and Wellington, the political concessions involved in Pitt's Act of Union itself in 1800 and the large scale devolution of local power in the 1880s and 1890s under Salisbury and Balfour. Lloyd George's Coalition conceded the Government of Ireland Act in 1920 which granted Home Rule to both Ulster and the South, followed closely by the Anglo-Irish Treaty conceding an Irish Free State with Dominion Status. This would suggest that the Tories, Conservatives and Unionists conceded far more to Ireland. Nonetheless Irish constitutional nationalism usually preferred to work with Whigs and Liberals who conceded much on religion and economic reform (Tithes in 1838, Land Reform in the 1880s and economic rationalisation under Birrell's Chief Secretaryship to 1916). Some may stress the similarities between the different types of government. Both frequently resorted to Coercion (the Whigs setting up a police force in the 1830s, the Liberals coercing in the 1880s, whilst the Tories frequently coerced from Pitt to Peel and on to 'Bloody' Balfour who often took repressive action). Both parties talked to opponents and 'terrorists', the Whigs to O'Connell, Gladstone to Parnell in the Kilmainham treaty of 1882, Lloyd George and his Tory Coalition partners to Sinn Fein and the IRA prior to the Anglo-Irish Treaty in 1921. All mainland parties were determined to maintain the Union and any Irish 'gain' was seen as simply making the Union work, at least until 1920 – 21.</p>	60	<p>The strongest responses will adopt a thematic approach, considering governments and their actions on a variety of political, religious, social and economic issues. Such an approach, with regular synoptic comparisons between different periods and themes throughout the essay, should be rewarded in the higher levels for AO1b. Stronger answers will consider both varieties of government and will seek to define that they stand for.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	Financially the Balfour / Wyndham Land Purchase Acts and Birrell's Edwardian welfare were 'generous'. Politically concessions on local power by both Whigs in the 1830s and the Conservatives in the 1880s proved more valuable than Liberal Home Rule. Candidates can thus agree or disagree with the assertion, or argue there was little to choose between the two political groupings.		

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
10	<p>‘There was more continuity than change in the domestic policies of Russia’s rulers in the period from 1855 to 1964.’ How far do you agree with this view?</p> <p>Candidates might consider the policies of Alexander II, the Provisional Government, Lenin and Khrushchev represented change more than those of Alexander III, and Nicholas II. Candidates may see Stalin as the direct heir of Lenin simply embedding many of Lenin’s policies whereas others may see Stalin’s policies as significantly different.</p> <p>Arguments in favour of continuity might include autocratic / dictatorial government, the use of terror and centralized control of the economy. Both regimes tended only to reform under pressure.</p> <p>Candidates may choose to assert that the Tsars were predominantly opposed to change whereas the communist dictators introduced sweeping changes. Lenin seized power in 1917 during the October Revolution and his Marxist-Leninist creed rid Russia of most of the trappings of the Romanov regime. Candidates could argue that Stalin was even more revolutionary, arguing that his economic and social policies in the 1930s utterly transformed the USSR which post-1945 was emerging as a global super-power. Candidates are likely to argue that Khrushchev supported political change (de-Stalinisation) and economic change. The Provisional Government are also likely to be seen as favouring all types of change, most certainly political, though some candidates may argue that their caution in going ahead with land re-distribution puts a question mark against their enthusiasm for social and economic change.</p> <p>In terms of arguing that there was more change than continuity in the domestic policies of Russia’s rulers, candidates might focus on the fate of the old elite and the Orthodox Church.</p> <p>Candidates may argue that whilst there was continuity in policy there were considerable differences of scale, for example in terms of economic progress, urbanisation and the use of terror. It might be argued that the communists represented a more ruthless and efficient twentieth century variant of Russian authoritarianism than the Tsars.</p> <p>Candidates may also assert that despite the revolutionary nature of their doctrine, Lenin and Stalin both exhibited reactionary tendencies, pursuing policies that have led many historians to refer to communist dictatorship as simply another version of autocratic authoritarianism.</p>	60	<p>The strongest responses will adopt a Thematic approach, considering political, social and economic domestic policies. Such an approach, with regular synoptic comparisons between different periods and rulers throughout the essay, should be rewarded in the higher levels for AO1b. Stronger answers will also consider both sides of the proposition.</p> <p>Others are likely to structure the essay around the various rulers of Russia, perhaps arguing that some rulers’ policies tended to reflect continuity with the past whereas those of other rulers represented change.</p> <p>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
11	<p>‘Stalin was more successful in dealing with opposition than any other ruler of Russia in the period from 1855 to 1964.’ How far do you agree with this view?</p> <p>Candidates may well see Alexander III, Lenin and Stalin as more successful at dealing with opposition than either Alexander II (who faced a growing tide of opposition and was ultimately assassinated) or Nicholas II (under whom the Romanov dynasty ended) or Khrushchev (despite his evident success in the power struggle after Stalin’s death as he was forced to retire by the Central Committee in 1964) or Prince Lvov / Kerensky (who were swept aside in 1917).</p> <p>Candidates may well argue that Stalin was more successful at dealing with opposition than any other ruler. Stalin defeated all of his rivals during the power struggle with consummate skill and exterminated real and imagined opponents with bloodcurdling efficiency for the next 25 years and his chilling terror may well lead candidates to argue that he was the most successful ruler at dealing with opposition. Candidates are likely to see Stalin as the most effective user of repression of all Russia’s rulers in this period.</p> <p>However, candidates must also consider whether other rulers dealt with opposition more successfully than Stalin did. Most candidates are likely to concentrate their alternate arguments on Lenin and Alexander III when considering whether Stalin was the most successful ruler at dealing with opposition. Some candidates may well argue that Lenin was even more successful because he cut a swath through the other parties that aspired to power in 1917 and successfully defended his revolution during the Civil War. He created the world’s first communist state and died with his party securely in power. Other parties were all banned, as were factions within the Communist Party.</p> <p>Alexander III came to the throne after the assassination of his father, whose reign had seen opposition spiralling out of control. His imposition of ‘the Reaction’ drove opponents underground or abroad. Candidates may well compare his achievements with the failure of both his father and his son to control opposition. Amongst these latter-day Tsars he was undeniably most successful at dealing with opposition. Candidates who choose to differentiate between dealing with opponents and dealing with the reasons for opposition may see Alexander III in a different light. They may wish to argue that the granting of concessions was a more successful way of dealing with opposition than ruthless repression. It can be argued that his imposition of ‘the reaction’ from 1881 bequeathed Nicholas II a revolution.</p>	60	<p>The strongest responses will adopt a Thematic approach, comparing how various rulers dealt with opposition throughout this period.</p> <p>Such an approach, with regular synoptic comparisons between different rulers throughout the essay, should be rewarded in the higher levels for AO1b. Stronger answers will also consider both sides of the proposition and may define ‘successful’.</p> <p>Candidates who clearly define different ways of dealing with opposition, for example repression, reform and the policy of ‘divide and rule’ are most likely to be successful.</p> <p>Others are likely to structure the essay around the various rulers of Russia, perhaps arguing that some rulers were much more successful at dealing with opposition than others. 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
12	<p>‘The development of Russian government was influenced more by revolution than any other factor.’ How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1855 to 1964?</p> <p>Candidates may argue that the development of Russian government was influenced more by revolution than any other factor using a variety of evidence. When arguing in support of this view candidates are likely to draw most of their evidence from the 1905 Revolution (the October Manifesto and the introduction of the Duma; in a pure sense the abandonment of absolutism) and the twin revolutions of 1917. The February Revolution ended over 300 years of Romanov rule and the establishment of the Provisional Government intent on bringing constitutional government to Russia. October 1917 and the triumph of Bolshevism crushed all possibility that a liberal democracy might emerge in Russia and transformed Russia into the Soviet Union – the world’s first communist state. However, some candidates may argue that whilst the revolutions of 1917 swept aside the Romanovs and introduced Bolshevism, they had a limited impact on the development of Russian government as one form of autocracy was replaced by another.</p> <p>Candidates may well choose to argue that war had an important influence on developments in Russian government. Arguably, the horrific impact of the First World War, both at the front and at home, sealed the fate of the Romanovs and, in turn, the Provisional Government in 1917. Candidates may argue that the appeal of the Bolsheviks in 1917 and the triumph of Lenin were directly related to the impact of the First World War. War can therefore be viewed as the prime cause of the end of autocratic government and the failure of the temporary move towards constitutional government. Defeat in the Crimean War can be seen as the trigger for Alexander II’s programme of reform and the introduction of Zemstva as a new system of post-Emancipation local government. Similarly the Russo-Japanese War led to Nicholas II’s announcement of the October Manifesto and the formation of the Duma. Arguably, victory in the Second World War entrenched Stalin’s dictatorial power and had a brutal impact on the government of many of the outlying ‘republics’ of the USSR.</p> <p>However, candidates may still argue that revolution had a greater impact on the development of Russian government than war. The impact of the First World War was not the only cause of either the October or the February revolutions of 1917, nor was defeat by Japan the only cause of the 1905 Revolution. As the revolutions were multi-causal candidates may argue they had the most important impact on the development of Russian government in this period.</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.</p>	60	<p>The strongest responses will adopt a Thematic approach, comparing the importance of revolution against the other dominant factors in the development of Russian government during this period. Such factors may include war, reform and the aims and policies of rulers.</p> <p>Such an approach, with regular synoptic comparisons between different factors throughout the essay, should be rewarded in the higher levels for AO1b.</p> <p>Candidates who discuss aspects of Russian government such as the fate of opposition, changes in ideology, the absence of democracy, the one party state and compare the relative influence of revolutions on these developments are most likely to be successful. Examiners must not expect to find reference to all these aspects in candidate answers.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
13	<p>‘The Supreme Court had more influence on the African American struggle for civil rights than any other branch of government.’ To what extent do you agree with this view of the period from 1865 to 1992?</p> <p>The evidence for the Supreme Court includes the judgements which underpinned Jim Crow segregation: notably, the Slaughterhouse Case (1873), Cruickshank Case (1896), Civil Rights Cases (1883) and Plessy versus Ferguson (1896). It also includes the cases that facilitated the civil rights movement: notably, Smith v Allwright (1944), the two Brown cases (1954, 1955), Browder v Gayle (1956), Boynton v Virginia (1960), Loving v Virginia (1967) and Swann v Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education (1971). The best candidates will also be familiar with more recent cases in which the Supreme Court has been less supportive of minority rights. These include: San Antonio Independent School District v Rodriguez (1973), Milliken v Bradley (1974), Bakke v University of California (1978), Grove City v Bell (1984) and Freeman v Pitts (1992). <u>Not even the best candidates should be expected to be familiar with all of these cases and some may refer to cases not listed here.</u></p> <p>Evidence for Congress includes the period of Reconstruction (1865-77): notably, the 13th, 14th and 15th amendments (1865, 1868, 1870) and the Civil Rights Acts of 1866 and 1875, the role of the Freedmen’s Bureau (1865-70), the period of military rule in the South (1867-77) and the Enforcement Act (1870) designed to suppress the Ku Klux Klan. Candidates are also likely to refer to the Civil Rights Acts (1957, 1960, 1964), the Voting rights Act (1965) and the Civil Rights Restoration Act (1988). They may wish to balance this by illustrating Congressional indifference to civil rights for much of the period and even hostility to measures such as a federal anti-lynching law.</p> <p>Candidates evaluating the role of the presidency may refer to the hostility of presidents Andrew Johnson and Woodrow Wilson, the indifference of the majority of presidents from 1877 to 1933, and contrast this with the modest support given by FDR, Truman and Eisenhower. Candidates are likely to credit recent Democratic presidents JFK, LBJ and Carter with greater support than Republicans Nixon, Reagan and Bush. In assessing the role of state governments candidates are likely to refer to Southern states maintaining legal discrimination through Jim Crow laws, and devices such as the poll tax or literacy tests designed to prevent African Americans from voting. Candidates could also support their answers by referring to the attempts by Southern states to resist desegregation. Evidence could include the Little Rock crisis (1957), the ‘Ole Miss crisis (1962), the attempted defiance of Governor Wallace, the activities of law enforcement agencies (such as ‘Bull’ Connor in Birmingham or Jim Clark in Selma) and the close relationship between state officials and the Citizens Councils.</p>	60	<p>The strongest responses will adopt a thematic approach, comparing, contrasting and evaluating the relative importance of the Supreme Court, Congress, the presidency and state governments. Such an approach, with regular synoptic comparisons between different periods and the different branches throughout the essay, should be rewarded in the higher levels for AO1b.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
14	<p>Assess the view that trade union and labour rights in the USA changed more significantly in the 1980s than at any other time in the period from 1865 to 1992.</p> <p>The significance of the 1980s for trade union and labour rights was considerable. New technologies and economic globalization brought major structural changes to American business and the workforce, accelerating trends already begun in the 1970s. Many companies shed labour and the traditional manufacturing and extractive sectors became part of the “rust belt”. However, jobs in service industries, finance, technology, and the information and entertainment sectors increased, bringing high salaries to some. But many jobs in the expanding service sector were low-paid, part-time, and non-unionised. As a result, union membership fell dramatically. The defeat of the PATCO strike in 1981 indicated that unions faced a hostile political climate and attempts to expand into new sectors of the economy met with little success because businesses fought unionisation, claiming that it would raise labour costs. Cesar Chavez’s United Farm Workers (UFW) steadily lost ground. Strong stands by growers to keep out union organisers, opposition from the Teamsters union, and the continued influx of new immigrants eager for work undercut the UFW’s efforts. By 1992 the UFW was struggling to rebuild its membership and regain bargaining power. Union organization among new, low-paying sectors of the economy expanded only slowly. The major growth for organized labour came among government employees and workers in the health care industry. But these gains did not offset the losses in union membership in the old industrial sectors.</p> <p>Candidates will need to contrast the 1980s with other significant turning points. Negative ones include the late 19th century or the 1920s when trade unions faced legal obstacles, violence and government hostility to strike action. Candidates could also refer to the immediate post-war period when the New Deal gains were, to some degree, clawed back by Congress. The 1947 Taft-Hartley Act allowed states to pass right to work laws and banned the ‘closed shop’. The 1959 Landrum-Griffin Act banned secondary picketing. Candidates analyzing more positive periods for labour may consider the 1930s as the most important turning point. The New Deal’s alphabet agencies aimed to get the unemployed back to work, FDR’s administration gave trade unions and workers the support of the Federal government for the first time, and trade union membership tripled between 1933 and 1939. Better candidates will be aware that the New Deal period was not wholly positive as there were serious, and sometimes, violent industrial disputes in 1934 and 1937 and some major employers (such as Ford) resisted recognising unions until the war. Some candidates may argue for the Second World War when an unprecedented expansion of American industry to meet the demands of war production gave considerable bargaining power to workers. Some may opt for the 1960s and analyse the impact of the New Frontier and Great Society programmes on workers’ conditions, welfare, opportunities and living standards.</p>	60	<p>Stronger responses will consider the importance of the 1980s, even if they want to argue that this decade was not the most important period of change. The strongest answers will adopt a thematic approach and compare and contrast the 1980s with other periods. Such an approach, with regular synoptic comparisons between different events and themes throughout the essay, should be rewarded in the higher levels for AO1b. If responses adopt a period by period approach they can still reach the highest levels, however to do this they will need to make regular comparisons with the 1980s in order to judge their relative importance, rather than leave this analysis to the conclusion.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
15	<p>'The reasons for opposition to gender equality remained the same throughout the period from 1865 to 1992.' How far do you agree with this view?</p> <p>Some candidates will wish to challenge the notion that reasons for opposition did not change by arguing that there has been a linear development towards gender equality which caused opposition to recede because the notion of 'separate spheres' became outmoded as women progressively gained improved rights. They are likely to refer to women's franchise campaigns which culminated in the 19th Amendment (1920) giving women the vote in national elections; the improved educational and employment opportunities that American economic development and participation in the two world wars brought, and the impact of post-1960 sexual liberation as a result of the increased availability of contraception and abortion.</p> <p>Some responses will suggest that the notion that men and women occupy 'separate spheres' of life has never been fully challenged by some Americans, even if opposition to gender equality has been expressed in different ways as attitudes have changed. They will, perhaps, point out that throughout the period men have dominated senior positions in society and politics, even if the notion of 'separate spheres' is less often explicitly articulated. They might point out that some extensions of women's rights have owed more to reluctant pragmatism than to reduced opposition to gender equality. For example, some western territories (eg Wyoming 1869, Utah 1870) gave women the vote to encourage emigration westwards and hasten statehood rather than because they recognised women's equality. Wartime necessity explains why women were able to enter certain skilled jobs, even if their employment was temporary and was resented by men and some trade unions who were fearful that the employment of women would lower wages.</p> <p>Candidates may wish to analyse the concept of gender equality and link it to the development of a 'rights-based' culture since the Second World War but point out that not all women are agreed about the concept. For some it has meant equality with men; for others it has meant recognition of separate rights. Candidates might refer to women's roles in the opposition to the Equal Rights Amendment, to controversy over the Roe versus Wade case (1973), and analyse the support for the conservative social agenda of the parts of the Republican Party and some religious groups.</p>	60	<p>The strongest responses will adopt a thematic approach and consider how far, and why, the reasons for opposition to gender equality remained the same. They will contrast this with the degree to which attitudes were altered by political, social, economic, and cultural changes. Such an approach, with regular synoptic comparisons between different periods and themes throughout the essay, should be rewarded in the higher levels for AO1b. Stronger answers will also consider both sides of the proposition and might discuss the lack of agreement over what gender equality means in practice, and may be aware that changes to women's status have been patchy and contested, that different rights have been opposed more than others, and for different reasons.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
16	<p>‘Steady progress characterised women’s political emancipation.’ How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1868 to 1997?</p> <p>Candidates can argue that it was steady, from the suggested inclusion of propertied women by Mill at the beginning of the period through the late 19th century campaign for legal equality, the early 20th century campaign for the vote, firstly for middle class and propertied women and then universal suffrage in the 1920s, through to issues of representation and political representation (all women shortlists were proposed in the later 20th century and in 1997 Labour promised a Minister for Women). The argument would be that women’s political emancipation proceeded in ever widening circles – legal, franchisal and representational. Some mention may be made of linked issues – their right to equality in the workplace and wider role in the labour market since 1970, their position within trade Unionism (the Dagenham car workers in the 1960s and 1970s), the Sex Discrimination Act of 1975, feminism and its relationship to politics etc. The number of women MPs increased from 1 in 1918 to 120 by 1997. The 1997 election was a highpoint (from only 19 in 1979). In opposition to the view candidates could argue that there is little pattern, just a series of discontinuities. At various points little political progress was made, from 1868 to 1905 for example their campaigns for the vote and on legal issues were marginal and again from 1918 to 1935 politics remained patriarchal. From 1950 to the mid-1960s little was contributed to the debate perhaps because of segregation in education, the difficulties of reconciling work and family and prejudice in general. In 1997 women still remained seriously underrepresented at all political levels, despite pressure groups like the Fawcett Society. The lack of progress is significant. With the exception of Thatcher no woman before 1997 held the key offices of Home or Foreign Secretary or Chancellor of the Exchequer. Since the early 1900s, with the Suffragists and Suffragettes, there has been no all-embracing movement dedicated to political emancipation. Progress is focused on particular issues like shortlists, particular campaigns and the home rather than parliament or local government. No set conclusion is expected.</p>	60	<p>The strongest responses will adopt a thematic approach, considering themes particularly political but also social, economic, and cultural. Such an approach, with regular synoptic comparisons between different periods and themes throughout the essay, should be rewarded in the higher levels for AO1b. Stronger answers will also consider both sides of the proposition and may define progress and political emancipation.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
17	<p>‘The most important factor in the development of the Labour party was its association with the Trade Union movement.’ 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 trade union movement in the development of the Labour Party. Other factors that might be compared and considered are franchisal factors, ideological ones, events external to the party like the problems of the Liberals after 1916, the impact of depression and war or social factors, especially the rise and fall of a distinct industrial working class, leadership and electoral and organisational issues. The argument for the primacy of the Unions is that the origins of the party lay here – in the 1860s a TUC was created and it looked to political representation, albeit Liberal (the Lib Labs). By the 1880s the New Mass Unionism of Tillet had no such allegiance and with the failure of direct action the focus by the late 1880s fell back on political representation. Candidates might point to the crucial creation of the LRC in 1900 and how this was given substance by a perceived attack on Unions by employers and the Courts and the weak response of the Liberal party. The party was given a huge boost by the accession of various Unions in the Edwardian period, notably the Miners in 1908. Unions were key to financing and supporting MPs to represent their interests and to organising votes in industrial and urban constituencies. Most Labour MPs were Union candidates. In the mid-century the unions were more powerful and many of the legal limitations on political contributions had gone. They had been given a dominant say by the 1917-18 Constitution. Labour’s marginalisation from 1970 until 1997 was partly because of waning Trade Union power in the wake of deindustrialisation and Conservative governments determined to restrict their legal powers (the Thatcher government passed 6 trade Union Acts) whilst Labour itself split over the issue of Union power (SDP) within itself. In opposition to the view other factors could be stressed. At each of the above stages of 19th-20th century development candidates might stress the importance of other issues. That Trade Unions before 1899 and often beyond stuck with the Liberals. The key developments in the 1890s owed more to other groups like the SDF and the ILP who took their inspiration from ideological Socialism (Keir Hardie and Ramsay MacDonald). They provided the leadership until the mid-20th century rather than the Unions – Hardie, MacDonald, Henderson, Snowden and Attlee. Crucial was the working class vote, not fully operating until 1918 and declining by the 1970s, and for reasons other than Trade Unionism, played a role. The 1st WW split the Liberals and the 2nd WW brought Labour more fully into Cabinet office and de facto domestic power. The Collectivism involved in both wars helped Labour’s ideas to become more main stream, dictating the post 2nd WW consensus and appearing modern in the late 1940s and again in 1964. Even in 1918 the Constitution of the party (Clause IV) was arguably more about socialism than trade unionism. In the inter war period Trade Unionism suffered a series of blows – the General Strike and the Great Depression. The argument</p>	60	<p>The strongest responses will adopt a thematic approach, considering political and trade Union/Labour movement themes linked to the development of a political party. Such an approach, with regular synoptic comparisons between different periods and themes throughout the essay, should be rewarded in the higher levels for AO1b. Stronger answers will also consider other factors and may define various aspects of Labour development.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	for the post Callaghan period – Kinnock, Smith and Blair – was about modernisation without and against a Trade Union movement (media manipulation) and political splits between left (Militant) and right in the party. Clause IV was repealed by Blair whilst in opposition. Between 1951 and 1997 Labour was in power for only 11 years. New Labour was to be a party that turned its back on the Trade Unions.		

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
18	<p>How far would you agree that the House of Lords remained essentially unchanged in the period from 1868 to 1997?</p> <p>Candidates could argue this to be the case. For much of the period the Lords possessed considerable powers (and were co-equal before 1911 excepting finance bills) although even at the beginning of the period governments had become responsible to the Commons because defeat on a key issue there would lead to overthrow. Defeat in the Lords did not. Before 1909 a constitutional clash was carefully avoided and the Lords often rejected key pieces of government legislation or seriously amended them, especially Liberal ones like Home Rule (1894) or nonconformist issues post 1906. 19th century Cabinets contained at least half of their members from the Lords and often the leadership itself – Salisbury and Rosebery in the 1880s and 1890s. In 1940 George VI, on the resignation of Chamberlain, did not consider Lord Halifax’ membership of the Lords as a barrier to him becoming PM – he had been Foreign secretary. Thatcher’s Foreign Secretary up to the Falklands War, Lord Carrington, operated in the Lords whilst the Lord Chancellor, head of the judiciary, along with the other law Lords had their base there up to 1997. The Peerage Act of 1963 allowed hereditary peers to renounce their title and stand for the Commons – Lord Home did this, won an election and became PM in 1963. The social standing and alleged expertise of the Lords ensured continuity throughout the period (until 1999 the majority of peers were hereditary, nearly half taking the Conservative whip) and their powers arguably increased as government legislation increased. Their powers of delay could effectively finish off a bill whose timetable in the Commons was increasingly restricted. The Lords continued to make life difficult for governments on occasions, though less so than before 1911. Since 1945 the Lords have felt free to reject or offer substantial amendments to bills not mentioned in manifestos (the ‘Salisbury Convention’). It frustrated the minority Labour government of 1974-79, annoyed the Thatcher government on issues of liberty. It has been labelled a meeting place for yesteryears’ elites and has always fought off proposals for major change in this period, from the Webbs in the 1920s to Churchill in the 1930s. The argument against an unchanging Lords rests on two key periods – the crisis of 1909-11 and social developments from the late 1940s. The Parliament Act of 1911 clearly subordinated the political role of the Lords to the Commons. Money bills were to become law a month after being sent to the Lords. Any other Bill passed in three successive Commons sessions but rejected by the Lords would automatically become law. In 1949 the power to delay was further reduced to one year by the Attlee Labour government, anxious to implement its welfare legislation. Since 1868 the Lords remained the same in composition until the 1950s, but its power was radically reduced, although not perhaps its influence. Since the 1950s the rise of Life Peerages has begun, arguably, to affect its social composition. The rise of Prime Ministerial patronage via Life Peers has had an effect in ensuring the Lords reflects more the political composition of the Commons and it has become less</p>	60	<p>The strongest responses will adopt a thematic approach, considering themes such as political, religious, social, economic, cultural in as far as they relate to the House of Lords. Such an approach, with regular synoptic comparisons between different periods and themes throughout the essay, should be rewarded in the higher levels for AO1b. Stronger answers will also consider both sides of the proposition.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	of an independent force, and perhaps less of a Conservative force, a perceived problem in the late 19 th and first half of the 20 th centuries.		

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 2015

